

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

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. James Truslow Adams wrote, 'Man is a creature of impulse, emotion, action rather than reason. Reason is a very late development in the world of living creatures, most of whom, as far as we know, get along admirably in daily life without it'. Let us pray. Almighty God, we praise Thee this day for our being, and we praise this day, we pray to this day for our well-being. We are grateful that we may serve the people of the State of Illinois as Members of this House of Representatives and we implore Thy gracious aid that we may so do with definitive responsibility. Save us from pride, prejudice and all other uncharitableness as we contemplate the issues now before us. Let our actions be based upon considered evaluation rather than impetuous irresponsibility that so directed we may effect laws which are of the highest merit and consistent with Thy will for all mankind; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, pledge of allegiance."

Collins: "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: "Roll Call for Attendance. Your switch only. Nobody else's switch please. We're going to take the record in about one minute so don't put anybody on that's not here. And then let them cry that they didn't get a chance to pass their Bill. Have all voted? Have all answered the Roll Call that are here? Take the record. Representative Oblinger. When did you discover that? Representative Oblinger. Put her on the Roll Call."



Representative Steczo. Representative Piel.  
 He wasn't here. You weren't here. I looked out there  
 and I couldn't see you. He wasn't here. Bower wasn't  
 here either. Yeah but you weren't when we took the record.  
 Give me the record, Mr. Clerk. Even the wrong seat. That's  
 against the  
 rules. He can't push the button in the wrong place.  
 And Representative Ropp was over here too but he was  
 in the wrong place. He was over here. Introductions  
 First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3574, Representative Huskey.  
 A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department  
 of Public Aid. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill  
 3575, Representative Dawson. A Bill for an Act in  
 relation to public purchases and contracts for public  
 work projects. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading, page three.  
 House Bill 282. Representative Young on the floor?  
 Out of the record. 966, Steczo. You want to go with  
 that one? Okay. Read the Bill. 966."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 966. A Bill for an Act to  
 amend an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second  
 Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1294. Out of the record.  
 1384. Representative Young on the floor? Out of the  
 record. 1444. Out of the record. 1528. Greiman.  
 1528. Public utilities. Okay, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1528. A Bill for an Act to amend  
 Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Second  
 Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted  
 in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments  
 1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1801, Skinner. Any Amendments on that one? Out of the record. 1920. Preston on the floor? Out of the record. 2131. Read this Bill. Let's see what happens."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2131. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. 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 Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. The understanding is, if the Sponsor objects violently, we should bring these back. 2227."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2227. A Bill for an Act in relation to a statewide emergency medical service program. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any... Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you kindly hold this Bill?  
Kindly hold the Bill sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold 2227. 2349. I guess this one's out of the record. 2906. Representative Anderson. Okay. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2906. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging and the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3002. Out of the record. 3014."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3014. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3021."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3021. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the furnishing of legislative staff, secretarial, clerical, research, technical, telephone, and other utility service, office equipment and office general cost, and Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, does this Bill provide funds to give a reasonable increase to the secretaries."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, without divulging the full content of it, it provides enough money to run the General Assembly for the next year." It may be some reductions in some places too. May be a curtailment in staff in some places. Third Reading. 3022."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3022. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3023."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3023. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans.



Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3028."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3028."

Speaker Redmond: "3028. What do we got up there? 3028.

Representative Macdonald. Okay. Did you read the Bill Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3028. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions. Floor Amendment #2, Matijevich. Amends House Bill 3028 on page one, line 27 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an Amendment which was discussed in Committee and I mentioned to the Committee that I was going to offer it on the floor as a Floor Amendment. It transfers the matters that are under consultant services contract to personnel services. We had the discussion in Committee that this was the second year in a row that this agency has been using the line item of contractual services to hire full-time personnel and we felt that it is a better appropriation procedure to do it this way as long as they can be identified as full-time personnel. Otherwise, the people are getting the best of both worlds being hired on contractual services and getting the other benefits that they shouldn't get unless they are full-time personnel hired by the State of Illinois, and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "May I ask the Sponsor a question please? Representative Matijevich, can you tell me what the response



of the Director was to your comments?"

Matijevich: "I'm not sure but I thought he said that there's a difference of opinion as between the House and the Senate on how we want to go and he'll leave it up to the Legislature. He seemd to be sort of ambivalent about it. He can go both ways as to whether we want to do it this way or the other way, and I guess it'll come down to a show-down between the House and the Senate."

Macdonald: "That was my understanding also. So I will accept the Amendment in the House but I will suspect that maybe the Senate will make another recommendation and we may have to go to Conference Committee with it."

Matijevich: "We may and this may be one for those years we may win one."

Macdonald: "Hopefully, you're right."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? It's acceptable to you? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. Motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Leverenz. Amends House Bill 3028 on page one, line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Darrow, will you please sit down. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 would reduce the appropriation by 18,000 dollars for contractual services for the purposes of the use of chartered aircraft flights by the Environmental Protection Agency. And I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would have to oppose this particular Amendment because the Director of the Agency explained for travel I would not.. the chartering for travel would not be that much of a problem but I do think we have explained



for different uses, such as siting of illegal land fills and other uses for chartered planes, it is cheaper for them to charter than it is to do it any other way and it can be done more efficiently and better by airplane charter and I'm afraid I would have to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I can appreciate what the Sponsor of the Bill said if, in fact, the chartered aircraft flights were for the purposes as the Representative has so eloquently outlined. They were not, however; for surveying land fill or land fill site operations and these were for no more than commuter flights from Springfield to 'Migsfield' in Chicago. Environmental Protection Agency has seen fit to order up a chartered aircraft out of Bloomington, Illinois to fly to Springfield, pick people up and fly them up to 'Migsfield' in Chicago. We have Air Illinois and other airlines that can do the same thing right out of Springfield. The state has its own aircraft that could be ordered up for the same purpose and we are eliminating the use of chartering planes from another town to bring them over to Springfield and I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wolf: "Representative Leverenz, my memory seems to be a little hazy. Did we discuss this in Committee last week?"

Leverenz: "Yes we did, Representative Wolf. This is where the Director or the Agency, by his order, has chartered aircrafts for the purposes of commuting to and from Springfield and Chicago at 'Migsfield' where they're bringing the chartered aircraft out of Bloomington, Illinois which I just don't understand why they would go through that and especially when we have our own aircraft



or Amtrak goes to the same place."

Wolf: "Okay. It's coming back but it seems to me that you did pose those questions to, I believe, the Director last week and his answer was that they chartered the plane out of Bloomington I believe it was for purposes of air surveillance and so forth. Are you saying now that that is not the case?"

Leverenz: "No no. I am saying that the flights that were lifted on those vouchers were listed exclusively for commuting between Springfield and Chicago. The Director tried to have us believe that they were surveying from the air, land fill operations or possibly finding new land fill sites. He also mentioned that he would to that to look at coal mines from the sky. There were 47 flights in total. The amount of money is the 18,000 dollars. The average voucher was processed two months after the flight was made. Over 50% of the flights did not include what is mandated by the Governor's Travel Control Board and that is to state what the emergency was to use a charter aircraft. So if they do not want to state what the emergency was, or do not remember then I feel that it should be removed from the budget and that is why I ask for your support to adopt Amendment #3."

Wolf: "Did you offer this Amendment in Committee last week?"

Leverenz: "No, but I did advise the Committee <sup>Amendment</sup> ~~Amendment~~ that I would have the Amendment drawn for Second Reading

Wolf: "Alright. Just to clarify. You say there were 47 round trips made between Chicago and Springfield or Springfield and Chicago."

Leverenz: "Springfield to 'Migsfield' yes."

Wolf: "Round trip, 47?"

Leverenz: "Some of them... a couple of them were to Marion, yes."

Wolf: "A couple were what?"

Leverenz: "They were principally for commuter flights. The





majority were to 'Migsfield'. The vouchers did not include what the emergency was to use a charter flight nor did some of them contain the entire list of who flew on that flight."

Wolf: "Okay. I'm just going to ask you two things before I would want to vote on this or make a decision. I'd like to know, could you tell me what time of the day or night those flights were made and what was the purpose of those flights? Now if they were necessary flights, I would be opposed to cutting the money."

Leverenz: "For the most part, they were made during the day. When we have Amtrak trains going up, state planes going back and forth and I also pointed out that there were vehicles being moved from Springfield to Chicago or visa versa. If you'll please understand that this is a charter aircraft company in Bloomington having a plane fly to Chicago to pick up people to bring them back to Springfield...it's just unbelievable."

Wolf: "I recall its questioning but I thought the Director said it was used for air surveillance of pollution problems. So you're disputing that now and you say you have evidence of 47 flights made to and from Chicago."

Leverenz: "Yes, I don't understand why you didn't ask to see the vouchers that we had there in Committee but we did have the actual vouchers there and I did see them. This would not, would not in any way take any dollars away for air surveillance or emergency trips."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf. Representative Winchester. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in behalf of the Amendment because in Committee I think the Members saw that this was a total abuse of the travel regulations that we have in the statutes because we do have the Governor's Travel Control Board and at the Committee hearing I asked the Director, 'How did you get beyond the



Travel Control Board?' and he said, 'I don't know.' And so it is an abuse of the regulations that we do have. If it were an emergency as the Sponsor of the Amendment has said or if it were the matter explained, that would be a different matter, but this is purely a matter of using charter aircrafts when there is no need for it and I think that the Amendment is responsible and it's a cut that we ought to make and in fact, the staff on this side of the aisle has uncovered this abuse ... abuse of the charter flights to such an extent that I asked them to go into broader detail of all agencies of government to see if other agencies might be doing this too. So I ask the Membership to vote for this Amendment and support it. The green hornet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly this is a controversial Amendment. I have great sympathy and support for the need for the surveillance flights. I have not had a break-down as to what was used for travel or for what purpose. I am certainly opposed to the unnecessary use of that kind of flight for any agency. I believe that we probably could live with the 18,000 dollar cut but I would much rather, through another channel of communication and I thought we had done that in Committee and I thought that the Department had, under the Director's and his assistants who were with him, agreed that they would certainly revise their voucher system and that they would look into other uses. I hate to, at a time of inflation, I hate to see this budget cut by any amount and I would have to say that I will oppose this Amendment and would ask all of you to think carefully of what we are doing here. I think we have one of the best Directors that we have had in the ten year history of the Environmental Protection Agency who is making every effort to work with Illinois, the



business community and still maintain the environmental needs that are imposed upon him both by the federal government and by the necessity of his duties of keeping our environment clean. I think he's doing a good job while I do not agree with unnecessary chartered flights. I think there are times, certainly Amtraks record is no great record if we are going to work with efficiency in getting to and from any given point and most of us who have taken that mode of transportation realize that. And I have no objection with the proper chartering of flights when they are necessary. I would not support any agency's abuse of that system, but I do not believe that the Environmental Protection Agency has abused the system, and therefore; I will oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm very happy to see that the Sponsor of the Bill would agree in support of the Amendment in as much as it does delete money only for chartered flights basically by a Bloomington charter firm or a Decatur charter aircraft company and would not delete any money that would impact the protection of the environment. If it did that, I would withdraw the Amendment. The Amendment simply deletes 18,000 dollars for the use of chartered aircraft to commute between Springfield and Chicago and the Director, I'm certain, has done an outstanding job when it comes to protecting the environment but has in every case, or almost every case on these vouchers, violated the Governor's Travel Control Board rules in stating what the emergency is for the use of a chartered aircraft. So I would ask for your support of the Amendment and move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Before I put the question, we're going to have to have a Roll Call for Attendance. Roll Call for Attendance. And only your own switch. Representative Walsh has timed his entrance very well. Representative



Walsh is now in the chamber. Everyone on the Roll Call? Anderson. Is he on the Roll Call here? Representative Anderson is over there. Anderson. Representative Patrick your switch is still open. The switch is still open Mr. Clerk What's the matter with Patrick's switch? There it is. You press it down. Everyone on the Roll Call? Take the record Mr. Clerk. Now the question is on Representative Leverenz's. Wait a minute. Question's on Representative Leverenz's motion for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 aye and 45 no. The motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3036."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3036. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Court of Claims. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3037, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "According to this Illinois General Assembly status of active legislation April 21, it says that House Bill 790 is placed on the Calendar on the order of Second Reading. Well, that is incorrect. It was...voted 'do not pass', and that should be at its proper end."

Speaker Redmond: "What do we do, Mr. Clerk? I guess...it's not on the Calendar here. Is it on the Calendar here? Well,...it won't be called again. 3037."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3037, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Arts Council, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments number one and two were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments one and two?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Representative McPike:"

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, we had some problems with this Bill in Committee, and the Sponsor agreed to keep it on Second Reading until those problems were worked out, and I'd just like to ask the Representative if she's met with our staff to go over those fifty vouchers that we felt were unethical."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, that meeting was held last Thursday. We had wanted to meet with Mr. McPike, but instead we... met with Mr. DuVall, Clark Mitze, Steve Stalcup, of the Democratic staff, and Sue Carlson of our staff, and it was agreed that the Illinois Arts Council would be very happy to change the operation of expenses, but first of all, they would like a written account from the Comptroller's office exactly what he wants. And, they are very happy to comply with it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."



McPike: "Well then I would request that we leave this on Second Reading until which time that we can come up with a list of what you would agree to, that our expenses, and that we can either appropriate money from them or transfer money out of the...out of the other account. One or the other."

Barnes: "Well, Representative McPike, would we have any objections if we move it to Third with the agreement that I'd bring it back?"

McPike: "No, as long as you agree to bring it back. Alright. Sure."

Barnes: "I will, yes. Thank you."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment number five, J.J. Wolf, reduces the Bill...amends House Bill 3037 as amended on page one line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf on Amendment five."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I 'd like to withdraw Amendment number five."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf withdraws Amendment five. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment number six, Totten, amends House Bill 3037 as amended on page one by deleting Section two and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chair. If the Sponsor...I would like to proceed with the Amendment, but if the Sponsor wants...and it directs itself to the question that Representative McPike raised, if we move the Bill to Third till that question gets resolved and then bring it back to Second, is this Amendment still alive? That's my question."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat the inquiry?"

Totten: "Okay. Representative McPike raised a question that has not been answered."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay..."

Totten: "Amendment number six..."

Speaker Redmond: "What would you do...what would you do with



Amendment six?"

Totten: "That's right. If we bring it to Third then the Sponsor has agreed to bring it back..."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you move to amend...to put Amendment six on?"

Totten: "That's right. Is six still alive?"

Speaker Redmond: "And then move it to Third with six on it? Is that correct? I don't quite understand. If we move it to Third with six on, and it and it comes back, of course the Bill will have Amendment six. If at this time you withdraw it, why then it will go without Amendment six. And if it comes back, it will still be there...you'd still be able to move for the adoption of Amendment six."

Totten: "Okay, if I don't move to adopt six, she moves it to Third Reading, can we come back and address six later?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well yes, you can do that. I would recommend that...take it out of the record or withdraw Amendment six. We'll just hold it here, and then if it comes back, then you move the adoption of six."

Totten: "I would like the opportunity to go with Amendment six when she brings it back on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, you'll have it."

Totten: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Now everybody understands that...are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment number seven, Totten, amends House Bill 3037 as amended on page one by deleting Section two and so forth."

Totten: "I'd like to withdraw seven."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment seven withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Now the understanding is that those Amendments would be alive if we bring it back Second Reading. 3039."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3039. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office... Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3041."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3041. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain state agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #2, 3, 4, and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3048."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3048. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prison Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments and no Amendments from the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3053."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3053, Oblinger. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging, the Department of Public Aid, and the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Committee Amendments or Amendments from the floor?"





Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3055."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3055, Polk. A Bill for an Act amending an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3063."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3063, Swanstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Law Enforcement Commission and various state agencies which participating with Law Enforcement Assistant Administrative and Statewide Plan Program. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments on the floor?"

Clerk Lecae: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3074."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3074. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor or any motion with respect to the Committee Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed. And no Amendments from the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3180."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3180, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Attorney's Appellate Service Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3208."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3028 (sic), Taylor. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain claims against the State of Illinois in confrontation with awards made by the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3268."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3268, Ryan-Redmond. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale and credit and the lending of money. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Committee... Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3288."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3288, Ryan-Redmond. A Bill for an Act to amend the Retail Installment Sales Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3376."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3376 sponsored by the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee. Amends School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, could we go to the Order of Second Reading, Short Debate and so the Bills but no Amendments on page two?"

Speaker Redmond: "Page two?"

Friedrich: "The top of the page, yes sir. Short Debate, Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "That's first legislative day. What did you say?"

Friedrich: "They've been moved then."

Speaker Redmond: "You can't move it on first legislative day. Representative McPike, where is 1299?"

McPike: "It's on page 13, Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 13, on the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 1299, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move 1299 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1299 returned to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, do you have an Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, McPike. Amends House Bill 1299 as amended in the first sentence and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 makes two changes to House Bill 1299 as filed. House Bill 1299 prohibits a new bank from being purchased by a bank holding company until that new bank is at least five years old. This Amendment changes that to ten years old so that a bank holding company could not acquire a new bank until that bank was at least ten years old. The second change is on the last page of this Amendment, number (sic) C, it increases the home office protection of the third facility from 600 feet to one mile. And that is the... the Bill itself allows the establishment



of a third facility, but this Amendment provides that that facility cannot be any closer than one mile to an existing bank. And I would move the adoption of the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Opposed 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. No put it back to Consideration Postponed. Now are there any other Members who have a Bill on Third Reading or Consideration Postponed that desires to have it returned to the Order of Second Reading? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know whether anybody knew that we just adopted an Amendment on the holding companies whether that should be a Roll Call vote or not. I don't know whether they know what the Amendment was. We're going to Second Reading. These Amendments are going by by a vote instead of a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Boy, ... Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, the only thing but I'm afraid it's too late because you already declared it adopted but this Bill that we're talking putting an Amendment on is the holding company Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "1299."

Conti: "1299 and by a voice vote we just adopted an Amendment here and by the time I got to look and look at the Amendment I don't know what we just adopted. It's a very important Bill. It's going to affect the banking in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "I know it. I don't know what I can do now though. What you want to... I have reservation about the advisability of Floor Amendments in toto quite frankly



but I don't know what you're going to do..."

Conti: "Are there any more Amendments on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. Representative Skinner, for what ... what purpose do you rise? You got to tell me what page these things are on. Page seven. Page seven, House Bill 1136. The Order of Third Reading. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would like permission to take this back to Second Reading to put on an updating Amendment."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Skinner. Amends House Bill 1136 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, because the Revenue Act was amended during the past Session, House Bill 1136 is no longer in proper order. For example, the Department of Local Government Affairs is referred to as the Department of Revenue and there are other updates that need to be made so I offer Amendment #5 to do that on this Bill which sets performance standards for supervisors of assessments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "Does that include Cook County?"

Skinner: "Not unless Cook County has a supervisor of assessments and to the best of my knowledge it has a county assessor."

Lechowicz: "It is not. Correct."

Skinner: "The answer is it does not include Cook County."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Skinner: "Except for the fact that the Revenue Department would still be, you know... changes like that would be the same."



Lechowicz: "I'm sorry sir. Like what?"

Skinner: "Well we changed. Wherever it said Department of Local Government Affairs in this Revenue Act, we changed it to the Department of Revenue so it doesn't affect it substantively...~~read~~entially. Not substantively."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... Representative Getty.."

Getty: "I'm sorry Representative Skinner..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Getty: "I missed your explanation. The noise level was a little bit high. Would you mind going over that again for me?"

Skinner: "The operative question is Representative Lechowicz's question. What we have done on line 10 of the first page of the Amendment is change Department of Local Government Affairs to Department of Revenue and the definition of the Revenue Act. That seems to me fairly non-controversial. The part that would be controversial is basically the same as it was in the original Bill but because we amended... made small Amendments on a couple of the... or small changes in the language, they are reprinted. This has to do with performance standards of supervisors of assessments and of course supervisors or assessments or the downstate counties except for St. Claire."

Getty: "Alright, and we've established that that would not, therefore;... the Bill would not... the Amendment would not affect Cook County. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "As far as I can figure out it wouldn't."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any other questions? Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1500. Representative  
ackSkinner."



Skinner: "Yes, I would ask leave to take this back to Second Reading to put on Amendment changing the name of the Department of Local Government Affairs to the Department of Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends House Bill 1500 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, now the Bill in question certainly affects Cook County but the Amendment doesn't do anything more or less than the original Bill does. All I'm doing is changing the name of the Department. I offer Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, on my copy of Amendment #2 seems to indicate more than name changes on page four and... four and five."

Skinner: "That is the only change."

Dunn: "What..."

Skinner: "If you, Representative Dunn, if you compare this Amendment to the original Bill, you'll find, I believe, that the only change is the Department of Revenue." The other is already in the original Bill."

Dunn: "The language on page four and five are language from previous Amendments which were incorporated into this Amendment? Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Because it's in the definition Section, and because when we amend a Bill, they print the whole Section that's being amended. They have reprinted stuff that is already in the Bill in addition to the change of the Department. The Departments name."

Dunn: "Then the changes shown on page four and five are not part of this Amendment. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Sure they are because they're... I don't know how



I may state it more clearly than I already have. The only change in that Section is the change in the Department of Revenue... in the Department of Local Government Affairs name. The other language is already in the original Bill which is on the House floor."

Dunn: "Is Amendment 2 now the Bill then?"

Skinner: "No, this is a minor part of the Bill. This is just the definition Section."

Dunn: "For the record then, what are the changes that are on pages four and five? What do they do?"

Skinner: "On page four what I'm attempting to do is to make entrust county equalization. That is the equalization for homeowners from township to township based on the most recent years assessments to sales ratio studies rather than on an average of three years. In other words, since we're spreading this years taxes, it seems to me we ought to base how that burden is spread based on the most recent information possible rather than on some of the... well, rather than on less recent information. That's what the language does on page four. On page five on defining co-efficient dispersion which sounds like Greek or Latin but can be understood as margin of error, and this is a technical definition of the term which has been given me by the Department of Revenue."

Dunn: "Does the language on page four provide for a township multiplier?"

Skinner: "No, it just... the language on page four specifically says how one shall determine how the Local Board of Review shall determine what the township multiplier shall be. Now, the Board of Reveivs, I believe, are using poor judgment in using a three year running average which distorts the spread of the tax burden. I'm suggesting they use the most recent one year statistics rather than a three year average."

Dunn: "Thank you."





Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Representative Skinner, as I read the... using the word 'specified areas' rather than assessing districts means you could separate out individual neighborhoods. Is that your intent?"

Skinner: "What page are you on? Oh. On page 28? Excuse me. Paragraph 28, line 35 on page five?"

Getty: "That's right."

Skinner: "Yeah. This Bill, as I said, does affect Cook County. There's no doubt about that, and what I'm attempting to do is to force equalization within Cook County on the old congressional township lines because that is where the data is available. But that's the..., it seems to me, we should be having on Third Reading rather than on Second Reading."

Getty: "Well, your Amendment is the Amendment that says 'specified areas'. I'm not sure I know what specified area means."

Clerk Leone: "Lechowicz in the Chair."

Skinner: "Well, it means congressional townships."

Getty: "Is it otherwise defined in the Bill?"

Skinner: "No it is not. If you would like that clarified, I would be happy to clarify it in that... I will be happy to get the language which will define, more specifically, what I'm talking about within the City of Chicago."

Getty: "Well, I would be happy if you take it out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record."

Skinner: "Okay. Fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record."

Skinner: "Would you just leave it on Second Reading please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, we can leave it on Second Reading for you. Gentleman has the same request on House Bill: 2044 which on Third Reading wants to bring it back to



Second Reading for an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, bring House Bill 2044 to Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2044. Floor Amendment #5.

Amends House Bill 2044 as amended in Section 3 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "House Bill 2044 is the tuberculosis district voluntary phase-out Bill. What we're doing here is changing the effective date from January 1, 1980 to October 1, 1980. The language in the latter part of the first page has to do with putting a growth rate which is parallel to the Governor's proposal in his tax limitation legislation to the base rate. On the top of page two, we are saying that if a... if the assets and liabilities of a tuberculosis district are taken over by a public health department, that the public health department must also take over the employees for the grandfather clause. And the rest of it has to do with... the tax limitation... the way the rate may be allowed to grow with the growth and personal income. I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr.

Brummer. You seeking recognition? Okay. Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen seeking recognition? Ebbesen. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Cal, is this putting a limitation on this sort of taxing body that isn't on any other?"

Skinner: "Probably, at this point, it would be. Yeah.

What I did in the original Bill, what the Committee did, was to peg a flat rate that could never... it was pegged to the extension, as a matter of fact, It could not grow and it seems to me with inflation we should allow some increase in the extension. And that's what this would do. I think it's a conservative increase however."



Getty: "Well I am just questioning the wisdom of having a tax rate limitation on this unit of local government when it isn't effective on any other. I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Mr. Getty. Let's give the Gentleman some attention. The noise level is rather high this afternoon."

Getty: "Not speaking to the point of whether I support it or don't support it, I think that's immaterial here. The question is why should we impose it upon this unit of local government and we don't impose it on any other unit of local government. Standardly, it ought to be across the board unless you have some specific reason why this uniquely ought to have a limitation on it."

Skinner: "Well, the specific reason is that the people from Public Health Departments thought that the cost of providing tuberculosis type services and the other services which would be authorized under this Act would increase with inflation. And instead of giving no increase, I acceded to their wishes to give them some increase."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question has been made to the Chair to have... for photos to be taken by AP. The request is granted. Any further discussion? Mr. Getty.

Mr. Skinner to close."

Skinner: "I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has requested the adoption of Amendment #5. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Oppose. Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich on an announcement."

Matijevich: "Well we have... I have two announcements. One, there will be no meeting of the Insurance Committee meeting this week due to the death of the Chairman, Emil Jones father. So there will be no meeting of the



Insurance Committee. Also, my Committee is meeting at 2:00 in case anybody's interested in that.

Appropriations I, same room."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the record indicate Representative Jones is excused because of a death in the family. House Bill 515, Mr. Stuffle. I'm looking on page six of the Calendar. Gentleman asks leave to bring that Bill back for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, House Bill 515 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor? 515."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 515 on page one, line one and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 deletes everything after the enacting clause and increases the post-retirement benefits for the IMRF from 2% to a 3% annual increase. And I would urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I really didn't hear what the Sponsor of the Amendment said. What is he... Does it strike everything after the enacting clause and makes a completely new Bill out of this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute?"

Ebbesen: "Would you explain it again. I didn't hear you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr, Kane, on Amendment #2."

Kane: "What the Amendment does is increase the automatic post-retirement benefits for the IMRF from 2% to 3%."

Ebbesen: "Could you tell me what the... if this Bill was to pass, what the fiscal impact of this would be?"

Kane: "Seventy-six million dollars."

Ebbesen: "Seventy-six million dollars? Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't received a copy of



the impact note and I believe the rules do require that. I can request a copy of the impact note before the adoption of the Amendment. And I would..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, basically, what we can do is adopt the Amendment and then if you request a fiscal note, the Bill will have to remain on Second Reading until the fiscal note is filed."

Terzich: "Well, it was my understanding on the impact statement that the requirement would be that it would not be adopted until the impact statement. It's not a fiscal note, it's an impact statement request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. And then if it's an impact statement request, the same procedure follows. And I believe Mr. Kane indicated to Mr. Ebbesen that the impact will be approximately 76 million dollars. Was that the correct figure, Mr. Kane. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "That would be the accrued liability. The annual impact would be about three million."

Terzich: "Well, I would request then the Sponsor to hold this Amendment until we at least have some time to review the impact statement. It's a substantial change, and I haven't had a chance to look at it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What does the Sponsor yield?"

Kane: "I'd be more than willing to leave it on Second..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Fine. Leave the Bill on Second Reading."

Kane: "Does he want the impact statement before or after we consider the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'd like to have it before I guess. Leave the Bill on Second Reading. May I point out to the Membership that according to our schedule we are suppose to be working this afternoon and this evening, and for the remainder of the week, primarily during the day. But the number of hours that we have left and the number of Bills that we have on the Calendar, for the Membership's own benefit, it would be



best that when your Bill is called that you prepared and call the Bill either up or down. Because, as you know, Friday is the deadline date. House Bills, Third Reading, page five. House Bill 100, Mr. Daniels. Out of the record? I'm sorry, what? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 262, Mr. Pierce. Out of the record. House Bill 331, Mr. Kornowicz. Out of the record. House Bill 426, Mr. Dave Jones. Out of the record. Why don't you just get up and table the Bills? House Bill 429, Kornowicz. 432? Read the Bill. Out of the record. 434. Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. 447, Mr. Reilly. Out of the record. 515. Oh, that's on Second Reading. 582, Mr. Piel. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 582, Piel. A Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will relinquish my time to my hyphenated Sponsor, Jack Davis, for the opening remarks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 582 was a Bill that was held over from last spring, was discharged from the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 96 to, I believe it was, 15. It has to do with the Judicial Branch of government and the idea of limiting the substitution, preemptary substitution of judges in all Judicial circuits from two to one judge. It expands the definition of 'cause' for 'challenge of cause'. It was worked on very hard by the Judiciary Committee, Members of it very interested in seeing it so passed. I think it's a very good Bill that will tend to restore the integrity in the minds of many of the population of the State of



Illinois about the Judicial process. The Bill would tend to discourage what is perceived to be judge shopping in some Judicial districts in Illinois. So I would simply ask you for your favorable vote on this very good Bill and thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, this Bill, from my point of view, is a most valuable and interesting Bill, and I certainly know from personal experience. When I had all my troubles over the campus disorders and all of that, and I won't go into that, and we went to trial on the use of my money to investigate and to pay an investigator, the judge of the trial, although we put an affidavit or we made a motion for a new judge, refused to do it. That was... And as a result of that, he attempted to gag me that I couldn't talk for five years about the trial even to my own family. Now, I had supported his opponent, Judge Green, in the election for the Appellate Court prior to this trial. We actually can show that I went on TV and newspaper ads supporting his opponent. We brought that up as a political prejudice. He would not allow us to... He would not withdraw from my case. Now this gives a man a chance to get a new judge. If a judge... and... trust the judge himself who could very well have hurt my case, refused to withdraw from my case. This way you can get another judge to make a decision if there was prejudice or not, and God knows there was sure prejudice in my particular case. The Civil Liberty's Union themselves came down from Chicago to support my case based on the fact never, ever, in the history of Illinois or any other state, had a man been gagged for five years that he couldn't even talk about his own case to his own family. So I hope



you all support this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "The Sponsor is Mr. Davis? I'm sorry, Mr. Piel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Piel is the Sponsor, and Mr.

Davis is the Chief Cosponsor, and he opened up the discussion on the Bill. It was Mr. Davis. Mr. Piel will answer the question."

Brummer: "Okay. First of all, I guess one part of the question was addressed to Mr. Davis. He said this Bill was... was discharged from Committee and then he indicated that the Committee had worked very hard on this and wanted the Bill. I was wondering why it was necessary to discharge Committee if the Judiciary Committee wanted the Bill."

Piel: "Representative Brummer, without going into personalities, there was a situation that arose in Committee that Jack Davis, when he discharged Committee, a lot of the Members in the House new what the situation was in Committee with one of the Members who stopped in Committee. And so, you know... Sponsors. Mike Getty is on there also and he was in the Committee so he knew what was going on also."

Brummer: "The provisions... Are the provisions of this Bill currently law in Illinois?"

Piel: "Yes, they are."

Brummer: "Why do we need the Bill then if it's the law already?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, for what purpose seek recognition?"

Davis: "I would like to answer the question of the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're going to have one or the...

Another procedure is one person responds to the question. If you want to handle the questions, fine. Then it will be Mr. Davis."

Davis: "I'd like to handle the question. Representative





Brummer, House Bill 265 in the Conference Committee Report last year did remove the Section of preemptory challengers. It changed the Section on preemptory challengers from two judges to one judge. However, this Bill goes further in scope, and, at this point in time, we are attempting to pass this... expand Section C for preemptory and cause... or for challenge for cause and add a Section in for preemptory challenge for prejudice against the attorney of the client as well."

Brummer: "Okay. Could you explain specifically then, and not in generality, but specifically, what changes this Bill makes from the existing law?"

Davis: "Alright. This Bill makes the change... the existing law has decreased the number of substitutions from two to one. This Bill also adds in that there's prejudice against the defendant or his attorney is sufficient for preemptory challenge, for the one challenge. In Section C, it provides, and this was a... spent a lot of time in subcommittee on Judiciary working this Section out, provides that in a third party hearing shall be held and a petition for change of judge for cause, for prejudice for cause. That now, the currently the law exists that challenge for cause is heard in front of the jurist who is being challenged for cause. This now provides for a third party hearing for an affidavit and support thereof and that the hearing be held in front of a judge not named in the motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you have any more questions, Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "How many Amendment have been adopted to this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony."

Davis: "How many... I don't understand the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has asked how many Amendments have been adopted to this Bill."

Brummer: "There was an Amendment #2 offered. Was that



adopted?"

Davis: "If you're referring to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #1 is the only Amendment that's been adopted."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your welcome. Any further discussion? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question, I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Deuster: "... would like to ask this. Right now, under existing law, if you find yourself a defendant before a judge and you or your lawyer think that that judge isn't the one you want to hear your case, what grounds exist now for you to select another judge?"

Davis: "Well, there are two provisions in the law. You have one preemptory challenge now, under current law. And you have a challenge for cause that you have to support in testimony before the same judge you're challenging for cause."

Deuster: "So, you can, without alleging any cause, get a second judge."

Davis: "No. That's not true."

Deuster: "Well, I thought... What is preemptory then?"

Davis: "Well, preemptory... the law currently exists that you have one preemptory challenge."

Deuster: "Well, that's just what I said. That if you just want another judge for no good reason at all, you have a preemptory challenge."

Davis: "That's true."

Deuster: "And your Bill would change that so to take away that preemptory."

Davis: "No. No. The Bill was a duplicate Bill in some instances, Representative Deuster. What the Bill does now is in the preemptory Section, adds in prejudice against the defendant attorney as well for substitution of one judge in a preemptory fashion. It then, in Section



C, expands the Section for challenge for cause for a third party hearing not in front of the judge being challenged."

Deuster: "Let's get this straight, Representative Davis. If I have a right, as a defendant through my attorney, to get another judge as a matter of right, that's called a preemptory challenge, and I don't have to have any cause at all. So I don't understand you saying that you've added to the cause or you've changed the cause."

Davis: "Well, you're confusing preemptory with cause. There are two Sections. One is preemptory which we're only adding in, 'or his attorney', the phrase, 'the defendant or his attorney may substitute preemptarily one challenge'. We are not changing that. We are changing the Section for cause. When you challenge for cause, not preemptory."

Deuster: "And the precise change you're making is one, that the hearing will be held not before that judge but before a third party hearing."

Davis: "Not named in the motion."

Deuster: "And then secondly, what is the change you're making? Any change in the cause? Are you limiting the cause?"

Davis: "No."

Deuster: "Could be any cause at all and it's up to the third judge to decide whether you have valid reasons."

Davis: "Indeed true."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." Jack."

Stearney: "Representative, as it is now, the defendant may move for cause and remove one judge. Am I right?"

Davis: "That's true."



Stearney: "And your Bill now would say that he would have to allege grounds by affidavit?"

Davis: "Say that again, Representative Stearney! I didn't hear you. There's a lot of noise in here."

Stearney: "That your Bill now provides that to move, strike one judge, that he would have to allege in his petition, in his affidavit, certain grounds."

Davis: "That's true."

Stearney: "In order to remove that very one judge."

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "Now, last year, didn't we change the Criminal Code to provide that whereas before an individual could remove two judges from hearing his case, now that was reduced to one. Am I right?"

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "Well, and what you're doing now is even whittling down even further that right of the defendant to remove one judge."

Davis: "No.":

Stearney: "By requiring that he set forth on an affidavit certain grounds. Am I right?"

Davis: "For cause only, not preemptary."

Stearney: "Okay. Does he still have the right to remove one judge preemptarily?"

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "Okay. How does your Bill differ from the existing Criminal Code then?"

Davis: "What?"

Stearney: "How does your Bill differ from the existing Criminal Code?"

Davis: "It adds in as your request, Representative Stearney, the word, 'or his attorney' for prejudice in preemptary challenge. It changes the Section of cause for a third party hearing for cause so that the motion for challenge on the judge for cause is not heard in front of the same judge who is being challenged."



Stearney: "Well, but you're saying though, that the individual defendant would still have the right to strike one judge preemptarily?"

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "And he could still file a motion for cause..."

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "... before a second judge."

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "And what is the purpose of this? What is the purpose of this Bill?"

Davis: "The purpose of this Bill was originally to reduce the number of preemptary challenges to one, to add in the attorney as being prejudice as well the defendant, and to expand the Section for cause to allow third party hearings for cause, to remove the idea of a judge being challenged from cause for hearing the same petition for removal of himself from the case."

Stearney: "Who wants this Bill, by the way?"

Davis: "I suppose I do and you don't from the sound of it."

Stearney: "Well, no. It's a very fair question. Any states attorney groups that have lobbied for this particular Bill."

Davis: "Yes."

Stearney: "And who is that?"

Davis: "I beg your pardon?"

Stearney: "Who is that? Which group?"

Davis: "The States Attorney's Association was in support of the Bill. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think Representative Stearney, and I hope Representative Stearney is paying attention, properly understood this... the answers to the questions concerning this Bill. Representative Stearney, I think you, as a defense attorney, would support this Bill because it will do two things in addition to what the law already



does as we amended it by 265. It'll do two things. It will provide that prejudice may be alleged not only against your client but against you yourself. In addition to that, it will remove the hearing on prejudice to a different judge. So, inasmuch as you are a defense attorney, I would think that you would probably support this. You might not have supported House Bill 265 as it was amended, but I would think you would probably support this in its present form."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well, I think we've had adequate discussion. I simply..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 582 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 ayes, 10 nos, 1 recorded as present and House Bill 582 receiving the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 668 is taken out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 675, Mr. Katz. Out of the record. 677, Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 703, Mrs. Younge. Out of the record. 744, Mr. Pouncey. Out of the record. 748, Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 750, Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 750. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Service Mine Lands Conservation and Reclamation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, by enacting the geography, most of the gravel for the State of Illinois comes from Northeastern Illinois from the 33rd district, as a matter of fact. Approximately 80% of the gravel flows out of my district, Representative Burnidge's district, and Representative Hanahan's district. I'm sorry that Representative



Hanahan isn't here today yet, because he can speak out... to this subject perhaps more so than I can. Back when the Bill was passed with regard to surface mine conservation and reclamation, there, apparently, was a lot more understanding of what the problems were in coal mined areas than in gravel areas, because, in the Act is a clause which virtually excludes every gravel pit in the entire state from any requirement for reclamation. What House Bill 750 does is to put them back in, or that is to put them in by taking this qualifying language out. The language that we're taking out defines, as not under this Bill... not under this Act, an area where the overburden shall exceed 10 feet in depth or where the operation shall affect more than 10 acres during the current year. Alright, now, this is a loophole that's large enough to drive a ready-mix truck through. You can't mine gravel if you have more than 10 feet of overburden.. It just is not economically feasible. And 10 acres, while it doesn't sound like much, is about the size of... my guidelines for 10 acres is the size of Temple Square in Salt Lake City. They just happen to be that size and I just happen to have lived there. That's not... that doesn't seem like much land, but for gravel operations that is a lot of land. That is a lot of truck loads of gravel. So what I'm trying to do is to change the strip mine... well the Surface Mine Reclamation Act so that gravel pits will be covered. All gravel pits will be covered in the state. At the present time, let me just give you an example of how big the loophole is. In McHenry County where approximate 60% of the gravel in the state comes from there are only four companies with pits that meet the qualifications so that they have to get a permit. Well, that's just ridiculous. You have seen the scars that coal mines have left, strip mines



have left on the way down from Chicago, for example, on Route 55. And those of you from Southern Illinois or Central Illinois know more about it, probably, than the people from Chicago who just see it from the highway. To see Algonquin township in Southeastern McHenry County is to see something that looks like it came out of outer space. There are these huge craters at the bottom of which there may or may not be water and there's no attempt whatsoever at reclamation. Now, putting gravel pits underneath this permit requirement is not going to be a big deal. It's not going to be that much of a change because the requirements of the Department of Mines and Minerals are that they have a 15% slope for example. What that means in my area is they can't drop straight at maybe an 80 degree or 70 degree angle. They're going to have to grade it up. Maybe we can use the land for something after the gravel is taken out. It means that there's going to have to be a bond posted per acre. Maybe 5000 bonds. A very minimal bond. What it means is that we're going to put a foot in the door into gravel pit rehabilitation in this state. So far, that door... that... so far there isn't even a door. There's sort of a mouse hole along the wall, and some of the gravel pits get through it. And I would ask you... I would ask your support for this measure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Pierce: "What you do here, Cal, is take out the exemption that exists in the law now that if they just do 10 acres a year, they don't have to get the permit."

Skinner: "That's what the overburden requirement..."

Pierce: "So it's the overburden as well... I know many gravel pit operators who were avoiding and evading the





necessity of a permit by just going about nine or 10 acres a year and, therefore; they needed no permit and every year they do another nine or ten acres, and they avoid the permit. So if that's what you're doing here, it was well taken out the exemption on the overburden would have to exceed 10 feet. I think you have a good Bill here for a change, and I think had the voters realize this before the primary, you might have been nominated for Congress. But you did carry McHenry County where the gravel pits are. So I think you have a good Bill here, Cal, and I intend to support it. It doesn't affect coal mines at all, I know, only gravel pits. I will support the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Skinner: "Certainly."

Borchers: "Well, Cal, we don't have deep and numerous gravel pits in our area. I do know that there... I have gone up and driven and seen some of these very large holes you have. Now, one of the things in landfills, and we own land that has a landfill on it, is the difficulty of getting enough dirt to cover the landfill in compliance with the law. Where in the world are you going to get all the dirt and the material to fill those holes or to grade it off as you say?"

Skinner: "The Bill does not require that the holes be filled. I mean, that would be impossible in my opinion. The requirements that state has are extremely minimal. It's not at all like the federal government Coal Mine Reclamation Act which requires them to be put back in the... well, so that they can grow crops as they were... as they could originally. The only requirements Mines and Minerals was able to give me that sounded... well, at all tough is a 15% slope. Now you can imagine you can't use much... you can't use land... or we don't



use much land in Illinois that has more than a 15% slope. So, I guess the answer to your question is they wouldn't be able to take as much gravel out."

Borchers: "Well, may I ask a few more questions? How deep are these holes up in your county?"

Skinner: "Fifty to a hundred feet."

Borchers: "And, you can then turn them... by filling... grading them, you expect to farm that."

Skinner: "This is not going to be retroactive, of course, this will just be prospective. But it seems to me we have to start somewhere. My area really looks like the armpit of the world and I'd just like to round out the edges a little bit."

Borchers: "Do lakes... does water form in these holes? Do they become lakes?"

Skinner: "There is some water in the... in many of the holes. Yes."

Borchers: "Well, you certainly put me on the spot because I can see that the difficulty of getting... I know what you're trying to do and I think it's an excellent idea, but I can't see where in the world all this dirt's coming from to fill all... replace all the gravel that's being taken out. What would be the cost to the people taking out gravel? Will that stop the gravel that we need for our roads and buildings. It makes me wonder about it because I know how difficult it is to get the dirt to cover just a land fill let alone gravel pits that's 50 foot deep. I think it'd be very difficult."

Skinner: "Of course, Representative..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before we all get on the rocks, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. Previous question's been moved. Gentleman from McHenry,



Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "If I... Mr. Speaker, If I might reply to Representative Borchers last question first. In a landfill, you have to cover it everyday. We're not suggesting covering this every day. We're not even suggesting covering it while it's being worked. We're just suggesting before they abandon it they have to make some minimum effort toward reclamation. What the Bill does is what we've discussed. It takes away a gaping loophole to which one could drive a material service gravel truck and those of you who have seen these pits, which are just incredible, can appreciate the problem. And those of you who can't, I would ask you to reflect upon what you know about coal strip mines and how big the problem is. And I ask your support House Bill 750."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 750 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I did want to ask the Sponsor some questions during the debate, but since it's impossible to do that, I'd like to point out that the Section that's being amended is a necessity of a permit. And it shall be unlawful for any operator to engage in surface mining without first obtaining a permit. So we've taken out the exemption that I'm sure you will find in the next week or so, if this passes, and I intend to vote no on it, because you're going to have most of the construction industry and those people in sand and gravel and the people doing whatever building they're going to be doing to kind of be curtailed by this Amendment #1. But #2, you have a situation that, without any exemption according to this Amendment the way I read it, everyone who wants to expand in an existing pit would once again have to come for a permit. If I read it correctly. And if



that's about the statement, you're going to affect, very drastically, the business climate in the State of Illinois, in my estimation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I fully realize the intent of Mr. Skinner with this Bill, and I do not disagree with that intent. I think there is several things that we should know. That we realize completely that, with the passage of the reclamation law that we passed last year, that we need to completely rewrite the law in regard to aggregate mining permit and aggregate mining reclamation. That's fully understood. This Bill does not do that. It merely starts something that I don't believe we are completely ready to rewrite our aggregate mining law at this time. We realize it must be done. Unfortunately, what we are going to do is probably cause a big increase in the cost of sand and gravel and rock which you know as well as I, all of you, affects not only the building of houses but also the cost of building of highways. I think this is what we should recognize when we're voting on this Bill. I don't disagree with the necessity of reclamation of these pits. But some of the things I cannot quite agree with the... what did Cal say? 16% slope or something like that. I think it's going to be very wasteful of one of the very important resources that we have which would be sand, gravel, and rock; with the construction of buildings as well as highways. So I vote no."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. Your light's on. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 ayes, 34 nays, 8 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 757, Mr. Watson. Take it out of the record. 777, Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. 821, Mrs. Younge. Out of the record. 830, Mr. Getty. Out of the record. 842, Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 848, Mr. Schneider. Out of the record. 927, John Dunn. Out of the record. 932, Mr. O'Brien. Out of the record. 955, Mr. Katz. McClain isn't in. 958, White. Out of the record. 971, out of the record. 980, Mr. Skinner. 980. House Bill 1016, Mr. McPike. Gentleman asks leave the Bill... bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, House Bill 1016 is on Second Reading. Mr. Bowman, are you here? Okay. Clerk, read the Bill. Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1016, McPike. The Bill's been previously read on Second. Amendment... Floor Amendment #19, Bowman. Amends House Bill 1016 as..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #19, if adopted, would become the Bill. It strikes everything after the enacting clause and replaces it with new material. It basically does two things. The first part of the Amendment provides for optional means by which territory, such as high school districts, can organize themselves into community college districts. That part of the Bill or Amendment is very similar, in fact, identical to legislation that's been passed by Representative McCourt in this chamber on more than one occasion. It provides for constractural community college districts. This is the arrangement that is now in operation in Quincy. It has worked very well there. This simply provides a mechanism for other parts of the state to have the same kind of community college district that Quincy now has. The second part



of the Bill provides that if in other cases where high school districts have had more than 200,000 dollars in charge backs over the last three years that they are obliged to organize one of these districts. This legislation was worked out in cooperation with Representative Walsh and others, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Reilly: "As you know, because I represent another territory that's not included, I may have to oppose this Bill on Third Reading, but I'm not going object to the Amendment. But I do have a few questions. The ... in terms of mandating that Evanston, which is a practical matter, it's the only area that's covered by the Bill. In terms of mandating that they have to go into a contractural district just legally. I mean, procedurally, how do you distinguish that from mandating that they have to go into some other kind of district?"

Bowman: "Well, perhaps I am not understanding your question. I... the trigger mechanism in the Bill simply provides that if any district in the state, but you're right that Evanston is the only one that follows this criteria, but if any other district were to have 200,000 dollars in charge-backs over the last three years, then they would be obliged to form the same kind of district."

Reilly: "Well, now that isn't the part I'm having trouble with."

Bowman: "I'm sorry."

Reilly: "How do you... I understand that trigger. But how do you... you and I just as we stand here know what a contractural community college district is, but in terms of the Bill, or what now becomes the Bill."



how do you distinguish that from a regular community college district? Are you giving them fewer powers in the regular district or..."

Bowman: "I see what you mean. Yes. The contractual district has no authority to build buildings. In fact, the contractual district is precisely one which has contracts with educational institutions to provide educational services in return for some kind of financial remunerations. Now, the district in Quincy, which operates on this basis, has the authority to build buildings. The only reason that they are able to form in that area was because they swore to their voters on a stack of bibles that they would never, ever build buildings

Reilly: "Build some..but anyway, go ahead."

Bowman: "Okay. But the point is that, under this option, if any district in the state use the option provided for in this Amendment and the voters approved of the referendum, or as in Evanston's case, were mandated to do it then that district would be prohibited from building buildings by the terms of the statute.

Reilly: "So the Amendment itself does that?"

Bowman: "Yes it does."

Reilly: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Under the terms of this Bill, what high school districts would be forced into a junior college contractual arrangement?"

Bowman: "Evanston."

Ewing: "Just one?"

Bowman: "Evanston is the only one in the state that needs the criteria specified in the Bill."

Ewing: "Is there any type of referendum in here to allow Evanston... the voters of Evanston to... back door



referendum to put this to a vote?"

Boman: "No. That's not an oversight."

Ewing: "Have they had votes in Evanston before to create junior college districts?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Ewing: "And what's been the outcome of those?"

Bowman: "There have been four separate referenda on different kinds of questions. There has been the question of whether to form their own district in conjunction with 'New Tier' and other North Shore communities, and that failed. The High School Board has adopted Resolutions to join other community college districts and they have failed. And in each case, it seems that the reason that those referenda failed is because the voters were concerned about the prospect of building new buildings in an area such as the North Shore which is already very heavily overbuilt with educational facilities. So I think this Bill does address the concerns of the voters in Evanston. See, the problem that they're facing right now, Representative Ewing, and I tell this to my voters when I go back home and discuss this matter, is that they're already paying the taxes right now. They're paying them through the high school district. Better, there should be a Community College Board with the authority to set community college policy and let them levy the tax rather than the high school districts. They're going to pay one way or the other."

Ewing: "Is this area that would be forced into a junior college situation in your legislative district?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Ewing: "All of it?"

Bowman: "About... well... about... percent of it."

Ewing: "... quite a bit of it. Pardon?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Quite a bit of it. It's the Evanston





special. Art Barman and Woody Bowman. Art...  
and Woody."

Ewing: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's the Amendment. Amendment #19.  
Please proceed."

Ewing: "But it becomes the Bill. I think everybody in  
this House should at least be aware of what the  
legislation of this Amendment would do to this Bill.  
There's one district, according to the Sponsor that  
would be affected. I think the important thing is  
that we are going to assume that we know better what  
is good for the citizens of this district than they do.  
Four times they have defeated proposals for junior  
college and referendums. I believe that we should  
leave that prerogative with them. I don't believe  
that we should second guess their reasoning and give  
them another type of junior college, a contractual  
one, thinking that's what they would have voted had  
they had the chance. We stand for local government,  
then let's let it work. Let's let these people decide  
how they'll pay their taxes. Whether they pay it through  
the junior college or through their high school for this  
type of education. And I would urge everyone to look  
very closely at this Amendment."

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

Getty: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Bowman, would you outline for us  
what, in your best judgement, would be the difference  
in cost to the voters, say of Evanston, if they were  
to... if we were to pass this and they were to ratify  
this sort of contractual community college system  
versus the establishment of the community college  
system?"

Bowman: "Okay. First of all, in order to make that judgement,  
a couple of assumptions have to be made which I will spell



out for you. The first assumption is that the community college district does not undertake any contracts with any institutions other than existing community colleges. The second assumption is that the cost impact will be measured next year, not two, three, five years down the road. Okay? If this were to go into effect now, next year, I would estimate that there would really be a very little difference in cost because the only levy that the new Community College Board in that area would have to make would be to pay the tuition charge backs essentially. In other words, they would not be levying for a building fund, only for the education fund. And so the difference in cost would be... well modest. Maybe not zero but at least modest. Now, further down the road, once the high school district's tax rate limit has been reached, and that is coming fairly soon, then there would be a difference in cost because to the extent that the high school district continues to pay the tax, the entire amount of the tax is coming out of high school programs. And the tax rate limit on the high school then provides an overall cap for the sum of the two programs; community college plus high school programs."

Getty: "My second question is, are there existing community college districts which enter into contractual relationships with any private colleges or universities to your knowledge? And if so, what are they?"

Bowman: "I have been told that the John Woods community college district in Quincy does have a contractual relationship with a private business college that teaches clerical and business type skills. Computer programming or something of that nature but it's fairly limited."

Getty: "As a for instance, does this Amendment mean that if Evanston were to pass this, that they could enter



into a contractual relation say with 'Loyola or Northwestern University or one of the other colleges or universities in that area that are privately funded?"

Bowman: "Well, if there's... on page one of the Amendment, if there's that... in the definition of the contractual district it means the district organized under the Section limited to providing educational services through a contractual agreement with existing public and private educational facilities subject to the rules and regulations of the State Board. Now, the State Board could put some restrictions on, simply haven't had this kind of system statewide. I'm not aware that they have any particular restrictions along these lines, but they could."

Getty: "Alright. Just reading the plain language of your proposed Amendment, there is nothing here nor do you intend to prohibit a community college district which would pass such a contractual community college referendum from entering into a contractual relationship with a private college or university."

Bowman: "That's correct. That's not my intention."

Getty: "And... And the conjunction... conjunctive language where you have private... public or private or public and private..."

Bowman: "Public and private I believe."

Getty: "... does not intend, in any way, to limit them from exclusively entering into a contractual relationship with a private university if that community college district so chose."

Bowman: "Quite right."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

McClain: "Mr. Bowman, we have a county in our legislative



district, Brown County, which... county does not belong to a community college system at this time. And I can't tell you how much a year they spend in charge-backs, but I think it's somewhere around 40,000 dollars. Would this... over a five year period when they finally reach 200,000, would this mandate that they would have to then belong to a community college system?"

Bowman: "No, it would not." The 200,000 dollar figure was an annual figure not a cumulative figure."

McClain: "An annual figure. So..."

Bowman: "Yes sir."

McClain: "So then the only system that we're really concerned with would be Evanston and then you go to... Let me explain John Wood Community College for a second. If the consortium whereby it has no... it has some full-time staff but generally they're administrative staff. What they do is they contract with five or six private schools for some clerical, some with Quincy College, some with Hannabal LaGrange, some with Culverstockton to provide a range of services and educational facets. This would still provide Evanston to do that same sort of consortium or contractual arrangement."

Bowman: "Exactly. It would."

McClain. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt. The other half of the district."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's certainly with some reluctance that I speak on this Amendment. I admire the Sponsor of the Amendment for trying to solve a problem that is unique for Evanston. And it is true that sometime ago I had the essence of this Bill to permit Evanston to go into a contractual community college district rather than go the full way into a community college district which before time it has lost in Evanston. However, in good conscience,



I cannot stand here and support a Resolution or an Amendment that, in essence, is going to mandate the taxpayers of one municipality an increase of 75% in their rate without a referendum. Now..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is that in Evanston?"

McCourt: "That's in Evanston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

McCourt: "And, so I would hope that this Amendment would be defeated."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Sepaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "Woody, I've got your Amendment here and I'm afraid even with all the questions I still don't understand what you're trying to accomplish here. We have an area in the 31st District that has chosen not to be part of our community college district. Will this Bill give the authority to the Board of Education within that particular area, Lake Forest and Lake Bluff, the authority to join the district even though the people do not wish to be part of the district?"

Bowman: "I believe that with the exception of Evanston, the only way in which a district could form such a contractual arrangement would be by a front-door referendum."

Griesheimer: "Well, what bothers me is your belief and not knowing. You're the Sponsor and that's the reason I'm asking you the question."

Bowman: "That is precisely what the Amendment says."

Griesheimer: "I've read through the Bill or the Amendment and I cannot see any reference to the municipality of Evanston."

Bowman: "The... starting at the very bottom of page two, paragraph number B, letter B, the municipality of Evanston is not mentioned but there is a classification which is set up which, as a practical matter, identifies it."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you see it?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, this is at the top of page three you're referring to."

Bowman: "It begins at the bottom of page two, but yes, the active language is at the top of page three."

Griesheimer: "Alright. Is that a population figure or a dollar figure?"

Bowman: "It's a dollar figure."

Griesheimer: "Is this the first time that any area within the State of Illinois that's chosen not to be part of a community college district will be, in effect, forced into a district?"

Bowman: "Yes, I believe so. Yes."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Bowman: "I was not here when the original community college Act was passed, but I believe that is correct."

Griesheimer: "Well, I'd like to speak to the Bill very briefly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed sir."

Griesheimer: "Although I appreciate the Sponsor's desire to make this apply only to his own legislative district, for those of us in the 31st and those of you that also have areas within your district that have chose not to be part of a community college district, I think we are establishing a precedence here which will grow to haunt all of us at some time or another. Whether we agree or not agree with the concept of a way the communities could vote themselves in and out of community college districts, I don't think we should substitute our opinions for the opinion back home. And now that I understand the Bill and more readily understand Representative Ewing's questions, I would think a no vote would be appropriate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's very disturbing to me that we have here an example



of legislation being brought into this House for the Legislature of the State of Illinois to impose something on the taxpayers of a district against their will. The people of Evanston have voted four times not to go into a community college district and now, by this action, they would be put into a community college district. The purpose for it is to bail out the high school district which is a very noble purpose, but we're helping the high school districts at the expense of the taxpayers. We're helping them over the taxpayers dead bodies and that is very wrong. There are other approaches which ought to be used so that both can be helped. I understand the problem of Evanston High School's education fund being sacked for community college tuition, but we could take some other approaches. We could allow them to reinstate the charge-back levy which was phased out in the community college board's attempt to sock it to everybody. Or we could do away with having high schools pay the tuition for students at all and if their out of district have them pay the tuition themselves to the community college. But to force Evanston into a contractual community college district, to say 'shall' in this Bill with respect to one district in the state and 'may' with respect to the others, is the height of unfairness, and I urge you, please, to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield please?"

Sepaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Hallstrom: "Woody, may I ask a question? And I'm listening carefully to what everybody's saying. I certainly don't want to be unfair to the taxpayers. But, what I'd like to know is how is it affecting the taxpayer now the fact that our school districts have to pay the



500,000 dollars charge-back out of their education fund? Can you tell me what is the actual difference between what they pay now and what they would have to pay under your Bill?"

Bowman: "At the present time, the total dollar amount would not be appreciably affected because the tax that would be levied by the new contractual community college district would be for educational purposes. So it would not include the tax levy for the building funds and so forth." So, at the present time, there would be hardly any difference. The reason that I have proposed this legislation is that the Evanston High School District 202 is very close, just pennies away from it's maximum operating tax levy even after referenda. As you know, the voters passed a referendum authorizing the... an increase in the tax rate ceiling. Right? Now, they are close to that ceiling. They have no place else to go, and once that ceiling is reached, every dollar that goes to any community college for purposes of paying a tuition charge-back is a dollar that cannot be spent on high school programs. And at that point, high school programs are going to suffer dearly. I want to pass this legislation so that we will not jeopardize those programs."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr Tuerk. Mr. Tuerk. Alright. Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "We have some area in our district that is not in junior college districts and these high schools pay this. Now if this Bill is passed on this specific issue, what is to keep it from extending to the other issue without allowing the people to vote on it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, I guess only your good sense, Representative Robbins. I mean, I offered this Bill to solve a problem that I have. Now, if you've got a problem I'll be





happy to vote for your Bill too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is not responsive to what my understanding of our meeting was, Woody. Not at all. I thought that it would be considerably broader, and, for that reason, I can't support it. I would appreciate it if we discuss this, Mr. McCourt, you and I, and I thought we had some kind of agreement and apparently he doesn't feel that it's responsive to what he had in mind either. Why don't you take it out of the record and we'll see if we can come up with the right thing?"

Bowman: "Could you elaborate. I thought...."

Walsh: "Yeah. I shall elaborate. My understanding was that we were going to have an Amendment to this Bill which would provide that all of the state would become a contractual if they chose or non-contractual, but in every case, become a part of a junior college district. What this Amendment does as you have drafted it amounts to a charge-back for Evanston and for Evanston only. And I don't agree with that. It was my understanding that we were going to address the problem of junior colleges for all of the state and included in that, of course, would be Evanston and Evanston, of course, would opt for the contractual junior college."

Bowman: "Well, if I can respond to the Gentleman. I think that the problem to which he refers in terms of securing agreement amongst various parties is a good example of what happens when things are done in small... various small groups. The reason that it is drafted in this particular way, quite frankly, is because Representative McCourt had told me that he couldn't support it the other way, and so I did this in this particular fashion because I thought that it satisfied the conditions that we had discussed and also satisfactory to Representative



McCourt. Apparently not. I think that he has had a change of heart on this and I'm kind of left holding the bag here. However, I would rather vote the Amendment up or down at this particular point. If the Amendment fails, then hopefully leave the Bill on Second Reading. But, the Bill is... was offered to me as a vehicle by Representative McPike and consequently has no other use so I would just as soon vote the Amendment up or down."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, in view of that then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word in opposition to the Amendment. Mr. Speaker, most of the Evanston junior college students go to Oakton. The question, it seems to me, of providing services to Loyola University or Northwestern or any other private college are pretty remote. The money that will be garnered through this 75 cent levy will go to the junior college district of Oakton. Now, what this amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is simply permitting the Evanston High School District a charge-back levy and getting them off the hook while every other high school district in the state is required to pay junior college tuitions from their operations or from their educational levy. I think this is pretty selective, and I think this Amendment should be defeated and that we ought to sit down and perhaps talk about doing it another way or not doing it at all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Well, I regret Representative McCourt's change of heart and the fact, as far as Representative Walsh is concerned, I was over at his desk earlier today after the Amendment has been distributed and we were discussing it. So, all of these problems are new ones to me! I've been struggling with this for some time as you all know. I think this Amendment carries forward the interest of the Legislature in making sure that all high school districts



in the state are either in a community college district or form their own community college district. The Legislature has gone on record a number of times in the past, many times in the past, in fact; in every General Assembly the House and the Senate have agreed on a Bill and sent it to the Governor to put all high school districts in the state into community college districts and the Governor has repeatedly vetoed them. What we have here is a step. It is a step that, in effect, puts the Evanston high school district into its own contractual community college district. Now, it provides another option for other high school districts and with this additional option I would hope that other districts would follow. But, Evanston is the only one at this time which is mandated. But I want to point out to the Membership that this particular Amendment carries forward the desire of the General Assembly to get all high school districts into community college districts. If it does it piecemeal, well it seems to me that's better than the holding pattern that we're in right now where it would neither fish nor fowl. You have high school districts out there who are being caught in a squeeze. It is a Catch 22 situation for them. It is a Catch 22 situation not because the Legislature really wanted it that way. In fact, the Legislature wanted all high school districts in the community college district. Governor Ogilvie is the one that used the amendatory veto and messed everything up to begin with. You have districts out there who would like to be in community college districts, who like to form their own districts but it had difficulty doing it. Evanston has used up all of its other options. If you want to get all community college... all high school districts into community college districts, it seems to me that you want to do this to vote for this Amendment as a first step. Therefore, I ask that those of you who support community



colleges to vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall Amendment #19 be adopted?"

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'No'. Nos have it. Amendment's lost. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman requested a Roll Call.

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 43 ayes, 88 nos, 3 recorded as present. Amendment's defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. Purpose of an introduction. I will call on the commander of the House, Representative Larry DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Speaker. I'm happy to announce that we have the national commander of the 'Amvets' with us today. His name is Joseph R. Koralowski and he's from Toledo, Ohio. He wants to say a few words while he's visiting our chambers here today. Commander Koralowski."

Koralowski: "Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor and privilege to have the opportunity to address the distinguished General Assembly of the State of Illinois. I speak to you on behalf of all American veterans and express to you the sad fact that their services and sacrifices are being forgotten. We in veteran's affairs are today confronted by an age old historical process. History has shown us that the further we get away from a war we have a tendency to forget the veteran who fought in that war and those who fought in all previous wars. On May 7, 1975, Seigon fell to the victorious onslaught of communist troops and closed the final chapter on that decade long national trauma known as Viet Nam. Time, they say, is a great healer. Today, five years after Viet Nam, time has been at work healing



the open wounds of divisiveness that ruined our land during the bitter South Asian struggle. Our collective conscienceness has been numbed as Viet Nam fades slowly receding into the midst of our memories. But as the wounds have healed and the painful reality of Viet Nam fades away, so too does the image of the veteran beginning to fade. The veteran needs become less pressing then neglected and ultimately forgotten. A recession stalks us and the times of austerity lie just ahead. The federal government at the direction of the President of the United States has reduced its... funding and inflation and unemployment continue to rise. The federal dollar has shrunk and competition among competing groups for their fair share of the federal dollar is becoming more acute. And as usual, they look to the veterans' share. Veterans programs have increasingly come under attack from other quarters. They claim the veteran is receiving too much and actively seeks to restrict and cut back the veterans' programs and services. Veterans claim they are satisfied with what they right... have now. They are not asking for more. No, they merely want to retain what they already have. But the veterans stance does not satisfy the other groups. They have seen their opportunity to strike and are pressing forward relentlessly with the attack. The veteran, they know, has been neglected by the American people and the government. You might ask, how do you forget service and sacrifice? It is very simple. Just look to the federal government. The Veterans Administration budget for this fiscal year has been reduced by over one million dollars and services will then decline and the veteran will suffer. State Legislators such as yourself may soon have an opportunity to act on an important veterans' issue. The issue is veterans preference. Last May the Supreme Court handed down an historical decision in the test case of 'Feeny versus Massachusetts. The Supreme Court held that



the State of Massachusetts absolute veterans preference statute did not discriminate against woman as a class. We at Amvet hail that landmark decision yet at the same time note it with some foreboding that the Supreme Court suggested to those who attack veterans preference that the remedy lies in the legislative area. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly of Illinois, I tell you that veterans preference has become a legislative issue. The forces that oppose veterans preference are powerful. They are well financed and are totally committed to eradicating the veterans preference statutes from the books. These forces are at work right now in Congress and in some State Legislators (sic). Their tactics in the legislative arena are much the same as the arguments they advanced in the Judicial system. There attacks are masked in the guise of discrimination. Veterans preference they say gives preferential treatment in local, state, and federal government employment at the expense of women and minority groups. We, in the veterans movement have always believed that veterans preference is earned recognition for wartime. Veterans preference in itself is nondiscriminatory. It cuts across the formidable barriers of sex and ethnic origins. It is an earned entitlement not a birthright as so many benefits are today. So I ask you that should veterans preference become an issue on the floor of this Body to think and remember, think of those three generations of young Americans we sent off to the armed conflicts of the last forty years and think also of their value and service and heroic sacrifices. And remember, their service and sacrifices were not in vain and this nation remains the greatest bastion of liberty in the entire world. We ask that you remember the men and women who made this possible. Those we probably know as veterans of whom more than a million and a half live in this very state. We seek your resolution that you too will



swear by the Amvets motto, 'The veterans shall never be forgotten'. Mr. Speaker, I thank you kindly for the opportunity of addressing this illustrious Body."

DiPrima: "For the purpose of an introduction, I'd like to introduce the National Auxillary President of the Amvets, Mrs. Lila Bassinger... Bassinger, from Delaware, Ohio. We also have with us today our state President of the Auxillary, Delores Spitz. We also have our own past state Commander, Don Russel, who is now National Vice Commander on membership for the Amvets. Don Russel. Thank you for your kind attention."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Might also point out to the Membership that a former Member of the House, a man who's from Florida, Illinois is with us in the Republican side of the aisle right next to Tim Simms, Mr. Les Jones. Les, good seeing you again. Gentleman is asking for some Bills to be tabled. Need be recognition for the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to table House Bills 1886 and 1887. They are in Committee. There are... That's my request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1886 and 1887. Any objections? The Gentleman's the principal Sponsor. Hearing none, House Bills 1886 and 1887 are tabled. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move to wave the appropriate rule so that House Bill 3584 can be heard in Rules tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has that been discussed with the Leadership?"

McPike: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You'd better discuss it first. Okay. On the Calendar in the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate appears House Bill 1980. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 1980 is on Second Reading."



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8. Amends House Bill 1980 in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Reference Bureau when drafting a prior Amendment had a technical error in it. They brought this to the attention of the House Clerk. All this Amendment does is complete the wording to fully make the new wording of the Bill applicable. It's purely technical. It has no other effects. Does not change the Bill as it was passed last week. I'd move the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Eight. Any discussion? Question is shall Amendment #8 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. Amendment #8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill remain on Third Reading, Short Debate. Why? Mr. Anderson, you have an Amendment #9. You better come over and talk to the Clerk. According to the rule that was suspended, the Bill was brought back to Second Reading of the purpose of a corrective Amendment which is...prepared by the Legislative Reference Bureau and based upon that, your Amendment would not be in order at this time. Mr. Mautino, what purpose seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Explanation of your statement certifying me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Corrective Amendment, rule #35I. Read the rule book."

Mautino: "Amendment... as it pertains to the germaneness of Amendment #8 which, by that Amendment, reduced the licensing fees for a separate license under this Bill. Amendment #9 does the same thing in a different category."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the interpretation that the Speaker has received, he brought it back for that corrective Amendment and no other Amendments are in order





unless the Sponsor agrees to the Amendment. And according to the Clerk, they're not printed anyway. Third Reading. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel, what purpose seek recognition?"

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to wave the posting rules as far as rules go for House Bill 3539, 3540, and 3541 that are a package of three Bills. There was a misinterpretation between Representative Bradley and myself. We thought each other were going to turn in the forms and they weren't turned in."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you discuss these three Bills with the leadership on both sides?"

Piel: "Yes, Gerry Bradley knows about it and I talked to Phil Collins from this side about it also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about the... What about Mr. Katz or the Speaker?"

Piel: "You can talk to Gerry about them if you want to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can't hear you."

Piel: "I was just telling Harold. He was looking for Gerry Bradley. He was right over in his seat a second ago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you repeat the Bill numbers, please?"

Piel: "3539, 3540, and 3541."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman's request is granted. Announcements. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Committee on Financial Institutions will not have a meeting this afternoon. The two Bills that were on the Calendar have been requested to be postponed for a week by the Sponsors. I repeat, there will not be a meeting of the Financial Institution Committee this afternoon. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Probate Subcommittee of Judiciary I scheduled for a meeting at



9:30 a.m. tomorrow is canceled. It will be reposted for a week later."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the last week that the House Rules Committee will be considering exemptions for House Bills. The House Rules Committee will be meeting tomorrow at 3:00 on the House floor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further announcements? Mr. Katz, did you ask for leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to post more than 50 Bills? Hearing no objections, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call and the Gentleman has leave to post more than 50 Bills." Any further announcements? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that we are about to adjourn, however;..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're going to recess till 6:00."

Braun: "About to recess. Well, in that case, we left off right before a Bill that I was going to table because it's already been passed into law..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wonderful. There's always room for that. The Lady asks leave to table House Bill 1034. Hearing no objections, House Bill 1034 is tabled."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anybody else want to table a few Bills? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevid, what purpose seek recognition?"

Matijevid: "Only to repeat my announcement that Appropriations I Committee is meeting immediately after adjournment and also to file my objection on returning here at 6 p.m. because I think it's ridiculous."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Chair agrees with you. We may be out of here very quickly tonight, John. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take you up on that last offer. I'd like to table, with leave of the



House, 2966. I find it's already a matter of law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to table 2966.

Where is it on the Calendar? It's not on the Calendar.

We'll table it anyway. Are you the principal Sponsor?

Gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 2966. Hearing

no objections, it's tabled. Anybody else want to table a few Bills? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, what purpose seek recognition?"

Greiman: "For leave to waive the appropriate rule to have House Bill 3499 posted in Rules. I have asked the leadership and they looked at the Bill. I don't know where they stand on it but they looked at the Bill, and I'd appreciate having leave to have it posted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you discuss it with the leadership on both sides?"

Greiman: "I did."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have House Bill 3499 heard in the Rules Committee or posted for Rules for tomorrow? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have similar leave on House Bill 3262 and 3577. I did discuss the Bills with the leadership and they have no objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to have House Bills 3262 and 3577 heard in Rules tomorrow. Hearing no objections, we will use the Attendance Roll Call. Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like permission to suspend the appropriate rules to have House Bill 3580 heard in Rules tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you discussed that Bill with the leadership on both sides? Lady asks to suspend the appropriate rule to have House Bill 3580 to be heard in Rules tomorrow. Hearing no objections, use the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Polk, what purpose seek recog-



nitition?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I request to wave the appropriate rule to have House Bill 2836 heard tomorrow in Rules."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you discussed that Bill with the leadership?"

Polk: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 28...2836 will be posted for Rules for tomorrow. 2836. Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may the appropriate rule be suspended to hear 3579? It's a substantive Bill to go with the appropriation Bill that's already on its way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you discussed that Bill, ma'am, with the leadership?"

Oblinger: "Yes, it was brought to me from the Legislative Reference Bureau at their request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Hearing no objections, House Bill 3579 will be posted for Rules for tomorrow. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "The same request on House Bill 3584. It's been discussed with leadership and no problem."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to have House Bill 3584 to be posted for Rules tomorrow. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Mr. Katz, you keeping track of all these Bills?"

Katz: "I'm sure that the Clerk is and we will have those. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to announce that Judiciary II will be meeting in room 118 immediately upon adjournment today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Mr. Simms, what purpose seek recognition?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table House Bill 2045 which I'm the principal Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves to table House Bill 2045. Hearing no objection, 2045 is tabled. Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea, what purpose seek recognition?"



Rea: "I would like to have leave to have House Bill 3583 heard in Rules Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you discussed that Bill with the leadership on both sides?"

Rea: "No, I have not."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You better do it first. Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, what purpose seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to request leave to have... suspend the appropriate rules so that House Bill 3429 can be heard in Rules tomorrow. Technical Bill and if there's any objection to it I'll be glad to hold it until next week, but I'd like to request that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you discuss that with the leadership, sir?"

Vinson: "I discussed it with Mr. Getty who said he could not speak definitively for all the leadership, but that he had no personal objection to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We can do it tomorrow. Take it out. The Gentleman... we can do it tonight. I'm sorry, what? I asked him if he discussed it with the leadership and he said he just discussed it with Mike Getty. Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to suspend the appropriate rules in order to hear House Bill 3536 in Rules Committee tomorrow. It is a Bill that is simply a revisary Bill correcting references in the School Code, and I do have approval from both sides for this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Good. We'll do it tonight. Thank you. Objections have been raised. Any further announcements? Any further announcements? Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, moves that the House stands in recess until 6:00 this evening giving the Clerk ten minutes of a Perfunctary Session. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. The House stands in recess until 6:00. Give the Clerk ten minutes of Perfunctary Session."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1648. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the banks and trusts companies... or the commissioner of banks and trust companies. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 3576, Totten. A Bill for an Act to designate depressed areas and relax governmental control to allow for economic development therein. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3577, Terzich-Capparelli. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill: House Bill 3578, Hoxsey. A Bill for an Act amend the Worker's Compensation Act and the Worker's Occupational Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3579, Oblinger. A Bill for an Act relating to a senior environmental employee program. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3580, Jane Barnes. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3581, Campbell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill." House Bill 3582, Representative Casey. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the facilities for the Handicapped Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3583, Catania-Rea. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill." House Bill 3584, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendments. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #44. Resolves that the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this State the adoption or rejection at the General Election next occurring six months after the adoption of this Resolution. A proposition to Amend Section 7 of Article



V of the Constitution will read as follows. Article V, the Executive, Section 7; vacancies and other elective offices. That the Attorney General, Secretary of State, Comptroller, or Treasurer fail to qualify or if his office becomes vacant the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member of the same political party of the person he succeeds. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor.

If the Lieutenant Governor fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term. Schedule; this Amendment takes effect upon its approval by the electors of this state.

Second Reading of the Constitutional Amendment as amended on Third Reading. No further business. The House now stands in recess until 6 p.m.."

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. We'll be at ease... unofficially, Judiciary II is still meeting and until we enough bodies here, we might as well let them go. I don't mean let them go. I mean let them continue. Have you anything we can do on kind of a... While we're waiting, is there any Members that baked brownies? Answer is no. I might as well keep going. On page seven, House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 1044. Is Representative Ewell on the floor? Out of the record. 1166, Representative McPike. Out of the record. 1192, Representative Sandquist. Out of the record. 1202, Representative Kelly. Out of the record. 1278, Representative Younge. Representative Younge, I don't know the signal. Does that mean roll it or does that mean out of the record? Out of the record. 1279, Representative Marovitz. Why don't you try it? You can't... You can't



be...Maybe it'll get the vote it deserves.

Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill on prostitution, and I know this is the kind of Bill that would bring people out of the woodwork. Out of the woodwork because I know it brings the... it brings the individuals involved with the legislation out of the woodwork. But I think we better take it out of the record."

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

Marovitz: "Well...Alright. Alright. We'll go over this. You got to start somewhere, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill. 1279."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1279. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Very simply stated, Mr. Speaker, this Bill says that upon a third conviction the crime of prostitution or soliciting thereto shall be an automatic jail sentence. Thirty days automatically. Upon third conviction." Very simple, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian wonders if this is called a three-time winner Bill."

Marovitz: "Parliamentarian should know." That's just a joke now. Just a joke."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay now. Is there any discussion? Question is shall this Bill... Somebody wanted to say something here?"

Marovitz: "Roll it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Marovitz: "I certainly will yield to Representative Bullock for a question."

Bullock: "Representative Marovitz, who... what organizations





are supporting this Bill?"

Marovitz: "Well, to be very honest with you, this is a very, very serious problem in our community. There are prostitutes on almost every street corner starting in April when the weather gets nice and our community, the Lake View, the uptown, the... communities have been plagued with very serious prostitution problems and this was a Bill that was suggested to me by people in the States Attorney's Office, by Members of the Police Department and I would hope that it would go at least a little bit toward solving the prostitution problem, the soliciting problem of innocent women on the street corners in our community."

Bullock: "This has nothing to do with the infamous Coyote Society does it?"

Marovitz: "Not a thing."

Bullock: "I see. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, if Representative Marovitz is representing one of these girls, what charge would you have the amended to if you had a working deal with the States Attorney's Office so it wouldn't be a third offense? What would you recommend?"

Marovitz: "Well, generally, if there's Plea bargaining in this case, it's disorderly conduct."

Giorgi: "So, how many times can you Plea bargain? Maybe a half a dozen or a dozen times?"

Marovitz: "Well, hopefully, if the States Attorney sees an individual has prior convictions and has plagued the community and the community comes in to testify on behalf of the prosecution, there would be no Plea bargaining. There's be additional pressure on the judge and we could get a third conviction, put these ladies behind bars where they belong, and really take the money out of the hands of the pimps so that the ladies will be off the streets."



Giorgi: "In other words, if a poor prostitute came before you..

Marovitz: "There are no poor prostitutes. There are no poor prostitutes."

Giorgi: "She didn't have sharp counsel. She'd go up for 30 days for three times unless she had a counsel... unless she had a counsel like yourself who had a working agreement with the States Attorney's Office. She could be convicted 15 times of disorderly conduct and never see the inside of a jail. Is that possible?"

Marovitz: "I have no working agreement with the States Attorney's Office."

Giorgi: "Would that be possible?"

Marovitz: "And there are no poor prostitutes."

Giorgi: "Would that be possible?"

Marovitz: "It would be conceivable but this Bill..."

Giorgi: "...Who?"

Marovitz: "Notice the pun, conceivable."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Giorgi: "In other words, if you ran into her and VD might be involved... is that right?"

Marovitz: "This would be no Plea bargaining in any case, especially when it's the third offense. Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not really an expert on this subject, but it seems that this is kind of severe treatment for someone who's going to get convicted three times in a five year period and as one of the prior speakers mentioned, you could have a change of what the charge is and if someone properly represented, they don't go to jail, and someone else who isn't properly represented can go to jail and ... I don't think that it's such a... not that it's not a serious thing, not that I approve of prostitution,



but I don't think that they should be forcing these girls to go to jail if because they're convicted three times in a five year period. I think that it's too severe. They can be fined up to a thousand dollars. A fine, I think, would be alright but I don't think they should go to jail for 30 days because of a conviction within a five year period, when because of some technical way they can get out of the charge. And I would vote no on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my present vote.

If I thought that this would magically cure a problem, I would vote for it. As a matter of fact, it won't. What will really happen is there will be more not guilty findings. That's all. Because judges are reluctant to put a nonviolent offender in jail. What we ought to do and what I would suggest to Representative Marovitz is to make this an example of how we ought to have instead of mandatory prison sentences, mandatory jail sentences; we ought to have positive community service required. Make them go out and work. Make them go out and earn an honest living. Let's not try to say, 'Let's crowd the jails again'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I hope some of my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle don't feel this is a slap at the small businessman or woman. I don't want this to be misconstrued, but I really think it will assist in solving a problem in some communities around the city and around the state, especially in the City of Chicago. I don't see how you can have a lot sympathy for a woman that's been convicted two or three times of prostitution or soliciting thereto in a community where women who are walking there kids to and from school or coming to work or coming home from work are solicited because there's prostitution



in the neighborhood. This will go a long way towards alleviating problems in certain communities. While there is a mandatory sentence attached here, it's a mandatory sentence on third conviction only for a very serious crime. Now, if you don't have prostitution in your community you may not be sensitive to this. But unfortunately, we have prostitution up in our area and this Bill was put in at an attempt at solving a problem that really is prevalent on the north side of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? I have that. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a poll of the absentees. There were 69 absentees, now there's only 65. But I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "You will get it, sir. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Gentleman has requested poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Bradley. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Chapman. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn, aye. Representative Deuster now entered the chamber. Do you desire to vote? He indicates no. He doesn't desire to vote. Representative Cissy Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Mr. Chairman, would you vote me aye?"

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Lady aye. What is the count now, Mr. Clerk? 84. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen. Farley. Flinn. Friedrich. Giorgi. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Macdonald. ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania, no. Representative Deuster, no. Proceed."



Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Pechous.  
Peters. Polk. Richmond. Robbins. Ropp. Sandquist.  
Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schuneman.  
Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Totten. Tuerk.  
Vinson. Vitek. Watson. Williamson. And Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jane Barnes, no.  
Representative Greiman, no. Representative Balanoff,  
no. Representative McCourt, no. Anyone further?  
Representative Katz, no. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?  
Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anybody would change their  
vote if we change this to a work release program."

Speaker Redmond: "8... Representative Kane, aye. 84 aye.  
How many no? 26 no. The Bill having failed to receive  
the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost.  
1327."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1327. A Bill for an Act reorganiz-  
ing and consolidating various legislative committees.  
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "I wonder if I could have a quorum called first,  
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what do you want to do? Do you want  
to call it or... I know what the... You'll have a quorum."

Totten: "I'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 1371. Representative Steczo, can  
you tell us what happened at Wrigley Field today?"

Steczko: "I sure can, Mr. Speaker. For all you Cardinal  
fans, our crew... the Cub fans sent their recruiter to  
Barry... who hit a grand slam home run in the bottom  
of the ninth inning and the Cubs won 16 to 12. One of  
their pitchers' duels."



Speaker Redmond: "1375. 1375, Katz. You want that one called, Mr. Katz? 1375. Out of the record. 1381, Steczko. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1381. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczko."

Steczko: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1381 simply says that the request of a school board or a superintendent of a school district that the Capital Development Board can come in and render an opinion as to whether or not a structural hazard which has been existing in a school building has been corrected. This is off shoot of the big snow storm we had a year and a half ago where, in my district and a couple others, there were school buildings with the roofs that were threatening collapse and after the local architects had arrived to shore up the buildings they asked the Capital Development Board to come in and to render an opinion as to whether the work was satisfactory. The Capital Development Board said that they could not do that under the statutes. This simply allows the school board to contact CDB to come in and render an opinion that the work is satisfactory and that the work will hold up. And with that, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 aye and 2 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1407, Representative Matijevich. Incidentally, are there any excused absences on the Republican side, Representative Ryan? Representative Madigan, any Democrats whose absence should be excused?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative



Emil Jones is excused because of the death of his father and that Representative Alexander is excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. 1407, Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1407. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is probably the simplest Bill we'll have all Session. It's a one word Bill that adds the word 'rehabilitation' to the current law to allow the Illinois Housing Development Authority to make grants to non-profit corporations for rehabilitation. They presently can do it for planning, construction, operating, and everything else. This just adds one word, 'rehabilitation'. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is shall this Bill pass? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "It kind of pains me to get up here and oppose this Bill because it sounds so simple and it may very well be very simple. The good question, whether or not the Illinois Housing Development Authority can do this anyway. This is a independent agency created by state law to make administrative grants for construction of, basically, apartment residential complexes. The Department or the Illinois Housing Development Authority doesn't really want this Bill. It probably won't hurt anything, but, on the other hand, we are criticized from time to time for putting in Bills and passing Bills that aren't needed. If it does anything at all it expands a program. It probably will take away from the direction that the Housing Development Authority is supposed to go in. And I really don't see any reason why we should pass this Bill. It barely got out of Committee by the minimum vote



allowed under our rules, and I think that ought to be a good sign that this Bill isn't needed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Marovitz, I haven't really had a chance to look at this Bill, but does your Bill provide for these rehabilitative funds only to those projects that are under the Housing Authority already or for other groups?"

Marovitz: "This deals with Bills which are only already under the Illinois Housing Development Authority."

Satterthwaite: "Then..."

Marovitz: "No new funds. No new plans."

Satterthwaite: "Then, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that this is a much needed improvement on the legislation. As these projects become older, we find that they do need rehabilitative funds in order to keep them in good condition and certainly ought to support passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Marovitz to close. Wait a minute. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rise and support this Bill. I have not been able to get IDA build any new homes in my community. Very possible with this piece of legislation I might be able to get some of the old ones rehabilitated. I solicit your support for House Bill 1407."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a problem in many of our communities. It's a problem in Representative Tylor's community. It's a problem in my community. We need funds for rehabilitation. I have never been approached by anybody from the Illinois Housing Development Authority and told that they were





against this Bill. It is a one word Bill. It is the most innocent, innocuous Bill that we have probably had. But it's a Bill that will help communities in rehabilitation where it can be done and people can live in buildings in low and modern for fixed income people. This is a Bill that's needed in many communities around the City of Chicago and the state, and just because it may not be needed in some, please don't vote against this Bill. It's one word and it will help a lot of people in the Chicago land area, and I'd ask for your support for this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing that the Sponsor should put in his other Bill with the prostitutes. They're rehabilitating housing. It's a very good idea. It's a fine Bill, good idea. Instead of trying to put these girls in jail and he was trying in the other Bill, he should try to rehabilitate them. But I would urge that this Bill be supported."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 aye and 32 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1410, Representative Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1410. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, would you take this out of the record please?" Pass this Bill. Out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz, 1410. Out of the record. 1480, Representative Madigan. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sponsor of House Bill 1480, I would move to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections,



1480 is table. 1483. Representative Katz. 1483.  
 Out of the record. 1566, Representative Terzich.  
 Out of the record. 1567, Terzich. Out of the record.  
 1570, Terzich. Out of the record. 1590, Representative  
 Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1590. A Bill for an Act to amend  
 Sections of the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act.  
 Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, take that back to Second Reading for  
 the purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Lady asks leave to return it to the Order  
 of Second Reading. Is there objections? Hearing no  
 objection, leave is granted. It's on the Order of  
 Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor, Mr.  
 Clerk?"

Younge: "Just leave it there. Just leave it on Second."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that the Bill... that the  
 Amendments have not yet been printed so we'll leave it  
 on the Order of Second. Is that the best procedure  
 Mr. Clerk? Leave it on Second? Okay. 1592, Represent-  
 ative Younge. Out of the record. 1624, Representative  
 John Dunn. Out of the record. 1629, Winchester.  
 Harris. Winchester, Harris, Rea. Anybody want to  
 handle that? Out of the record. 1673, Representative  
 Bowman. Out of the record. 1704, Leverenz. Out of the  
 record. 1710, Representative Reilly. Out of the record.  
 1729, Representative Kornowicz. Out of the record.  
 1736, Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1736. A Bill for an Act to amend  
 Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading  
 of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, This Bill amends the  
 Condominium Property Act and it requires developers  
 of conversion condominiums to publish a schedule of the



selling price and deliver it to the tenant at the time of the notice of intent. There have been problems, and I am a member of the Condominium Laws Study Commission, shared by Art Telcser and John Murlow, and there have been problems with people after a notice. Individuals who are really... had thought that they'd be living there for a long period of time not getting the schedule of the selling price so that they know what kind of a mortgage they have to get and whether they can get a commitment or not. It's a traumatic move for people, and while this will not interfere with conversions at all, it just says that people ought to get a schedule of the selling price so that they can know what kind of a mortgage commitment they have to get. I've worked this Bill out with individuals in the real estate industry, people who do conversions, and I've worked on this with Representative Telcser and Representative Abramson and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 aye and 1 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1741. Representative Bower, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1741, Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "That's your Bill, Representative Hoffman. Amends the School Code. It's had two Committee Amendments. Out of the record. How about 1742? Out of the record. 1762, Representative Molloy. Molloy? Out of the record. 1765, Yourell. Out of the record. 1800. Representative Dan O'Brien. Out of the record. 1810, Skinner. Out of the record. 1823, Donovan. Out of the record. 1830, Stearney. Representative Stearney. Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk? Representative Borchers. Out of the record. 1857, Steczo. Representative Steczo.



Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, since everyone's taking things out of the record, there was a Bill of mine that was called just before I walked into the room, 1673, if you wanted to go back to that I'd be happy to call it. It's noncontroversial."

Speaker Redmond: "1673?"

Bowman: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. How about 1857. Steczo here? Out of the record. 1673. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative McCourt, you seeking recognition?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1673."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to share with the House some good news I just received on the phone. After 33 years of marriage, I've just been advised that my number two son had a baby... his wife had a baby girl by the name of Kay and so I'm a new grandfather. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "What time was the child born? Representative McCourt, what time was the child born?"

McCourt: "Four o'clock this afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "I had a reason for that which you'll find out a little bit later. Representative Bowman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1673. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to security deposits for the payment of rent or as compensation for damage to property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The original Bill, 1673, was identical to a Bill which had passed the Senate. So, through an Amendment, everything after the enacting clause is stricken and this is now a new Bill. You may recall some of the debate on the Amendment which was pretty brief and to the point that really all this does is to codify the existing common law or existing case law regarding the transfer of security deposits with the property. When a property is sold, this Bill simply



provides that the transfers of the security deposits get transferred to the new owner and so the new owner then would not have to approach the tenant and ask for an additional security deposit when, in fact, they've already paid one to the former owner. So I ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He'll yield."

Griesheimer: "Woody does this change the basic law in Illinois with regard to how many units have to be involved before interest is paid on security deposits?"

Bowman: "No."

Griesheimer: "All this does is in the situation with regard to the sale of income property the security deposits must be transferred."

Bowman: "Would you please repeat? It's a little noisy in here."

Griesheimer: "I say, all this Bill does is require on transfer of income property the security deposit must also be transferred to the new owner."

Bowman: "Yes."

Griesheimer: "Thank you."

Bowman: "See, I said it was noncontroversial."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further? Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Let's roll it. I ask an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 aye, 120 aye and 2 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1878, Representative Richmond. Out of the record. 1892, Mulcahey. Out of the record. 1952, Steele. E.G. Steele. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1952. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative E.G. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1952 authorizes the Department of Transportation to lease out, under certain conditions, lands on state highway right of ways. This is really clarifying legislation and it clears up what existing statutes actually imply. And, so it's really clarifying legislation. It's been supported by the Department of Transportation, passed by the Committee 17-3, and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Getty: "What standards are in the Bill to determine what property is to be given?"

Steele: "Well, where there are state right of ways and at the present... at the present time, they're leasing these right of ways and have been doing over many years and the state acquires 500,000 dollars or more each year for this. But the Federal Highway Administration has requested that what is implied authority be reduced to statutory authority. And it's more or less a technical clean-up type of thing and that's why the legislation is before us."

Getty: "Will this result in the state giving land away for nothing?"

Steele: "Oh no. No. No, there's monetary amounts being received now by the state."

Getty: "How would... How would we know or how would... I'm not quite sure I understand. Would this give the Department the right to, on its own, make a decision as to what property would be turned over rather than having the General Assembly approve it?"

Steele: "It's merely clarifying legislation so that we can follow the federal guidelines. The federal guidelines as to what's involved here, and it's been done in the past. It's being done now under the implied authority."

Getty: "Alright. All I'm looking for is you have no language



that would indicate, for example, fair market value.

Some standard in here that would indicate that whatever it sold for or leased for would be of fair market value."

Steele: "Right. Well, those standards already exist under the federal guideline and this complies, you know, to get approval from the federal government you have to comply with their guidelines. Those kinds of standards are already built in."

Getty: "Wouldn't it be preferable if we were to specifically say in this legislation, make reference to that and say that it would be at fair market value?"

Steele: "Well, I think that these kinds of standards are in practice right now and they've been working very satisfactorily to the benefit of the taxpayers of half a million or more each year, and I think that what your speaking to, Representative Getty, is already being addressed and accomplished at the present time. Now, if in the Senate, if this should be passed in the House, if the Senate would feel that should be clarified there's certainly no problem with that except I don't think it's necessary because the actual practice over the past several years has been to do exactly what you're talking about."

Getty: "Well, I certainly, Representative, would take your word for it, but that's your understanding of what the Department is doing and I believe that's probably in fact the fact. But I'd feel a lot better if we had an Amendment in this Bill that specifically said that it would be at fair market value."

Steele: "Well, as I say, I think that... in practice has and is being done. We are under time constraints here. If that's a problem, I think it should be addressed in the other House."

Getty: "Would you want to take it out of the record and put on an Amendment now and then deal with this tomorrow? We still have the rest of this week and so forth?"



Steele: "Would we still be able to get to that this evening?"

Getty: "No, not this evening but you could tomorrow if we amended it. Could do the Amendment... get the Amendment on if you have time."

Steele: "You know, what we're really doing here, Representative, is to... we're not only doing what is already in practice under implied authority but we're doing also what the guidelines of Federal Highway Commission already clearly spells out. And so there's really... what the problem and the concern you're addressing is already being met. Let's take it out of the record and we'll talk to you and see what the problem is."

Getty: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2005, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sponsor, I would move to table House Bill 2005."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objection, leave is granted and 2005 is tabled. 2022."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2022. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2022 has been put in this House a couple of terms and last year I put it in and I did not call because a person felt that it was for one individual. That individual is no longer with the Chicago Board of Election Commission but I do think that we need to pass this legislation for fear that some day others might be there. The Bill simply moved the provision from Election Code to give a person... cities over 200 million the opportunity to have outside employment. Mr. Speaker, I solicit your support for House Bill 2022."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Hallock?"

Hallock: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"





Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hallock: "I see that the provisions of this Bill say that the commissioner shall still be a full-time job. My question would be how can he be a full-time commissioner and have part-time employment on the side?..."

Taylor: "That's not hard to do in the City of Chicago when the elections are only held once or twice a year or every two years. There's not that much work to be have to actually do as an administrator. He could be able to hold outside employment."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just like to point out for the record that the commissioner is now paid 25,000 dollars per year for what is to be a full-time job, and I would submit that for your information."

Speaker Redmond: " Any further discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't see why so many persons out of Cook County would be voting against this Bill when it only affects Cook County. The job in Cook County is for Cook County and I think we ought to support this piece of legislation. Right now, Mr. Speaker, I would.... it's too late to take it out of the record., but I would ask for Postponed Consideration on the Bill if I don't get the votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill that Representative Taylor has before us this evening applies only to the City of Chicago. But moreover, this Bill applies to individuals who supervise elections within the city. I think it's rather ironic that many of us who serve in the Legislature also hold two jobs and I think we do



a pretty good job at both of them. For those of you who are attorneys, you have outside employment and you certainly serve your constituents well in the General Assembly. And I think that we recognize from looking at the Chicago Board of Education that sometimes the citizens get exactly what they pay for. And if we don't entice the best and the brightest to seek government positions and seek positions of leadership in government, we're probably going to continue to have the kind of thing that so many of you abhor when it comes to the election procedures in Chicago and Cook County and throughout Illinois. I think that this Bill goes an awful long way to insuring the kind of honesty and decency that you would expect in the County of Cook and the City of Chicago, and I think that certainly the Board of Election Commissioners have done a commendable job in running the election procedures in the City of Chicago. And we have outstanding individuals who do retain outside employment not at the sacrifice of their primary place of employment, the Chicago Board of Election Commissions. I would certainly urge that at least a few other individuals give it an aye vote. If there are some particular problems that you have with this legislation, I'm sure that the Sponsor would be more than willing to work it out with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... Representative Slape, aye. Slape aye. Preston, for what purpose do you rise?"

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of explaining my aye vote. This... to do other than to vote for this Bill is to avoid reality where there are people who are very able and willing to work as a commissioner on the Board of Elections but are unable to because of the pay that they would receive in that occupation. That, notwithstanding, they should be permitted to have part-time employment. To restate what Representative Bullock



has mentioned, many of those here in this room have part-time employment. Whether it be teaching a course at a college while you're also employed at the General Assembly. While maintaining a law practice while also being employed by the General Assembly and otherwise. This is an important Bill that will make it possible for qualified individuals to serve in the City of Chicago and, I think I could do no other than to urge an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 78 aye and 58 no. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, will you poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Burnidge. Casey. Christensen. Ebbesen. Ewell. Gaines. Garmisa. Grossi. Hanahan. Hannig. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Klosak. Laurino. Lechowicz. McAuliffe. O'Brien. Pechous. Peters. Ropp. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Sharp. Stearney. Stuffle. Telcser. VonBoeckman. Watson. Williams. And Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Everyone voted who wished? What's the count? On this question there's 78 aye and 58 no. Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Postponed Consideration please."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. Turn the Chair over to Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Dyer and Representative Catania and I are very honored to have with us two special guests who I'd like to introduce to you at this time. First of all we have with us from the great State of New Hampshire, Senator Susan McClain, who is one of 24 Senators from New Hampshire. Senator McClain."



McClain(Susan): "Thank you. It's nice... We have 400 in our House and so this looks like a very small group to me."

Sandquist: "Thank you very much, Senator McClain. We also have with us the First Lady of the State of Michigan. We're very honored to have Mrs. Helen Millican, First Lady of Michigan."

Millican: "Thank you very much and I bring you greetings from the neighboring State of Michigan which I'm sure many of you know well. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: 2028, Representative Braun. Out of the record. 2045, Representative Simms. That Bill is tabled. 2054, out of the record. 2055, out of the record. 2056, out of the record. 2061, Representative Marovitz. Out of the record. 2069, Representative Hoxsey. Representative Hoxsey, 2069. Out of the record. 2014, Schneider. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2104. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to have leave to move the Bill back for an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman have leave to return 2104 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk?"

Schneider: "The Amendment's not been out yet, Mr. Speaker. Will you just hold it there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Hold 21... Hold 210... We'll hold 2104 on the Order of Second Reading. 2105, Yourell. You want to call it? 2105, out of the record. 2218, Farley. Out of the record. 2219, Farley. Out of the record. 2221, Taylor. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Taylor, do you... 2221. Out of the record. 2222, Skinner. Out of the record. 2224, Taylor. Out of the record. 2225, Taylor. Out of the



record. 2272, Kane. Schneider, 2272, Kane. 2272."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2272. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to bring House Bill 2272 back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk? Just want to leave it there. Leave it on Second. 2314, Williams. 2318, Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2318. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2318 provides explicit reference to the Savings and Loan Act. In 1979, the Illinois General Assembly passed the EFT, Electronic Fund Transfer Transmission Facility Act and provided Amendments to the Illinois Banking Act. This Bill clarifies the language to allow savings and loans to maintain and operate terminal as authorized by the EFT Transfer Transmission Facility Act by the Section 5 of the Illinois Banking Act. This is our understanding with the intent of the Legislature. We had some discrepancy here and this is clarification language."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 115 aye and 2 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2453, Mr. Patrick. Out of the record. 2475, Representative Gaines. Out of the record. 2495, Leverenz. Leverenz. Out of the... Out of the record. 2496, Leverenz. Out of the record. Is that right? 2497,



Leverenz. Out of the record. 2502, Patrick. Out of the record. 2412, Laurino. Out of the record. 2524, Hanahan. Out of the record. 2530, Pierce. Out of the record. 2531, Leverenz. Out of the record. 2536, Schlickman. Out of the record. 2572, Anderson. Anderson. 2572, out of the record. 2607, Currie. Representative Currie. Out of the record. 2621. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2621. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

This would amend the Election Code and would require that election authorities file new precinct maps as they change the precinct boundaries with the State Board of Elections."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

On this question there's 124 aye and 1 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2557, Laurino. Out of the record.

2703, Representative O'Brien. Do you want to make an announcement about that great event on... you don't.

That's the strangest thing, a modest fisherman. Out of the record. 2704. Out of the record. 2710, Garmisa. Out of the record. 2847, Kosinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2847. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2847 is a Bill which will exempt the first... up to the first thousand dollars of interest from taxation on deposits in credit unions, savings and loan associations, and banks. This is an attempt to fight the inflationary



spiral. It's really an attempt to show the people back home in all our districts that we're cognizant of this spiral of inflation and double taxation, and even in a small way, we wish to help them. It could mean the injection of more funds into Illinois institutions which would be good in home loan mortgages and other needs. I think it behooves us as a General Assembly to be concerned with people at all levels, senior citizens, citizens on fixed incomes, the young people who have mortgages and small savings in these institutions. This Bill is much needed at this time. It passed the Revenue Committee with 20 yes votes, one voting present and one voting no. I ask you for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brummer: "Would this include... Would this exemption include daily money market funds?"

Kosinski: "It includes deposits in savings and loan banks and home loan institutions."

Brummer: "Well, the daily money market funds are generally a joining of funds for the purchase of certificates of deposits which earn interest from various banks. It is like a mutual with regards to the purchase of certificates of deposits. Do you know if those would be included within the exemption or not?"

Kosinski: "If they are deposits within a savings and loan, they will be."

Brummer: "Well, they are deposited with the fund and the fund reinvests those in interest bearing items. The interest rate changes from day to day, but the nature of the earnings are interest but they are not specifically directly interest from the savings and loan or bank. The interest is paid to the fund and the purchasers in the fund are then reimbursed their earnings."

Kosinski: "In whatever small way this assists the people who have



investments in one sort or another in these institutions, I think it's in good keeping. Incidentally, one of the questions asked me was financial impact on the state and I have two conflicting opinions in regard to that."

Brummer: "I'm sorry. I'm still waiting for an answer to my question about whether it exempts the daily money market funds."

Kosinski: "The bank sends us statements on our money market certificates and their subject to taxation presently."

Brummer: "No, I'm not talking about... I don't think you made the acquaintance with the fund that I'm talking about. I'm not talking about a money market certificate that's purchased at the savings and loan or the bank. I'm talking about a fund such as the 'Dreyfus' fund or about 30 or 40 of them which are commonly referred to as the daily money market funds. What occurs is that investors contribute an interest into the daily money market fund. They combine those investments and purchase certificates of deposits generally in amounts of 100,000 dollars or more and, therefore; are not subject to the restrictions of the... of the limits on earnings on interest. The result is that the individual may be investing 5,000 dollars or 10,000 dollars or something like this but he is joining his funds with numerous other investors who purchase various certificates of deposits from different financial institutions. The actual payment comes from the funds, such as the 'Dreyfus' fund, as opposed to... from the... directly from the bank or savings and loan. And my question is, are those earnings which are really totally in the nature of interest exempt under this Bill."

Kosinski: "Well, I just conferred with the Chairman of the Revenue Committee and he feels short term investments in savings and loans are covered but not necessarily money markets."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"





Kosinski: "Now then to continue the impact, financial impact statement. We had two conflicting impact statements. One from the Department of Revenue in which they indicate that the potential impact on the State of Illinois could be up to 65 million dollars. And a conflicting one from the Illinois Economical... Economic and Fiscal Commission in which they put that level at 31 million dollars. But no matter what the impact... impact... small impact, I think it behooves this General Assembly to show the direction in which we're thinking to protect our people in our districts from what we might term double taxation to give them a little leeway in terms of their need...even 25 or whatever it is dollars a year. And also this will parallel what's being attempted in the federal government where similar Bills are being enacted in the Senate to also give some consideration to this type of taxation. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question or is that time passed? What's the maximum tax break that any individual would get assuming that that individual receives a maximum amount of interest?"

Kosinski: "If he receives a maximum amount of interest... interest at a 2.5 rate, he would receive 25 dollars as an individual."

Kane: "In order to get that maximum tax break, approximately how much in savings would that individual have to have?"

Kosinski: "Depending on the rate, it could... depending on the rate of course and now they're lifting the ceiling on that Doug."

Kane: "Okay. The normal... say, the normal rate."

Kosinski: "Well, I don't know what the normal rate will be very shortly because I understand the savings and loan rates will be increased. Presently, they're five and a half percent and we can compute that easily, but I understand that level will be increased shortly..."



Kane: "Well, say at five and a half percent."

Kosinski: "Well, if it's 10,000 dollars at five and a half percent that's 550 dollars obviously."

Kane: "So, the maximum amount of money that a..."

Kosinski: "At 5.5. If it's 20,000 dollars at 5.5, it would be the full limit of this Bill."

Kane: "Okay, so it would not affect anybody greater than 20,000 dollars worth of savings."

Kosinski: "This is directed at the average guy in our district. It's not directed at vested interest, not directed at the wealthy, not directed to the people who have absolutely no savings. It's the middle squeeze man. The man who can't make it today in our society because of the tax picture who have, what we consider, an average income."

Kane: "Somebody who has savings then between zero and 20,000."

Kosinski: "Right, sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Sandquist. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 aye, 13 no and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2883. Former House Member and also the lifeguard at the Kiddy Pool at the Mansion View, Senator Keats<sup>4</sup>. 2883. Representative Schuneman. Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2883. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of airports and landing fields for counties of less than one million population. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gnetlemen of the House, House Bill 2883 changes the Airport Authority Act and makes possible the expansion of airport boards from three members to five members. There



are only two Boards in the whole State of Illinois, two county airport Boards, that are organized under this particular Section of the law and they are the Whiteside County airport at Rock Falls, Illinois and the airport at Lincoln, Illinois. As far as I know, there's no opposition to this Bill and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Just a fairly simple question. I know in the Digest it says the operation by counties, but is that an overall or a vague statement. Would it also apply to an airport operated by a park district?"

Schuneman: "No, it does not. Only those that are operated by counties."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 aye and ..22 aye and no nay and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2955, Giorgi. Out of the record. 3034, Stearney. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3034."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "I ask leave to take this back to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Any Amendments from the floor? Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leinenweber: "I just had a question of the Sponsor when he gets to his Amendment. I want to ask him about the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what is known as an anticipatory brief."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Stearney. Amends House Bill 3034 on page one, line thirteen by deleting 9,239 and



inserting in lieu thereof 10,796."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Mr. Stearney, will you explain the Amendment."

Stearney: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this amount of a thousand dollars or twelve hundred dollars was deleted in Committee. However, it's been found that it was necessary and so an Amendment has been filed and it's been cleared with both the Chairman of the Appropriation Committee, Mr. Matijevich, and the Spokesman, Mr. Jake Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, was this additional money in order to facilitate the move of the commission from Springfield to Angelo's towhead?"

Stearney: "No, not that I know."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. Motion carried and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3040. Representative Ewing. 3040. Out of the record. House Bill 1952. Does the Gentleman have leave to return that to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Have you got an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Steele. Amends House Bill 1952 on page one by deleting line 25 and inserting in lieu thereof the Department of Fair Market Value."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Sorry Mr. Speaker. We had just discussed another



possible way to improve this Bill. In the Amendment, we've gotten passed the first quota which is fair market value and now I would like to ask the Sponsor how the administration who is behind this Bill intends to make certain that we maximize the value over the long term. Is there limit to the length of the lease or could it be 190 years like the Metropolitan Sanitary District sometimes leases property? There's second part of that question. Is there any provision for renegotiation of the lease assuming market value is greater after, well, some period of years than it was originally determined to be?"

Steele : "In answer to your question, the leases are by competitive bid and of course the Amendment before us would make it by appraised value also. There would have to be that taken into consideration. The competitive bid, I think, is standard along with the federal guidelines I think would satisfy concerns that you raised."

Skinner: "Boy, I sure hope so."

Steele : "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment that has been distributed answers the one objection raised by Representative Getty which I understand was made with his approval at this time and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Just for the record I want to say that, yes, this does meet the specific objection which I raised before and I support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading on page... Representative Steele."

Steele: "Mr. Speaker, it's been read three times. May this



be considered now on Third Reading? Be voted on."

Speaker Redmond: "We just adopted an Amendment. Are there any further Amendments? Oh. Any further Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Now, what was your inquiry?"

Steele: "Since this Bill has been read three times, I was wondering if it's now on Third and if we might consider it at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "It's against our rules. We have to suspend our rules. We'll get it tomorrow. On page 11, House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3034. We just adopted an Amendment and moved that up to Third Reading. Representative Stearney has a motion with respect to 3034. Is that the Bill that you wanted to talk about? 3034. Does he have leave to return 3034 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would move to table Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee because it is now in conflict with Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I... really, I was going to talk about Representative Steele's Bill. There have been many questions such as air rights and what the length of the leases would be and just all the specifics, and I would just... between now and tomorrow he could ask some of the people advising him over there just what those are and he might be a little more explicit in his explanation tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "3034, Third Reading. On page seven, House Bill 980. Representative Skinner requests leave to



return that to the Order of Second Reading. Is there objections? Hearing no objections, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Is there any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Skinner. Amends House Bill 980 as amended in Section 1 by deleting Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in my continuing attempt to wipe out the Department of Local Government Affairs and replace it with the Department of Revenue in the statutes, I offer Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question?"

Skinner: "Always to my senior Representative."

Hoffman: "On the fourth page of the Amendment you suggest that in intra-county equalization that the application of 33 and a third should be against the most... the most recent sales ratio study for the year preceeding the assessment year which is different than the procedure for the determining equalization generally using the previous three years."

Skinner: "Right."

Hoffman: "What is the reason for that?"

Skinner: "The reason is I wish to spread the tax burden for the next tax year based on the most recent data available rather than perpetuating past inequities. As it is now there are..."

Hoffman: "Wouldn't that increase the level of assessments?"

Skinner: "No. It would not because then the state would come in and equalize based on a three year average."

Hoffman: "Okay."

Skinner: "I mean the state would come out looking like the good guy because the state might come in with a negative multiplier every once in a while rather than the bad guy."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, does this Amendment do anything other than change the name from the Department of Revenue to the Department of Local Government Affairs?"

Skinner: "No."

Brummer: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Questions on the Gentleman's motion... Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, I'd like to... Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Cal, on that same fourth page, will you tell me how many times the State Board of Review has gone in on intra-county equalization as they were requested by that county to come in and do that intra-county equalization?"

Skinner: "Well, I know of one instance, that's Lake County, and I know of another instance where they refused to which is McHenry County."

Mautino: "Now, is it not true that they have the... rather than doing this method, they can, by virtue of Resolution, bring the Board of Review back to make those intra-county assessments and evaluations under current law?"

Skinner: "Well, they would not bring the Board of Review back. The Board of Review would do it before it went out of Session. What I'm trying to do is to countermand a Department of Revenue, or actually, Department of Local Government Affairs memo which seems to direct local county Boards of Review to use a three year running average. And I really think that that does not spread the burden as fairly as is possible."

Mautino: "I think you may be walking into a situation on a one year basis that's completely different from what there is now. Right now you might have one year of stabilization and two years of inflation making up the average. And if you do it just on the prior years, if





you happen to have an inflationary period, the base will be built on the last sales ratio which is higher than the average, and I think you could be raising your assessed valuation."

Skinner: "You're asking the same question, basically, that Representative Hoffman asked. And it's a very perceptive question and it is correct up to the point of the county Board making the equalization. But when the state comes in, the law does not change. The law for the county average as a whole has to be one-third of a three year average. So, the net effect for the county is zero. It doesn't make any difference. But who pays what within the county will make a difference. And those people that are under-assessed in a year before the equalization occurs. For example, this year with the reassessment having just taken place, there could be township that is grossly under-assessed that was grossly over-assessed three years ago. That township should not be given the artificial advantage that the three year average gives it."

Mautino: "By the same token if I may ask one more quick question. If you get into a rural area that sparsely populated, let's say only eight or ten parcels in that township, and there was a sale of one of those parcels, that automatically could conceivably raise the intra-county assessment 20 or 30... 20 or 30 percent upward. Could it not?"

Skinner: "No, it could not because there, in law we passed last year, last Sess... last year, there has to be at least 25 sales in the area to be equalized. So what would happen would be there would be another category as the Department speaks of. It would be all of the small townships would be grouped together. So there has to be at least 25 sales for there to be a change."

Mautino: "Cal, you may have a good idea but I'm afraid I don't believe that the County Supervisor of Assessments



will take this into consideration when they put that assessment value on it. I think they're going to just jam it up good."

Skinner: "When we get to the Bill, we can... we are giving more authority to the Supervisor of Assessments but the Board of Review still remains as a check and balance as I think it should be."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question's on the... Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor. Representative Skinner, I think I understand what you're trying to do is to... it to take back to one year the median assessment level for equalization of intra-county. Why haven't you approached the state of the same basis which is now using the three year average which tends to distort an inflationary period... which tends to distort the situation on assessments so that those who know how to play the game back home will go to the property State Board of Property Tax Appeals and actually find themselves in a situation where each year, when protesting in front of that State Board of Property Tax of Appeals, they continually reduce the assessments so I understand in some cases in Will County as low as 22%."

Skinner: "Wow. The reason that I don't do away with the three year average and do not dare suggest doing away with the three year average at a 33 and a third percent level is that we would increase assessments greatly as Representative Hoffman and Representative Mautino fear, incorrectly fear. I do support Representative Pierce's Bill which would lower the assessment level to 25% of a one year average. That is now in the Senate." And I thought that it would be... This Bill may be biting off more than is possible for us to chew..."

Davis: "I suppose that's my question. Why attack a township multiplier which is really what you're talking about



on the same basis without making that same restriction upon the State Board Property Tax appeal?"

Skinner: "It goes back to the legislative history of House Bill 990 and I made a mistake then when I agreed... when I acceded to the request of the Illinois Agricultural Association property tax man. I should not have made that... I should not have made that agreement but I did, and I don't see an easy way out of it except for Representative Pierce's Bill."

Davis: "Well, I agree with you and I'm going to support the Amendment because township multipliers would that they were mandated rather than permissive, at this point, to county board resolves. But I'll support your Amendment but I don't think it goes far enough."

Skinner: "It probably doesn't."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 4. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Page five, House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate appears House Bill 1563. Representative Polk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1563. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Interest Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill came out of the Committee 18 to zip. It certifies the law and allows the state charter banking instruction of privileges. Now, according to the federal regulation, it was necessary to bring our state into compliance with the federal law. That's all it does, and I'd appreciate an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question



is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 aye and no nay. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1828. Representative Schneider, aye. 1828, Representative Stearney. 1828, Stearney. Out of the record. 1833. Representative Dyer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1833. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1833 is a Bill similar to the one that has been in effect in Tennessee for several years. It is a child safety Bill. It requires that every child under age four riding in a car should be in a safety seat. This Bill was first conceived of by a pediatrician in the State of Tennessee who was alarmed at the number of accidents to children under age four who were just sitting loosely in a car not with a restraining seat. Since this Bill has passed in Tennessee, it has cut the fatalities of children by 90%. The Bill simply says that a violation of a child not riding in the little seat is a Class A misdemeanor and the parents or guardians are subject to a fine of 25 dollars. It received unanimous approval by the Motor Vehicles Committee. I request your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Leinenweber, short debate."

Leinenweber: "I don't know if we're in opposition but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Short debate."

Leinenweber: "There's certain question in this Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Short debate."

Leinenweber: "I would ask somebody to join me so that with... What is it, 5



Speaker Redmond: "Okay. She's been joined by at least five.

Put it on the order of long debate."

Leinenweber: "You say this is a Class A misdemeanor but there's a limit to the fine of 25 dollars?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes. I understand that in the Motor Vehicle Code where the penalty is spelled out, it can be a minimum fine of 25 dollars. A maximum fine of 50 dollars for a Class A misdemeanor."

Leinenweber: "Are you sure it's Class A rather than a petty offense?"

Dyer: "No, I... well, I stand corrected. My analysis says it's Class C misdemeanor, petty offense. I was told by the Department of Law Enforcement, which does support the Bill, that it was a Class A misdemeanor."

Leinenweber: "In other words, though, that a parent, such as myself, who has a child in that age bracket who did not have this particular restraint on at the time that the car is stopped would be limited to a 50 dollar fine. Is that correct?"

Dyer: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "Now, in the event of an accident, and the child is injured I notice, according to the staff analysis, that this shall not be considered a contributory negligence or admissible as evidence in the trial of any civil action. Is that correct?"

Dyer: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "I don't have... I've been looking for a copy of the Bill. How is that worded in the Bill? Do you have a..."

Dyer: "It's worded precisely that way. That language is listed specifically."

Leinenweber: "What about the parent's right to recover for the bills and that sort of thing where might it affect that parent's right who is guilty of failing to restrain the child? Or is it for any purpose whatsoever?"



Dyer: "Pardon me, Mr. Leinenweber. I'm getting a copy of the Bill here. No, I do not think that situation is particularly covered. The specific language is, 'In no event shall failure to wear a child passenger restraint system be considered as to contributory negligence, nor shall such failure to wear a child passenger restraint system be admissible as evidence in a trial of any civil action.'"

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Representative Dyer, did you say now that this is definitely a Class C misdemeanor."

Dyer: "Yes, I stand corrected. I had said Class A misdemeanor and it is Class C. I apologize."

Getty: "My recollection of the penalty for a Class C misdemeanor is that it includes incarceration for up to 30 days in a jail. Now, I'm just wondering if you really intend to create a criminal offense for which a person might be incarcerated for up to 30 days in a jail which a Class C misdemeanor would do, but not make that something that would be subject to introduction in a civil action. It seems to me a contradiction where on the one hand we require proof beyond a reasonable doubt and possible penalty of incarceration and yet that same action would not be subject to being introduced in a civil offense. I might suggest to you, respectfully, that if it is indeed a Class C misdemeanor you might want to change it to specifically state and amend the Bill to say that it would be a petty offense."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, could we take this out of the record... some of these questions are answered. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Take it out of the record. 1980. Representative Griesheimer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1980. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Representative Neff, please do not disturb Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1980 is entirely amended. It is different than it was last year when we were dealing with Representative Getty's problem of entering property without a warrant. The Bill now does only really one major thing. It recognizes the problem that we created last year when we did away with the differentiation between retail and wholesale license<sup>is</sup> for the sale of fish indigenous to the State of Illinois. We divide the license into two separate divisions again and lower the fee for retail licenses. This has been done by the demand of the retail sellers of licensed fish in the State of Illinois. This is a departmental Bill. They favor it. The balance of the Bill is all technical corrections in the Bill to take care of problems which really have no immediate effect upon the retail or wholesale sale of fish. It should be benefited... should benefit all of the... does not cover carp. I just had Representative Anderson ask me if carp were included. Carp are not included. We did not get into that. That Amendment is not in this Bill. No catfish either. So this is just a truly a merely Bill to protect the retail sellers of fish indigenous to Illinois and will reduce their license. And I would urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Anyone in opposition?"

Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 aye and no nay. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, 2722. Taylor Pouncey. 2722 out of the record. 3003, Lechowicz. Out of the record. Announcements. Announcements. Representative Donovan."



Donovan: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave that the House suspend the posting rule for House Bill 1255 to be heard in Rules Committee tomorrow. It's been..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you cleared it with both sides?"

Donovan: "Yes, I have. With both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion.

Those in favor indicate by voting aye, oppose vote no. Does he have unanimous consent? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Rule is suspended. Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave of the House to post House Bill 3583 tomorrow in Rules Committee and it has been cleared with both sides of the leadership."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I filed a motion to discharge the Committee on Human Resources on 2905 which is a companion Bill to 2906 which is on Third Reading. It's a transfer for the Department of Aging for the in home care and I've checked with both sides' Chairman and they're in agreement."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion? Discharge a Committee."

Anderson: "Yes, sir and advance it to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the motion. Any discussion?"

The question's on the motion. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 aye and 1 no and the motion carries. Committee is discharged considering House Bill 2905. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the posting requirement in order to hear House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 41 in the Revenue Committee tomorrow. I've already talked to Representative Ryan regarding this motion and the Constitutional Amendment deals with the redemption period on tax sales."





Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Posting rule is suspended. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would request unanimous consent and leave to suspend the posting rules for House Bill 3429 so that it can be heard in Rules tomorrow. I've spoken with Representative Madigan and Representative Ryan on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, unanimous consent is granted. Any further motions? Any announcements? Representative Chapman, you... Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Thank you, sir. I ask leave to suspend the appropriate rule for posting of House Bill 3536 and I've checked this with Mr. Ryan and Mr. Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have unanimous consent? Hearing no objection... suspend the rules. Representative Chapman, will you repeat your motion?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to suspend the rule in order to post House Bill 3536 for a hearing before the Rules Committee tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've checked with both leaders and I would also like to waive the posting rule so I can have House Bill 3185 heard in Rules tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent? Hearing no objections, consent is granted. The rule is suspended. Request of change of votes, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Karpel requests to vote no on House Bill 750."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Dave Jones requests to vote aye on House Bill, 1279 and 1407."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections,



leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Boeck requests vote aye on House Bill 2847."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Daniels requests to vote no on House Bill 1673 and yes on House Bill 2847."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Anything else, Mr. Clerk? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 713." Agreed Resolutions

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 713, McCourt. 714, Kelly. 715, Meyer. 716, DiPrima-Collins. 717, Swanstrom-Rigney-Mulcahey. 718, Swantstrom. 719, Schneider. 720, Steczo. 721, Hallock. 722, Hallock. 724, Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 713 by McCourt says we're privileged to honor a jubilee mass. 714 by Kelly talks about Tri-Town Radio Amateur Club. 715 by Meyer notes a 75th Anniversary. 716 by DiPrima picks the man of the year. 717 by Swanstrom designates Stevenson County Bar Association Day. 718, by Swanstrom does the same thing for Winnebago County. 719 by Schneider records 31 years of teaching. 720 by Steczo retires a fellow. 721 by Hallock honors the Harlem School girls' basketball team. 722 by Hallock the Jefferson Jay Hawks. 724 by Getty asks for another... I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 723, Keane et al. Respects the memory of Jesse Owens."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. Move the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolution's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk? Representative Madigan. 11:00, five minutes perfunct."

Madigan: "Are there any further announcements, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements?"

Madigan: "Providing five minutes Perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn to 11 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have. Motion carried. The House will stand adjourned till 11:00 tomorrow after five minutes perfunct.. Representative Madigan, what time is it? What time is it, Mr. Madigan? What time is it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1852, Pierce. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making certain appropriations. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 3585, Sumner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create the Court of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3586, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the Circuit Court. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3587, Huskey-Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3588, Huskey-Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3589, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3590, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3591, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Department of



Veterans Affairs. First Reading of the Bill.

No further business. . . The House now stands adjourned."



## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 22, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0515	2ND READING	PAGE	28
HB-0582	3RD READING	PAGE	30
HB-0750	3RD READING	PAGE	38
HB-0966	2ND READING	PAGE	2
HB-0980	2ND READING	PAGE	102
HB-1016	2ND READING	PAGE	45
HB-1034	MOTIONS	PAGE	65
HB-1255	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
HB-1279	3RD READING	PAGE	71
HB-1299	2ND READING	PAGE	19
HB-1381	3RD READING	PAGE	77
HB-1407	3RD READING	PAGE	78
HB-1480	MOTIONS	PAGE	81
HB-1500	2ND READING	PAGE	23
HB-1528	2ND READING	PAGE	2
HB-1563	3RD READING	PAGE	106
HB-1590	2ND READING	PAGE	81
HB-1673	3RD READING	PAGE	83
HB-1736	3RD READING	PAGE	81
HB-1833	3RD READING	PAGE	107
HB-1886	MOTIONS	PAGE	62
HB-1887	MOTIONS	PAGE	62
HB-1952	2ND READING	PAGE	99
	3RD READING	PAGE	84
HB-1980	2ND READING	PAGE	62
	3RD READING	PAGE	110
HB-2005	MOTIONS	PAGE	87
HB-2022	3RD READING	PAGE	87
HB-2033	2ND READING	PAGE	26
HB-2045	MOTIONS	PAGE	67
HB-2104	2ND READING	PAGE	91
HB-2131	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-2272	2ND READING	PAGE	92
HB-2318	3RD READING	PAGE	92
HB-2621	3RD READING	PAGE	93
HB-2836	MOTIONS	PAGE	67
HB-2847	3RD READING	PAGE	93
HB-2883	3RD READING	PAGE	97
HB-2905	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
HB-2906	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-2966	MOTIONS	PAGE	66
HB-3014	2ND READING	PAGE	4
HB-3021	2ND READING	PAGE	4

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 22, 1980

HB-3022	2ND READING	PAGE	4
HB-3023	2ND READING	PAGE	4
HB-3028	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-3034	2ND READING	PAGE	98
	2ND READING	PAGE	101
HB-3036	2ND READING	PAGE	12
HB-3037	2ND READING	PAGE	13
HB-3039	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-3041	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-3048	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-3053	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-3055	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-3063	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-3074	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-3180	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-3185	MOTIONS	PAGE	112
HB-3208	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-3262	MOTIONS	PAGE	66
HB-3268	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-3288	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-3376	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-3429	MOTIONS	PAGE	68
	MOTIONS	PAGE	112
HB-3499	MOTIONS	PAGE	66
HB-3536	MOTIONS	PAGE	68
	MOTIONS	PAGE	112
HB-3539	MOTIONS	PAGE	64
HB-3540	MOTIONS	PAGE	64
HB-3541	MOTIONS	PAGE	64
HB-3574	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-3575	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-3576	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-3577	1ST READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	66
HB-3578	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-3579	1ST READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	67
HB-3580	1ST READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	66
HB-3581	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-3582	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-3583	1ST READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	68

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 22, 1980

PAGE 3

	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
HB-3584	1ST READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	67
HB-3585	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3586	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3587	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3588	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3589	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3590	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HB-3591	1ST READING	PAGE	114
SB-1648	1ST READING	PAGE	69
SB-1852	1ST READING	PAGE	114
HR-0723	3RD READING	PAGE	113
*HJR-0041	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
*HJR-0044	2ND READING	PAGE	70

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 22, 1980

PAGE 4

## SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. COLLINS - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
EXCUSED ABSENCE	PAGE	28
INTRODUCTION NATIONAL COMMANDER OF AMVETS	PAGE	59
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	68
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	70
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	112
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	113
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	114
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	115