

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives. The House will convene in fifteen minutes. Attention Members of the House of Representatives. The House will convene in five minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be lead in prayer by Father Krueger. Father Krueger, please leave the Xerox machine."

Father Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. St. Theresa of Avila wrote: Our Lord does not care so much for the importance of our works as for the love with which they are done. Let us pray. Eternal Lord God, Father of all, Omnipotent and Omnipresent Creator, we do give Thee our infeigned thanks for this life and all the blessings which Thou hast given to us and our fellow mankind. May we seek to know values that are eternal to enable us to make judgments that are ethereal, that being so guided we may serve the people of this State of Illinois as Members of this House of Representatives with a charity whose depth is unfathomable through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen. Pledge of Allegiance. Ebbesen is the one in the pink coat."

Ebbesen (et al): "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen, do you give color blind tests? What color is that coat? Is that pink or is that salmon or...?"

Ebbesen: "That's Illini orange almost."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Yourell, Chairman of the



Committee on Counties and Townships, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' House Bills 966 and 2883. Representative Willer, Chairwoman from the Committee on Human Resources, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 2227. Representative Pierce, Chairman from the Committee on Revenues, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'Do pass' House Bill 2847. Representative Sharp, Chairman from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following Bill was referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1528. Representative VonBoeckman, Chairman from the Committee on Motor Vehicles, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 3003, 'Do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 1833."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #87, adopted by the Senate April 9, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 3033. Representative Ebbesen. Why don't we try 3030



right now? Representative Wolf. J. J. Wolf. 3030."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3030. A Bill...a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain retirement benefits for teachers. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3031."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3031. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the teachers' retirement system. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3032."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3032. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the judges' retirement system. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3033."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3033. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly retirement system. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3034. Representative... Do you want that without...3034? Out of the record. 3037. Out of the record. 3040. Out of the record. 3042. 3042. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3042. A Bill for an Act making ...amending Sections of an Act making appropriations to



the ordinary and contingent expense of the Institute of Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' House Bill 2955, 'Be adopted' House Joint Resolution 74, 'Be adopted as amended' House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #44."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3448, Hallstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3449, Ryan-Catania. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to public assistance and to repeal an Act herein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3450, Bullock. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Comptroller Merit Employment Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3451, Matijevich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3452, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections and the title of an Act relating to mortgages of property of public utilities. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Terzich, Chairman of the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do not pass' House Bill 1752 and House Bill 2801."



Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. House Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate. 1563. House Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1563, Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sales on credit and the lending of money. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1801. Skinner. Let the record show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1801."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1980."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1980. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fish Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendments 1 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Griesheimer, amends House Bill 1980 as amended by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "1980. Representative Griesheimer. Do we have a Floor Amendment? Is that what we're considering? Will you please...?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1980 has been amended in its entirety at the suggestion and direction of the Department of Conservation. They were the original promoters of House Bill 1980, and the subject matter of the Bill remains the same, but



it does not involve the same specific matters of the original House Bill 1980. Thus, in effect, they have used 1980 as a vehicle here to correct three errors in laws that were passed by us last year. The Amendment...House...Floor Amendment #4, which would take the place of the prior Bill, provides that the license, which we increased for retail and wholesale fish dealers last year to fifty dollars and combined into a single license, be divided and that the fee be reduced for retail dealers. I would suggest to all downstate Legislators this was done, because the fifty dollar fee imposed by the uniform license for small retail fish dealers was felt to be oppressive against them, and they very much protested this very high increase, so the Department agreed to roll back the retail fishers... fish dealers' license. It also clarifies the language with regard to fish indigenous to the State of Illinois, and, thirdly, at the request of several Legislators, they have reduced the prior requirements for interstate sale of minnow dealers prior to the...this Amendment and, ultimately, the enactment of this law. So, it was a requirement that they have an Illinois drivers' license and Illinois plates on their truck. I imagine this is statutory. They're releasing this requirement. Thus, all of these are rather technical in nature and have been done in response to requests of various Legislators. I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

DunnJ: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

DunnJ: "Does this legislation, as amended by Amendment #4 that is put onto the Bill, exempt a casual sale from one person to another as they walk away from the fishing hole and the guy says, 'I'll give you five bucks for



that string of fish you've got...got there.' Is that... do you have to have a license to do that under this Bill, or is a casual sale exempted?"

Griesheimer: "It would seem to me that it's always been exempt. Casual sales between parties are not bound by the retail or wholesale fish licenses."

Dunn J: "I wonder if we could have a little clarification, because the definition of a retail fish dealers' license does seem to me to say that any resident of the State of Illinois who sells one fish must have a license. Maybe there isn't..."

Griesheimer: "Where is that in the Bill?"

Dunn J: "It's on the...in the Amendment on page 4, line 11 under the definition. Any resident who sells or offers for sale any aquatic life indigenous to this state, except minnows..."

Griesheimer: "I think they're dealing with a retail sale, though, which would anticipate a profit angle. In other words, the business. I don't think an individual would be in the business of selling fish. I may be wrong, but..."

Dunn J: "Perhaps there's another definition someplace else that...that takes care of this, but this does seem unclear. At least, at this point, and I wonder if the Sponsor would be willing to let us take a look at this, and if...if this does need clarification, I presume you do intend to exempt such a casual sale, and if it is not clear, can we then take care of it with a technical Amendment?"

Griesheimer: "Sure, there's no problem."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman want to take the Bill out of the record?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, until we get this clarified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please take the Bill out of the record. On the Order of...Calendar on page 2 appears House Bill



2211 on Second Reading. Are there...? 2211, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2211. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendments #2, Schneider, amends House Bill 2211 on page 1 in line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is not on the floor. Take the Bill out of the record. On the Calendar on House Bills, Third Reading...if you recall, yesterday we ended up with approximately 1624, so the next Bill that appears on page 6 is 1670...1629. I'm sorry. Mr. Winchester, do you want to have that Bill called?"

Out of the record. 1673. Mr. Bowman. Out of the record. 1702. Mr. Leverenz. Out of the record. 1704. Out of the record. 1710. Mr. Reilly. Out of the record. 1729. Mr. Kornowicz. Out of the record. 1736. Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 1741. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. 1742. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. 1762. Mr. Molloy. Out of the record. 1765. Mr. Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 1800. Mr. O'Brien. Out of the record. House Bill 1810. Mrs. Barnes. Out of the record. 1823. Mr. Donovan. 1830. Mr. Stearney. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1830. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney. Excuse me. 1830."

Stearney: "One moment, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking for it in the Digest."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Glen."



Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 830 (sic) makes certain Amendments to the Marriage Act and provides that an attorney appointed to represent a minor shall be the guardian ad litem, and it makes a revision that the court may appoint an attorney to serve also as guardian ad litem to represent the interests of a minor or dependent child with respect to support, custody, and visitation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I...I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple questions if he'll yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Dunn: "I'm looking at a...Amendment #2. That was put on the Bill, was it not?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Dunn: "It seems to me to be a broad, far-reaching, sweeping Amendment to...it appears to me to completely redefine what is marital property. Is that so?"

Stearney: "Well, it doesn't completely redefine it. It's a definition of it, so I..."

Dunn: "It appears to be a far-reaching Amendment. Would you explain just what this Amendment does? What changes are made?"

Stearney: "Well, is the Dig...is the Digest unclear?"

Dunn: "I'm unclear."

Stearney: "Well, I'd like to respond to your question, but I don't know exactly what your..."

Dunn: "Well, what...what does your Bill do as amended?"

Stearney: "Well, the Amendment, as the Digest provides, adds the...that marital property means all property acquired after marriage and before a judgment of dissolution, which is the same as the present Act where the title is held by the spouses in some form of co-ownership, such as joint tenancy, tenancy in



common, or tenancy by the entirety. And, it also provides that whenever a dissolution of marriage is granted, that where it appears to the court that either party holds title to the property equitably belonging to the other for any reason, the court may compel conveying...conveyance there, too".

Dunn: "Okay, now why are all the definitions heretofore in the Marriage and Dissolution Act stricken?"

Stearney: "Why...?"

Dunn: "Why are we striking the Section that refers to property acquired by gifts, bequests, or devised for descent, property acquired in exchange for property acquired before the marriage, property acquired by a spouse after judgment, property excluded by valid agreement, so on and so forth? Why are all these Sections...?"

Stearney: "Well, even though those...even though those provisions are not in this Amendment, nevertheless, they would be included within the definition, because it would make marital property that property, which is held in some form of co-ownership, such as joint tenancy, tenancy in common, or tenancy by the entirety, so, therefore, the provisions that you've just enumerated would not be included within the...the concept of marital property as it is today in the present, existing Act. So, there's no change in that respect, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Well...well, your definition of marital property, as I read the Bill in its present form, indicates that marital property only includes property where a title is held in some form of co-ownership. Now..."

Stearney: "Yes."

Dunn: "...in the existing statute, marital property would include, perhaps, some other...some other things and specifically there are...there are definitions about what is excluded. Now, we're just trying to get



acquainted with the language of the new Act to find out what it means, and it appears to me that you're... instead of maybe adding to or supplementing or clarifying what we already have on the books. You're throwing it out altogether and substituting a new definition, which may have ambiguities that we can't even foresee at the present time."

Stearney: "Well, I don't believe there would be any ambiguities by this Act whatsoever. It's very clear."

Dunn: "What changes does this Bill make in its present form for the contributions of the spouse who is a homemaker?"

Stearney: "It changes that."

Dunn: "And...and it...but did it...?"

Stearney: "It creates the concept..."

Dunn: "Does it eliminate them altogether?"

Stearney: "No, it creates the concept of equity, which was the...which was the concept in the Marital Property Act for the last hundred years."

Dunn: "Special equities, you're talking about?"

Stearney: "Equities."

Dunn: "Yes."

Stearney: "Equity."

Dunn: "So, you will...you're going to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution Act to go back to the way it was prior to the adoption of the new Act with regard to the contribution of a spouse to the increase in net worth of the family during the marriage?"

Stearney: "Not altogether, but it restores the concept of equity, which was in the..."

Dunn: "But, the spouse must..."

Stearney: "...preceding Act."

Dunn: "...must prove special equities. The court will no longer be required as it is now to take into account the services of a homemaker as a relevant factor in making a distribution of marital property."



Stearney: "Well, you're wrong there, because in considering the question of special equities they will consider that very same factor which you are concerned with."

Dunn: "But, you're talking about special equities, and you know as well as I do that the...that the courts have attached a different significance to the terms, special equities, than...than the consideration of the contribution of the services of a homemaker under the new Act. If I may just speak momentarily to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? I would like to point out to the Members that at a...that House Bill 1830 appears, and I think, in fact, does make broad and sweeping changes in the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. The Bill makes substantive and sweeping reforms in the definition of marital property and also reverts back to the old antiquated system of taking into account the contribution one spouse may make to the marriage as a homemaker. We made a step forward with the new Act to require the court in determining the distribution of marital property between spouses to take into account the services of a homemaker. The Representative who is advocating the passage of this Bill is indicating that we will go back to the old system where special equities had to be proved, and special equities include things like...like a wife taking her name off a joint tenancy deed because her husband says it will be more convenient for one reason or another, and if she comes into court and proves that she had a joint tenancy interest and it was taken away from her for that reason, she can prove special equities and get a share of the property. It would only be in those kinds of circumstances that she can prove a contribution to the assets of the family, and I would strongly urge that this Bill be defeated in its present form and at least taken back for further Amendments to...to change the substance



of the Bill. This will be a drastic reform of a law that we're just getting acquainted with in the State of Illinois. It's a bad Bill in its present form and should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the last speaker, the Gentleman from Macon, was 100% right. What this Bill does by Amendment 2, which was never heard in Committee by the way... Amendment 2, what it does is completely changes the Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Law that was passed into law under the Sponsorship of my seatmate, Representative ^{Qaron} Aaron Jaffe, who has just returned to the floor and completely removes the reforms made in that Act in protecting women and defining marital property. Now, what this Amendment 2 would do, which wasn't explained in the initial explanation by the Sponsor, what it does is says only jointly held or tenancy in common property would be marital property, and the other property would only go on certain equities that we moved away from in Illinois years ago. Now, it seemed to me that Representative Greiman, and Jaffe, and others who have worked so hard to try to improve the present Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Law to those of you who know it by Divorce Law, that's what it is, who tried to improve that law, this completely takes the hatchet approach, knocks out all the reforms made three years ago, and installs the law as it was previously. But, as long as we know that...as long as we know what we're voting on, that's all right. Unfortunately, this Amendment was never heard in Committee. Now, those of you women Members of this House, who are always coming up with your little bitty women's Bills that don't mean a thing, this is the kind of Bill that you should be interested in fighting and opposing. This Bill destroys all the protection of women...all the



protection of marital property that we put into the law three years ago. This is the biggest anti-feminist Bill that we've had in the Legislature this Session, and if the women's advocates would spend a little more time watching some of this divorce legislation and a little less on the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "...pickiest little Bills they sponsor, we'd be better off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's give the Gentleman some attention, please. Please continue, Sir."

Pierce: "In closing, because we have other speakers who are even more knowledgeable than I am on this subject waiting to speak, this is a major revision in the Divorce Law of our state. It returns us to the law as it was previously. It deprives women of their marital interest and men on property acquired since marriage that is not in joint tenancy or tenancy in common. If that's what we want to do, fine, but I think it should be explained that that's what this Bill does with Amendment #2, and I think it should be re-referred to Committee for hearings in Judiciary I. We should not take up the subject of Amendment 2 in this Bill. It was adopted on the floor when the Bill was at Third...from Third Reading to Second Reading last spring, and with that...for those reasons I intend to oppose House Bill 1830."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to thank Representative Pierce for giving me my introduction to what I'm going to say. If a woman is a homemaker and provides the services within the home so the husband doesn't have to spend that money, it frees that money for him to buy stocks and bonds and invest his money. However, she didn't give him the money to buy it. It isn't a business, so she could never participate in



it. Also, some of the working women, who assume some of the burdens of the family to free up the money for their husbands to buy time deposit certificates, or bonds, or stock, she also has not given him the money to buy it nor has she participated in a business. But, she's freed up the money so that he can invest it, but she couldn't participate in it, and I think this is a bad Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I seem to have misunderstood some of the questioning between Mr. Stearney and the Gentleman from Macon. Mr. Stearney, did you say that the contribution as a homemaker is...is retained in the Bill now? Is that what you said?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney, please."

Stearney: "Would you repeat the question?"

Greiman: "That's what you said I think."

Stearney: "Would you repeat the question, please?"

Greiman: "Yeah. My...I heard you answer Mr. Dunn that...and said that the contribution of a woman as a homemaker is retained in the Bill."

Stearney: "No, I didn't say that."

Greiman: "Well, if you didn't, you talked around it pretty good, because I...that was the understanding that I had."

Stearney: "Well, that's your interpretation. Don't create an innuendo."

Greiman: "Okay, well, I...just in case there was any ambiguity, I would point out that lines 25 and 26 and ...through 28 makes it clear that it's a very significant and substantive change. On the Bill, Mr. Speaker, not to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Greiman: "Not to belabor the point, we spent a great deal of time over a great period of time working on some reforms



that would make...bring fairness to the...to a bitter and difficult area of human life. We are trying to make...to continue the research and the search for equity in divorce legis...litigation. This Bill takes us back. It is a step so far back that it should not receive a single vote up there, and it is just a... just a put back into the Eighteenth Century. This Bill must be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I wish everybody ought to pay attention to this Bill. Number one, because it's important, and, number two, because we've seen a good example now of how to defeat a Bill. The way to defeat a Bill is by getting two or three people to speak against it, totally exaggerate the Furport of the Bill, make all sorts of wild...wild accusations about what it does without really talking about the Bill. What really happened in this situation is that Marshall 'Averback from the City of Chicago came before the Judiciary Committee, and we asked three times, does this Bill, which is now our Marriage and Divorce Act, that...it was enacted three years ago, does this change the concept and doctrine of special equity? And, three times Mr. 'Averback said, 'No, no, no.' He lied to the Members of the Judiciary Committee and, in turn, and by reflecting, he lied to everybody in this House, and I think when that happens, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we've got an obligation to restore ourself to the previous situation. And, in addition to that, let's look at what the Bill really does, not what Representative Greiman says that it returns it to the 1700's, but what it really does. How many Members of this House, who are married, have their house in anything other than joint tenancy? There aren't very many of us. There are not very many people who have property other than in...than in co-tenancy of



some form, and the real...the real law is that if you hold property in co-tenancy, in the event of a dissolution, the court can grant it all to the...to the one spouse and, generally, to the wife. But, our existing law, it's generally considered a return to the community property status where it can only be divided on a half and half basis, and the people say you don't reward homemaking services. Of course, you do. How many times have you ever known a situation where there's been significant homemaker services where there aren't significant alimony or maintenance awards...alimony and gross award...those are all under the...the law. They'd still be under the law, or they...it would be restored into law under Stearney's Bill and Amendment, and that just isn't the case. We're not eliminating the allowance for homemaker services. As a matter of fact, in a good many cases, this Bill would go a lot farther towards that. This doesn't return anything to the Eighteenth Century. It returns it to 1977. before every Member of this House, was lied to by a person who was purporting to get a Bill in that's now made the Bill so complicated that everybody needs a lawyer if not a CPA and an accountant, to be able to get a simple dissolution. I think it's a good Bill. It's fair. It's a law that was a law in Illinois for 150 years. It worked very fairly for both spouses. Nobody ever thought that women were ripped off under the old law. As a matter of fact, the existing law probably is that they receive less allowance than they did before, and I certainly urge you to look beyond the rhetoric, and the hyperbole, and the exaggeration, if not the lies by...by not Members of the House, but by Sponsors of legislation in terms of the Bar, and see that this is a good Bill, a good concept, and something we ought to pass. And, I urge you to...to vote for Representative Stearney's Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. As indicated by Representative Pierce, this Amendment was put on this Bill on the floor of the House, I think, in the wee hours of the night when no one was really paying much attention to what was going on on this particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Let me get you a little attention here now."

Jaffe: "As I indicated, this Amendment #2 was put on the Bill, I think, at a time when no one was really paying much attention to what was being put on any Bill in the last Session of the General Assembly. For those of you who want to know, I think you ought to take a look at the Bill, and when you look at the Bill, you're going to be absolutely shocked at Amendment #2. What does Amendment #2 basically say? Well, it hurts the woman, especially the woman who stays in the woman...the woman who raises children. Let's go through the actual language of it. For instance, under this Amendment you would no longer...you would no longer take into consideration the duration of the marriage. In other words, you could have a woman married for 50 years and it wouldn't make any difference. You could just ride rough shod right over her. You would no longer have the contribution or the dissipation of each party in the acquisition, preservation, or depreciation, or appreciation in the value of the marital or nonmarital property, including the contribution of a spouse as a homemaker or to the family unit. There are so many things that would be knocked out. You would have no consideration of any obligation or rights arising from a prior marriage to either party. You would knock out any rights from any prenuptial agreement to the party. You would not take into consideration the age, the health, the station,



the occupation, the amount or sources of income, the vocational skills, the impliability, the estate, and the liability and needs of each party, and that's just directly from the Bill. So, if you will look at that Amendment, I think you would be shocked at this Amendment. I think it's a terrible way that this Amendment went on this particular Bill. I know it could not get out of Judiciary I in any shape, fashion, or form as it is at the present time. In addition to that, I would like to advise the Membership that yesterday in Judiciary I there were three or four Bills voted out that deal with this subject matter...that deal with it in a reasonable manner, and not in a meat axe approach, and I would urge each Member of this General Assembly to vote against this Bill as it is now constituted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, to close."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the consternation this matter has caused, I would like to speak with some of the Gentleman afterwards. Can I take this out of the record?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asked leave to take the Bill out of the record. Hearing no objections, the Bill is taken out of the record. House Bill 1857. Mr. Steczo. Out of the record. 1878. Mr. Richmond. Out of the record. 1892. Mulcahey. Mr. Mulcahey. Out of the record. 1952. Mr. Steele. Out of the record. House Bill 2005. Take it out of the record. 2022. Mr. Taylor. Out of the record. 2025. Mrs. Alexander. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2025. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again today in response to a question that was..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, ma'am. Let's give the Lady some attention, please."

Alexander: "I rise today in response to a question from Representative Johnson as to what was the fiscal note with regards to the passage of this Bill, and I'm presently able to inform this House to enact this piece of legislation would be 27,188,000 dollars. I do not know if any other person may have a question with regards to the implementation of medical services and treatment for persons in the common jail systems throughout the State of Illinois. If there are any questions that are desired by any Member of this House, I stand ready to answer them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill...the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson.'"

Johnson: "Just a couple of questions. Is this the...the prison reform or whatever? Is that right?"

Alexander: "It's not a prison reform."

Johnson: "Well, okay. This has to do with the prisons. I asked the question."

Alexander: "That is correct."

Johnson: "Okay, what is the price tag on this."

Alexander: "I just recited it."

Johnson: "Okay, I didn't hear you. I'm sorry."

Alexander: "Okay. 27,188,000 for the initial beginning of this program."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize that that's a miniscule figure...something we



can just pass around indiscriminately, but it seems to me that in a day when we're talking about, not only fiscal austerity, but potential Constitutional Amendments and legislation to restrict the level of spending, that to spend almost 28 million dollars on something that nobody here on this floor or anywhere else has indicated there's a demonstrated need for, is not keeping the faith with the 85% of the people who have indicated that they thought taxes were already too high, and they thought spending was already too high. Now, I realize we've got an infinite number of needs in this state...an infinite number of projects that we can dispense money around that would...that would probably improve various aspects of life in Illinois. As a matter of fact, we have so infinite a series of needs that rather than pay 50% of our total income for taxes, we could probably get to 100% and then we wouldn't have to worry about anything. And, I realize that 27 million dollars alone is not going to do that, but if we don't draw the line here, and we don't draw the line on other projects that are not a crying emergency or a necessity for expansion of programs, then all we're going to see is increasing taxes, increasing spending, more spiraling inflation, and I would...I would guess and surmise greater voter outrage over what we're doing here in Springfield. I really urge you to look real closely at this legislation and indicate or feel in your own mind as to whether this is necessary or whether it isn't. I don't think it is. I think it's an extravagance. It'd be nice like anything else would be nice, but it costs money and it costs too much money, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation. It



calls for the provision of mental health services in our prisons. I can't imagine a more appropriate use of state dollars. I can't imagine a more important public policy than to provide for mental health care for people who have already demonstrated, by their incarceration, their inability to relate to and adjust to circumstances in the outside world. We will pay for our omissions. We always pay for our omissions. We will pay for our failure to provide mental health treatment for people who are incarcerated. We will pay for our neglect of people in our prisons. I suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is fiscally responsible. It is in the interests of the State of Illinois, and I encourage an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Alexander: "Yes, I will."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Polk: "I just have some...some real concerns for some of us who are so far downstate. I realize that in your community that it's very possible that there...have the adequate number of mental health people to go into the institutions, but what happens in a situation, say in Henderson County, where you have a population of 1,900 total and you have seven or eight inmates in that institution and there are no mental health resource people available for 200 miles? How do we handle a situation such as that?"

Alexander: "To be specific to you, Representative, I cannot answer that. I do know that this piece of legislation would require a total evaluation upon admission even on misdemeanor admissions. I rue the day that we would not be kindly to persons that we have incarcerated. I think that we are doing an injustice to these persons,



because many of them do have a mental disorder which may be the cause of this crime on crime here in the State of Illinois."

Polk: "I don't think I have any disagreement with you in relation to..."

Alexander: "Thank you."

Polk: "...to the necessity of the problem in the institution. How...what I am concerned about is how we are going to carry this out and the responsibility that we're putting on...on local counties that do not have mental health institutions or the availability of institutions within their community. In the southern part of the state there are many areas...miles...hundreds of miles before you can get to a hospital that does have people that are capable of doing this type of work, and if we pass this and mandate this upon the...the local counties, how do we control it? Who becomes responsible if an inmate then says, 'I am not getting this service that the state has already passed and says it's necessary.'? Do we then...do we then sue the counties?"

Alexander: "No, the responsibility is put upon the Department of Mental Health. I would presume that the...your county would notify that Department of the incarceration of inmates with regards to it. There would then be a person who would come out and make that type of evaluation. Statistics have shown that all persons would not be in need of these services...that there's roughly a 10% average need of persons on a basis out of a thousand."

Polk: "Is it the responsibility then of sheriff's department to notify the state when a person is incarcerated and then the state's responsibility is to make that interview and see whether..."

Alexander: "That would be proper."

Polk: "...they think they need the mental health test?"

Alexander: "Facilities."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I consider my colleague's Bill, House Bill 2025, most necessary, and some of these Representatives are speaking about the money...the 27 million dollars. We can spend millions for roads. We can spend millions for institutions throughout the State of Illinois, but as soon as we begin to speak about the crime situation that everybody's all appalled about...Mr. Speaker, could I get some attention, please? Mr. Speaker, my point is that if some of the Representatives would visit some of the penal institutions throughout this state, they would see the need. I just...it just angers me to hear someone criticize a piece of legislation that's designed to help people, and this is what we're supposed to be all about, is to figure out what's needed and then move on it. Now, I recommend a 'yes' vote on this, and I applaud Representative Alexander for coming up with this legislation. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Satterthwaite, could you come up here, please? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. What we have here is another 27 million dollar rip-off for Cook County and the City of Chicago. We're going to deal later in this Session with Cook County Hospital. I have no doubt. We're going to deal later with the City of Chicago schools. I have no doubt. We will be talking about big dollar figures there. We have to balance the budget. We have a Constitutional obligation to do so, and I would suggest that those two ongoing responsibilities already adopted by this Legislature and the people of this state deserve a much higher priority than anything else. And, if we're going to confront those problems and solve them within the confines of a balanced budget, then we have to defeat



this 27 million dollar rip-off, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this. It's totally inconsistent with a balanced budget."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander, to close."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to give information to this House that, in response to Cook County being the benefit of this particular legislation, that one-third of the persons incarcerated in the county jails do come from Cook County. The balance are in the remaining Cook County jails throughout the State of Illinois. I'd like to further say that this House has looked favorably upon this type of legislation in the past. In the 79th General Assembly this Bill went and passed both the House and the Senate but was vetoed by the Governor. In the 80th General Assembly the House likewise passed this Bill again, because it was needed and felt that it was good legislation, but it failed on the second Conference Committee in the Senate. I'd like to call your attention to the fact that we are talking about human beings, and I know each and every one of us here in this House has, at some time, been acquainted with a pet dog, or a pet cat, or a pet bird, or a fish who got sick and we took them to the veterinarian so that they could be well, and we could enjoy them. Our persons who are incarcerated in these institutions sometimes have a very small psychosis, which perhaps was the cause of them being involved into a life of crime. How much do we pay each and every year to keep these persons incarcerated? The figure says something like 13,000 dollars a year for one man. Are we going to continuously pay this sum of money to keep them there, parole them, put them back on the street? In less than three months, they're back in. I think this is a very needed and necessary problem. We're



dealing with mental health...a sickness which some of us cannot cure by just going strictly to a doctor and he put a bandage upon us or put some mercurochrome on it. I ask for a favorable vote from this House on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2025 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House. I'm surprised at many of my colleagues. I'm surprised that you don't understand the needs that exist in our state. You look like you're looking for more John Gacy's and William Speck's and many others. This kind of legislation will prevent those types of things from happening in the future. This Bill has passed out of this House before. Why is getting such a bad vote today? One day you might live to regret the things that you are doing today, because this type of legislation is definitely needed on our books. I solicit your 'aye' vote for this Bill...House Bill 2025."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 79 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Oh, the Lady...the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Alexander: "May I poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you may, ma'am."

Alexander: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absen...absentees. Beatty. Breslin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."



Clerk O'Brien: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Jack. Doug Kane. Record Kane as 'aye'. Please pro...Mr. Richmond as 'aye'. Anyone else? Uh, change Harris from 'no' to 'aye'. Slape as 'aye'. Brummer from 'no' to 'aye'. Please proceed with the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Breslin. Dawson. Donovan. John Dunn. Ewell. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Emil Jones. Leinenweber. Macdonald. McCourt. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Oblinger. Van Duyne. Willer. Williams. Winchester. And, Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Yourell as 'aye'. Excuse me. Mr. Winchester wants to be recorded as 'no'. Mr. Gaines as 'aye'. What's the count now, Jack? On this question there are 76 'ayes' and 78 'noes'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander."

Alexander: "May I have this placed on Postponed Consideration, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave...the Lady asks leave to have this matter on Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection, House Bill 2025 will be placed on Postponed Consideration. Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 695, Giorgi-Simms-Hallock; 696, Woodyard; 697, Schneider...got some lower numbers here. 689, Rea..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you start all over, Jack? In fact, while you're in the process of putting them in numerical order, let me just point out to the Membership that this does not mean that we're adjourning. It's been requested of the Chair that a Republican have a... that the Republicans are requesting a half hour conference, and I would...I think we will have a similar request from the Democratic side as well. But, I thought that we could get through with the Agreed



Resolutions before we go to that Order of Business, and Mr. Bradley also has a Resolution he wants to present to the Body before that...before we go to that Order of Business. Do you have the Resolutions in the numerical order now, Jack? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 689, Rea; 690, Yourell; 691, DiPrima-et al; 692, DiPrima-et al; 693, Reilly; 695, Giorgi-et al; 696, Woodyard; 697, Schneider-et al."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 689 by Rea tells us about the Benton Rangerettes that won the Class A Girls Basketball Championship, 690 by Yourell says...picks the Suburban Journalist of the Year, 691 by DiPrima honors a Boy Scout, 692 by DiPrima implores the V.D.A. not to cut benefits, 693 by Reilly hails the top school executives, 695 by Giorgi honors the Woman of the Year in the Rockford land area, 696 by Woodyard recognizes the Illinois Mother of the Year of America Committee, and 697 by Schneider celebrates a 50th wedding anniversary. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a House Resolution 694 that's been introduced. I would request that the Clerk read the Resolution and if any of the Members of the House would like to be Cosponsors of the Resolution, I wish they would go down to the well and sign the form, and if it's all right, then I would not have to sign that form to endorse their signatures. Just go ahead and up them on, and I wish he'd read the Resolution. I think it would be of some interest to the Members of the Body."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will read House Resolution 694."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 694, Bradley-Schisler-Darrow."



Whereas, 53 Americans are being held as hostages in violation of every premise of international law and whereas, after many months of patient diplomacy by President Carter, the government of Iran has seen fit to continue a position more frequently associated with international terrorists than with actions of a responsible foreign power, and whereas; the United States has broken diplomatic relations with Iran and is expelling its diplomatic corps and whereas, there are many Iranian citizens attending the public and private universities and colleges of this state; and whereas, our great nation has a long tradition of holding all our great institutions open to the students of the world who seek ways to solidify world peace and harmony; and whereas, this great tradition should not be tarnished by educating those bent only on sowing the seeds of discontent, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois that for summer semester 1980 and thereafter, until the American hostages are released, all Illinois state colleges and universities shall not enroll Iranian students, that all private Illinois colleges and universities not enroll Iranian students on state scholarships or aid and urge the Board of Trustees of all Illinois private colleges and universities not to enroll the remaining Iranian students; and be it further resolved that suitable copies of this preamble and Resolution be presented to the president of every Illinois college and university and to the Leadership of the General Assemblies of the other 49 states."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question on his Resolution?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Pierce, he just had the



Resolution read into the record for the edification of all the Membership. The Resolution will go to Committee."

Pierce: "He asked us to be Cosponsors. I think it would apply to people whose parents fled Iran, are opposed to the Shah...maybe Bahai's, maybe Christians, maybe people who fled Iran, and their students can enroll in our universities unless he amends it. So, I...that was the question I had. Certainly, those students whose parents or themselves are fleeing the cruel regime in Iran shouldn't be punished further by not being able to attend our universities."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we have a new Committee...a Committee on Foreign Affairs and assign it to that one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the suspension of the posting rules, so it could be heard in Committee next week in Exec."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, why don't we just give it to the Assignment Committee, and they'll..."

Bradley: "Fine. All right. Fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "They'll make the necessary assignments. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I've just spoken to the Co-Chairman of the Gov...Committee on State Government Organization, and that Committee is willing to accept this Bill for a hearing if the Committee on Assignments is so willing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "When do you anticipate we're going to get to considering matters on the Speaker's Table? Day after



day we go through the Calendar and never touch any of those, and I'm not...I think that the people who have items on that are entitled to be heard, and I wondered if you're deliberately withholding those or whether there's going to be an order of time when we will be... consider those timely? If we don't get them out pretty soon, we just as well table them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point's well taken. On House Resolution 694...Committee on Assignment. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, he has two Agreed...House Joint Resolutions up there he could read and get them over with."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will read the House Joint Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 88, Kane: House Joint Resolution 89, Goodwin-Patrick."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kane's House Resolu...Joint Resolution heralds the Bicycle Awareness Day and 89 by Goodwin asks that a landmark be established in the Chicagoland area, and I move for the adoption of the House Joint Resolutions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Aye. Opposed...the House Joint Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, we have a large number of Members who are coming before the Rules Committee to have their Bills declared exempt. We would like to waive the appropriate rule limiting the number to fifty so that all of the Members will have the opportunity to appear next week, and I would ask leave for the waiver of that rule on the posting of House Rules Committee Bills for next week."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call, and the Gentleman's prevails."

Katz: "Now, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Could I make the announcement that next Tuesday in room 118 immediately after adjournment, the House Rules Committee will be considering these matters next week."

Speaker Lechowicz: "More Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 87, Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Committee on Assignment." The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" Oh, you got your light on. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a Republican Conference for 30 minutes in room 118."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "A Democratic Conference will be held in room 114."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Further motions? Giving the Clerk for a Perfunctory Session, the House will stand in recess until the hour of 1 o'clock for the purpose of a Democratic and Republican Conference. Democratic Conference in room 114. The Republican Conference in room 118, and we'll see you back here at 1 o'clock."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee report. Representative Jaffe, Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary I, reported the following Committee Bills for introduction: House Bills 3465, 3466, 3467, 3468, 3469, 3470, 3471, 3472, and 3473, action taken April 9, 1980. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 3453, Greiman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Finance Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3454, Greiman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3455, Greiman."



A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to installment contracts to sell dwelling structures. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3456, Hoffman.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3457, Sumner.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3458, Grossi-Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3459, Currie. A Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Commercial Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3460, Currie. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Commercial Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3461, Friedrich. A Bill for an Act in relation to exclusion of townships from county zoning ordinances. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3462, Ewing-Ryan-Telcser. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3463, McGrew. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3464, Balanoff. A Bill for an Act to prohibit simultaneous employment by certain...certain state officials. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3465, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3466, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to limitations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3467, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3468, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to contractors' and material men's liens, known



as mechanics' liens. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3469, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act in relation to contracts for dance studio services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3470, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend various Acts in relation to the dissolution of marriage and to repeal an Act to punish the offense of advertising for dissolution of marriage. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3471, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3472, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3473, Committee on Judiciary I. A Bill for an Act in relation to contracts for dance studio services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3474, Daniels-Ryan. A Bill for an Act creating the Local Government Finance Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3475, Peters. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3476, Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3477, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. Committee report. Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 10, 1980, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' House Bill 3050 and House Bill 3060, 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 3047, 3058, and 3061. The House stands in recess."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in your seats. First Reading...Introduction."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3478, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3479, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3480, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3481, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3482, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3483, Chapman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2028. Representative Braun. 2028. 2028. Page 7. You want to go with that? Out of the record. 2029. Representative Braun. 2029. Representative Braun."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2029. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in light of the emergency situation facing the Chicago public schools, I'd like to table this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, 2029 is tabled. 2044. Skinner. Skinner. 2044. Out of the record. 2045. Simms. Out of the record. 2061. Marovitz. Out of the record. 2069. Hoxsey. Representative Hoxsey. Out of the record. 2082. Representative Sharp. Out of the record. 2104. Out of the record. 2105. Out of the record. 2119. Stanley. Out of the record. 2182. Robbins. Representative Robbins. Out of the record. 2218. Farley. Maybe instead of going through all these, maybe I should say is there any Member that wants any Bill...any House



Bill on Third Reading called? If there...Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "House Bill 2275. We need to drop it back to Second for an Amendment and then bring it back to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 2275 to Second? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk. Anyone else has a Bill on Third Reading that they want to return back to Second Reading? What number is it, Representative? Yeah, he wants to move on the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Daniels, amends House Bill 2275 as amended by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels on the Amendment #2."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 applies to premises liability and it abolishes the distinction between invitee and licensee, and it's the Amendment that came out of Subcommittee hearings with Mr. Dunn as the Subcommittee Chairman. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? You've heard the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate on page 3. 1828. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to Mr. Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the interests of moving things along, I'd like unanimous leave of the House to table House Bill 3378."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. House Bill 3278 (sic) is tabled."

Marovitz: "3378."

Speaker Redmond: "3378. Pardon me. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move House Bill 703 back to Second Reading and...and leave it there."

Speaker Redmond: "What page is it on?"

Younge: "Page 4."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 4. on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 703, is that correct?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge asks leave to return 703 to the Order of Second Reading. Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Braun...or Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to...on page 6 House Bill 1589, I'd like to table that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to table House Bill 1589? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Dyer. 1589."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Represent..."

Dyer: "I have a Bill that I tried to table in Committee the other day. House Bill 2870...2870, I'd like to table, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to table House Bill 2870? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. They tell me this is contagious. Is there any else... has anyone else caught the disease? Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table House Bill 1702."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table 1702? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is



tabled. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "On page 11 I'd like leave to table House Bill 975."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to table House Bill 975 appearing on page 11? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 975 is tabled. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I would like leave to table House Bill 2119, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What page is that on?"

Stanley: "It's on page 8."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 8, the Gentleman asks leave to table 2118 (sic). 2118?"

Stanley: "2119."

Speaker Redmond: "2119. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have leave on page 12 to table House Bill 2638."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table House Bill 2638 on page 12? Hearing no...hearing no audible objection, leave is granted. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Page 8. I'd like to table 2182."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table 2182? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2182. Wait a minute. What number was yours, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "2638. 2638."

Speaker Redmond: "2638."

Clerk O'Brien: "21..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Robbins is 2182. Now, let's go to Third Reading...House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. Page 3. 1828. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to take this back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk? Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Stearney, amends House Bill 1828 as amended in the title and in the introductory portion of Section one and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney, on the Amendment."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 would provide that when there was an order directing payment for support or maintenance of a spouse or child is reversed on appeal, and the amount ordered paid is subsequently reduced the spouse ordered, the payee shall have a right of set-off against future support or maintenance payments to the extent of the amount he would've paid under the modified order. In such a case, the court would've determined the amount each subsequent payment is to be reduced until such right is satisfied."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Greiman: "Okay, when there is an appeal, isn't there a bond put up?"

Stearney: "Well, not necessarily."

Greiman: "Well, why wouldn't we require...why wouldn't there be a bond? Then the order itself could be enforced if there's no bond staying it. Right?"

Stearney: "Well, it's at the discretion of the trial judge whether he would require a bond to be posted pending the appeal."

Greiman: "Well, but, if...if a..."

Stearney: "And, in a marital matter, I don't believe they really require bonds to be posted, Mr. Greiman."



Greiman: "Well, okay, then on the Bill if that's your response. On the Bill, as a matter of fact, a litigant in a divorce legisla...litigation has the same right of having a bond. If they've won in a trial court, you have to put up a bond to go to the appellate court. The courts impose bonds. What we would be doing here is to, in a sense, let a guy take an appeal. If he wins, he wins. If he loses, he loses. But, he wins both ways, because ...".

Stearney: "Let me ans..."

Greiman: "I'm not asking a question. I'm now debating the Bill, if I may. What we find here then is the kind of provision that will increase the number of appeals substantially, because the guy would have nothing to lose or, not a guy necessarily, but the person would have nothing to lose. If they lose in the lower court, they'll take an appeal. We would then be extending out the period of time that people would have to wait for support. People need support immediately. They don't need support two years from now. They need it right now. That's just a part of the Bill. As to the other part of the Bill, which, I think, wasn't mentioned, that deals with the increase in value during marriage of all nonmarital property, so what it does is to add another classification of property that will not be included. It is another exclusion similar to the one that we had earlier changing what's marital property and what isn't marital property. And, I don't think you mentioned that, but that's on page 3 of the Amendment. I would...I would frankly turn this Amendment away. It is an Amendment which is not appropriate and should be defeated."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me answer...answer his question that he posed, and he neglected to allow me the opportunity to answer. And, that is...and that is,



Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Mr. Greiman is totally mistaken."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I...I don't, and I'd like to hear the answer.

On the other hand, there is an orderly process. I didn't ask a question. I spoke in debate."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought...I wasn't paying enough attention. I don't know whether..."

Greiman: "He has a chance to respond."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you ask...did you ask a question?"

Greiman: "I asked him, and then I said I'm speaking to the Bill. He has a chance to respond..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Well, that's correct."

Greiman: "...in closing."

Stearney: "Well, may I have the opportunity to respond, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes. Well, when...a little bit later on. Representative Schlickman. We'll get back to you in closing."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, too, arise in opposition to this Amendment. As the Gentleman from Cook just pointed out, the Sponsor of this Amendment neglected to point out that the Amendment's in two parts. The second part, another attempt on the part of the Sponsor of this Bill, to change the definition of what constitutes nonmarital property, on one hand, and marital property, on the other. And, he further neglected to point out, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that part two, the one he neglected to call to our attention, is an attempt by him, as a Member of the Legislative Branch, to reverse a court decision. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have a Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has a Domestic Relations Subcommittee. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, yesterday in Judiciary I we considered further



Amendments to the Domestic...or to the Dissolution of Marriage Act, and the Sponsor of this Bill was, in fact, there. But, at no time suggested under subject matter that this particular Amendment be considered. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just a few years ago this Body enacted the Comprehensive Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Now, he doesn't like, the Sponsor of this Bill, those comprehensive changes, and he's trying to revert back to where we were previously on a piecemeal basis. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that if he wants this Body to give consideration to changes of the new Dissolution of Marriage Act, he follow the correct procedure, and that is to go through Committee rather than throwing at us, on the floor, House Bill 1838 (sic) with an Amendment that substantially changes the definition of marital or nonmarital property to the detriment of homemakers. And, now, to a lesser degree but in the same sense, adversely affect homemakers by a change in the definition of marital and nonmarital property, particularly when it would constitute a reversal of a court decision. I suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we defeat this Amendment, not only in terms of substance but to protect the rights of all Members of this House to orderly procedure. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Stearney, to close."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me first correct the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle who is completely mistaken as to the provision...as to the appeal. He has not read the Bill. This provides that the losing party, who wins on appeal, would have a right of set-off at a later date. Now, he confuses the issue by bringing here, to



the floor, the question of a bond: Well, who would post a bond in an appeal? The appellant posts the bond. The appellant is the losing party mind you. If he wins on appeal, is he going to attach his own bond? That's ludicrous. The Gentleman is mistaken. The purpose, if the bond was posted by the winning party in the trial court, then you would have something to attach if you won on appeal. But, remember, the losing party is appealing. If he posts a bond and he wins, is he going to get only his own money? No. This Bill provides that if he were to win on appeal and the matter then goes back to the trial court, the judge would say to the party who accumulated, let's say, five or ten thousand dollars in a period of time that the matter was pending an appeal, that now you owed back to the person who paid you that thousand, or fifteen hundred, or two thousand dollars that amount, and you must pay them back. The bond has nothing to do with it. The Gentleman is confused. He knows not what he speaks of. Now...now, let me address my remarks to the Gentleman on this side of the aisle. The Gentleman, too, here makes certain misconceptions. In fact, we are dealing with the provision of nonmarital property and that is, for example, if you were to inherit a...ten thousand dollars, that is considered to be nonmarital property, and upon your divorce the other spouse would have no right or title to that amount that you inherited. Let's say from your deceased father. The Bill now merely expresses what we felt was our legislative intent at an earlier time, and that is that if you put that ten thousand dollars in a certificate of deposit, and you earned interest on it, that interest, too, would be nonmarital property, and that's what we believe was the legislative intent at this time. The Bill merely codifies that, because we have a decision out of an



appellate district in southern Illinois which says that the interest that was gained on that bequest would be considered marital property and divided, so what I'm merely trying to do is say that if you inherited money, and that's nonmarital property, then the interest you earned on that money is still to be considered non-marital property. That's entirely fair. It's reasonable. It's not an attempt to emasculate the Act as the Gentleman on this side of the aisle so wildly misrepresents to you. It's a reasonable attempt, and if people were to read the Bill and consider it, they would be in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn first. I'll be back to you. Representative Dunn. I'll be back."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I disagree with the Sponsor of the Bill insofar as the Bill provides another exception to the marital property Section of the Dissolution of Marriage Act. The Sponsor would include a Section that would exempt from marital property any increase in value during the marriage of what is nonmarital property. An example of this kind of thing would be a young couple starting out moving onto a farm that, perhaps, the husband inherited from his family and owned prior to the marriage. Supposing that they jointly worked together to develop that farm, to increase the productivity of the farm, and the farm increases in value during marriage. Their marriage may be 30 years. The farm triples, quadruples, multiplies in value 10 times, largely through the efforts of the wife who helps her husband in all the homemaker duties, all the chores around the farm. This Amendment would say that at the end of that time, any increase in value in the market value of that farm would be nonmarital property and would all accrue to the husband and zero or none to the wife. That does not



seem equitable in the spirit of the Dissolution of Marriage Act. We should either follow the policy that the Act set forth or repeal it altogether. We shouldn't piecemeal it in some areas and not in others. If the parties work together to increase the value of property that one of them had when they were married, fine. Then...then they should share in that increase. If the parties did not participate in the increase in value, then the court can make a determination and award the property in full to the one who...who owned it to begin with, and it'll award all the increase in value to that spouse. This is a bad Amendment to the Dissolution of Marriage Act. It would be a major shift in emphasis again. Sort of like the one we were talking about earlier today, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "When this Bill was under discussion, I asked if anyone else had anything to say, and nobody arose. So, I called on Representative Stearney to close. Therefore, I think that anyone who seeks recognition now should confine their remarks to the explanation on how they vote on the Amendment, with the exception of Representative Greiman who arose on a point of personal privilege. So, the question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ewing to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm supporting this Amendment, because some of the conversation that we've had here today is misleading. If you inherited a farm five years ago, it may be worth three or four times what it was then. It may only have doubled. I think that under the decision that was promulgated in southern Illinois, that becomes marital property. Now, you're going to do a couple of things.



Maybe that spouse that didn't inherit the farm or the spouse...or the inheriting party is going to get a windfall. Second, we're going to increase litigation tremendously in this state if we don't keep marital property clean. I think that was the original intention that inherited property was nonmarital. It was non-marital when you inherited it, and it's nonmarital when you dissolve. And, I think that unless we approve this Amendment, we could be opening up a lot of litigation as well as making some people very wealthy when they possibly don't deserve it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 25 'aye', 75 'no', and the motion failed. The Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Stearney, amends House Bill 1828 as amended in the title and in the introductory portion of Section one and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is the Sponsor? Stearney?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney, on Amendment 3."

Stearney: "I'll table that measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 3 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Greiman, to ...point of personal privilege. Well, you were happy a minute ago."

Greiman: "No, no, That was...that was..."

Speaker Redmond: "That was a minute ago."

Greiman: "That was a minute ago. I just wanted to suggest that we all should read our Amendments. I did read the Amendment, and it was my interpretation, and I think it was correct, and that's all I have to say."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you ask leave to keep it on Short



Debate? Representative Stearney? He so...he asks... does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now, Representative Lechowicz...Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to table House Bill 2656."

Speaker Redmond: "What number? 2656?"

Leverenz: "2656."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Anyone else? Anyone else want to move something from Third to Second? Anyone have a Bill on Third Reading they want called? Anyone want to table a Bill? On the Speaker's Table? Well, let's get this one. Senate Joint Resolution 20...or 86. Matijevich, will you handle this one? Page 15."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 86 is the Adjournment Resolution resolving that the Eighty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 10, 1980, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 15, 1980, at twelve o'clock noon. I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, and the Resolution's adopted. Are there any announcements? Any Committee Chairmen with any announcements? Anything for the good of the Order? What are we doing? Mr. Clerk. We have some motions for change of votes here that..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Under motions we have requests pursuant to Rule 58 for unanimous consent to change votes. These are the requests that have been filed in the last week."



Speaker Redmond: "Somebody...you want to read the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pechous requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 111."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? No objections."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kelly requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 247."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection. Hearing none..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Brummer has the same request on 247."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E. G. Steele wants to vote 'aye' on House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf. Representative McBroom, will you please sit down?"

Wolf: "I have no objection. I just want to ask one question, Mr. Speaker. None of these Roll Calls were Verified Rolls, were they?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, we haven't had a Verified Roll Call in a year and a half."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E. G. Steele requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Macdonald has the same request."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bowman has the same request."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pullen has the same request."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Preston requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 2 to House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 554."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 745."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative...Representative Ryan requests to vote 'aye' on 745."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Jane Barnes requests to vote 'aye' on 549."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kelly requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 755."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Patrick requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 800."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pouncey requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 800."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative White requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 800."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1015."



Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave 50. is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Macdonald requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 1182."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Preston requests to vote 'no' on Conference Committee report on House Bill 1325."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Dyer requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1337."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Wolf requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1522."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leinenweber requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 1182."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leverenz requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 800."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bowman requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 1625."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1737."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Johnson requests to change a 'yes' vote to a 'no' vote on House Bill 1737."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Donovan requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2010."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 3 to House Bill 2676."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Repres..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard a number of Representatives asking to change their vote on House Bill 800, and if I remember, Representative Hanahan had that Bill verified. Am I incorrect?" It was not?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No. Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2676."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "House...Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, since we've gone through so many, and nobody's objected, I would ask leave that all the rest be granted the same privilege. Oh, we only have two more?"

Speaker Redmond: "Two more."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kelly requests to vote 'aye' on 2723."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Breslin requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1625."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 87, Representative Polk. House Resolution 698, Borchers. House Resolution 699, Marovitz-Telcser. House Resolution 700, McClain."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I don't have the Joint. What does that do? Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution #87 resolves that we commend Rose Poelvoorde for her service to the 330,000 mentally retarded in the State of Illinois. House Resolution 698, Borchers, resolves that we direct the Illinois Investigating Commission to investigate the use of humans in medical experiments. House Resolution 699, Marovitz, resolves that the Members of this Body join in commemorating the Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, May 7 to May 10. House Resolution 700, McClain, congratulates Fred W. Koch of Quincy, Illinois for his long, respected service to the community in fraternal affairs. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "698 has been taken out of that list. That calls for an investigation."

Matijevich: "All right. I move the..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question..."

Matijevich: "...adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 698, Borchers-et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Anything else? Five minutes perfunct. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, allowing the Clerk five minutes perfunctory for the purpose of completing its business, I move that the House stand adjourned until April 15 at twelve o'clock noon."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."



The motion carried, and the House stands adjourned until April the 15th. Have a happy Easter."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1641, Peters. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1645, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to amend certain fiscal year '80 appropriation Acts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1649, Representative Mahar. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1653, Winchester. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations to the Department of Administrative Services and the State Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill, and Senate Bill 50...1655, Winchester. A Bill for an Act amending Sections of an Act making appropriations to the Department of Administrative Services and the State Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3484, Capparelli. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3485, Macdonald-Chapman. A Bill for an Act in relation to coverage of certain reconstructive surgery under accident and health insurance policies and service plan contracts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate...House Bill 3486, Vinson-Kane. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3487, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3488, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of a Local Governmental and Governmental and Employees Tort



Immunity Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3489, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3490, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3491, Mahar. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands ...Further introductions. House Bill 3492, Oblinger-et al...Oblinger-Pouncey-Taylor-Patrick-et al, that is. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Fair Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 10, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0703	2ND READING.	PAGE	37
HB-0975	MOTIONS	PAGE	38
HB-1563	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-1589	MOTIONS	PAGE	37
HB-1702	MOTIONS	PAGE	37
HB-1830	3RD READING	PAGE	8
HB-1980	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-2025	3RD READING	PAGE	19
HB-2029	MOTIONS	PAGE	35
HB-2119	MOTIONS	PAGE	38
HB-2182	2ND READING	PAGE	38
HB-2211	2ND READING	PAGE	8
HB-2275	2ND READING	PAGE	36
HB-2638	MOTIONS	PAGE	38
HB-2656	MOTIONS	PAGE	47
HB-2870	MOTIONS	PAGE	37
HB-3030	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3031	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3032	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3033	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3042	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3378	MOTIONS	PAGE	36
HB-3448	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-3449	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-3450	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-3451	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-3452	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-3453	1ST READING	PAGE	32
HB-3454	1ST READING	PAGE	32
HB-3455	1ST READING	PAGE	32
HB-3456	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3457	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3458	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3459	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3460	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3461	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3462	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3463	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3464	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3465	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3466	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3467	1ST READING	PAGE	33
HB-3468	1ST READING	PAGE	33

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 10, 1980

PAGE 2

HB-3469	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3470	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3471	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3472	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3473	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3474	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3475	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3476	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3477	1ST READING	PAGE	34
HB-3478	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3479	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3480	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3481	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3482	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3483	1ST READING	PAGE	35
HB-3484	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3485	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3486	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3487	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3488	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3489	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3490	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3491	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HB-3492	1ST READING	PAGE	53
SB-1641	1ST READING	PAGE	53
SB-1645	1ST READING	PAGE	53
SB-1649	1ST READING	PAGE	53
SB-1653	1ST READING	PAGE	53
SB-1655	1ST READING	PAGE	53
HR-0694	1ST READING	PAGE	28
HR-0698	1ST READING	PAGE	52
HJR-0087	1ST READING	PAGE	32
HJR-0088	1ST READING	PAGE	31
HJR-0089	1ST READING	PAGE	31
SJR-0086	3RD READING	PAGE	47

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 10, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	4
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	27
RULES COMMITTEE - NUMBER EXEMPTION	PAGE	31
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	32
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	32
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	34
MEMBER VOTE CHANGES	PAGE	47
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	51
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	52
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	53