

Doorkeeper: "Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes."

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

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

Reverend 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. Henry Cardinal Manning wrote: Some cannot endure the presence of those who are, in any way, higher than their own intellectual or moral stature. They are restless till they can escape into the society of those who do not dwarf them. Let us pray, Heavenly Father, Thou who hast given us our very life and being, and who hast endowed us with freedom of choice in all that we do or say, including our acceptance or rejection of Thee; do Thou O Eternal Lord God, support us in these hours of our need. Liberate us from perversity of Thy will; interpose Thy love for us that we may respond with loving obedience to that which Thou in Thy infinite wisdom didst reveal to all mankind that so quickened we may serve the people of this State of Illinois in this House of Representatives in the highest level of competency and in accord with Thy Almighty intention; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United State of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all. Roll Call for attendance. Your switch only. Everyone on the payroll that's here. This is the one that we're going to pay the per diem" on. Take the record. Senate Bills First Reading.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1506, Mahar. A Bill for an Act extending the corporate limits of the metropolitan sanitary district of greater Chicago. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1521, Yourell. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Joint Committee on administrative rules. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1524, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1557, Bowman. A Bill for an making appropriations to the Legislative Information System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1617, Sandquist. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Liquor Control Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1628, Darrow. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1658, Peters. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1667, Rea. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasure. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1705, Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Cannabis Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1710, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1713, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fish Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1726, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1728, Watson. A Bill for an Act in relation to exemption from bankruptcy proceedings. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1741, Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1750, Neff.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1760, John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1625, Klosak. A Bill for an Act provides for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Racing Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1634, Hallstrom. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense for the Governor's Purchasing Care Review Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 569, Bowman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1630, C. M. Stiehl. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Office of Lieutenant Governor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill ~~1726~~¹⁶²⁷, Hallock. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Illinois Commerce Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1623, Mahar. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Military Naval Department. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1620, J.D. Jones. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense to the State Employees' Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1616, McAuliffe. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers' Training Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1663, Telcser. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills Third Reading appears...I mean Senate Bills Third Reading on page 14. Appears Senate Bill 1652, Representative Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1652, a Bill for an Act to provide for the transfer of certain funds in the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I put a note on your desk, I meant to ask for 1655 instead of 1652, if we can correct that."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the gentleman have leave to return to Senate Bill 1652 to the Order of Second Reading?"

Winchester: "No, Mr. Speaker....Mr. Speaker."

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

Winchester: "I would like to have leave to return Senate...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute."

Winchester: "I would like to have leave to return Senate Bill 1655 to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Was it 52 or 65?"

Winchester: "1655."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. He asks leave to return Senate Bill 1655 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted. Any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Winchester. Amends Senate Bill 1655 engrossed on page 4, line 17 and so forth."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment which was....it was an incorrect Amendment, the wording was incorrect. The Democratic Staff advised the Senate and I would ask....I would move that we...that we table Amendment #1."

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

Winchester: "I would ask, Mr. Speaker that we withdraw Amendment

#2."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn any other...."

Winchester: "And Amendment #3 now is the corrected Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We don't have a #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Page, have you got Amendment #3?"

Winchester: "We filed it yesterday, Jack."

Speaker Redmond: "Where did you file it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Oh, I have a 2...they...."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you file it in the Senate?"

Clerk O'Brien: "They advised #2 may have been withdrawn and refiled. Did I check your LRB number? Amendment #2 is LRB8110469EGjsam."

Winchester: "Okay, that's correct. Then it should be Amendment #2 instead of Amendment #3."

Clerk O'Brien: "That's Amendment #2."

Winchester: "All right. This just corrects the technical error that we made in Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker and I would ask for adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On 1652 was anything to be done on that, Representative Winchester?"

Winchester: "No, Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill is ready to move but I don't think we have enough...."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Well I was...."

Winchester: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "I had a mistake on here, I showed that was the one you wanted to return."

Winchester: "Yes, that's my fault, Mr. Speaker. I came back but you were busy talking. I left you a note correcting it and you hadn't received it...."

Speaker Redmond: "I couldn't read the handwriting on the note."

Winchester: "She wrote it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Agreed Resolutions. Incidentally let the records show that Representative Simms is on the floor. Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 780, Redmond, 781, Redmond, 782, Redmond, 785, Catania and 786, Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 780 by Redmond honors the North College Vikings. 781 by Redmond marks the 100th Anniversary of the great General Douglas MacArthur by Redmond. 782 by Redmond talks about the Director of SPEED. 785 by Catania mentions 125th anniversary and 786 by Bradley honors the institution of marriage and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well as a bachelor I'm concerned about that last one. What...would Representative Giorgi elaborate on honoring the institution of marriage."

Giorgi: "Well, he honors a couple that has been married for 50 years. You wouldn't know about that, not being married."

Bowman: "Well it sounds like...not a bad idea though. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Agreed Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. The Agreed Resolution are adopted. Let me see now...on page...on page 12 appears on House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 3425. Representative Reilly is recognized."

Reilly: "We're not...I ask leave to bring this Bill to Second

Reading, please, for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have Leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Reilly: "It should be #6."

Speaker Redmond: "3245."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Reilly, amends House Bill 3425 on page 13, line 15 and 16, by deleting...and so forth."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There were some...I apologize. There were some suggestion that the words on the time period for serving the notice...we had thee the words, 'or as soon thereafter as may be practicable'...and there was as suggestion that that made the ten day time limit meaningless. And so we're deleting that and simply providing that the time period not be jurisdictional. I would ask adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the motion for the adoption of Amendment 6. All in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'...the 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Okay. House Bills, Third Reading, appearing on page 13, appears House Bill 3491. Representative Epton is recognized."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a cosponsor of this with Representative Mahar and there is an emergency. I'm a member of Idlewild Country Club which presently is in conflict with the environmental pollution authorities. The Metropolitan Sanitary District will not allow us to correct...make the correction until the Bill is annexed...until the property is annexed. It was annexed in the last Session but in error they were ten feet without the boundary. This corrects the error and will enable them...enable the

Country Club to comply with the rules of the EPA. I solicit your passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Is this passage of the...those that which you ask?"

Epton: "Yes, passage of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think maybe we better wait until we have a quorum Roll Call yet, Representative Epton. The quorum Roll Call vote is out of order. We'll reach you later on this one. Take it out of the record. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1588, Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Consideration Postponed on page 17, appears House Bill 2822. Representative Lechowicz is recognized."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I ask leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Any Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any....anyone object to returning it to Second Reading? No objection, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Lechowicz. Amends House Bill 2822 as amended and engrossed on page 39 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 removes the 3% provision for the funding of the RTA and I move for its adoption. It's the elimination."

Speaker Redmond: "Any question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. The Amendment is adopted."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "We're back to Consideration Postponed."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On the appropriation Bill.....House Bills Third Reading on page 9, appears House Bill 3216. Representative Macdonald is recognized."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take that Bill back to Second to put on Amendment #5 which actually will become the Bill. Strikes everything after the enacting clause and will now become the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Piel....."

Macdonald: "One moment please, my cosponsor says that she has already taken care of that Barbara Flynn Currie said yesterday....."

Speaker Redmond: "So then we don't have too. Representative Piel for what purpose are you nodding your head?"

Piel: "I was just going to let her know that it was done yesterday."

Macdonald: ".....is already on so I guess I can leave it on Third. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll leave it on Third. Senate Bills First Reading".

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1480, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act in relation to transfer and leasing of real estate for school purposes. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Whats he want? On page 11, appears House Bill 3365. Representative Meyers is recognized."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have leave to move House Bill 3365 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, McClain - Meyer. Amends House Bill 3365 as amended by deleting title and inserting in lieu thereof the following:"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 3365, redefines the definition of hazardous waste. It puts limitations on the institute of env...natural resources on how they may spend the money and it deletes siting authority. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "When Governor Carter...Governor Carter....Governor....there is a lot of similarity I understand...."

Speaker Redmond: "Stratton."

Skinner: "No, I think it was Thompson...a lot of similarity between those two. When Governor Thompson vetoed my Bill to allow...or to reassert local zoning authority over gravel pits. He did so....saying that it was not appropriate single out gravel pits from landfills and in his comprehensive Bill, he would include landfills. Are landfills included?"

Meyer: "Not landfills, he would include gravel pits."

Skinner: "Are gravel pits anywhere in this Bill?"

Meyer: "No, Sir."

Skinner: "Why not?"

Meyer: "This is a hazardous waste Bill, it isn't a gravel pit Bill. Gravel pits aren't...aren't regulated or controlled by the environmental protection agency."

Skinner: "Yes, they are. They are the....environmental protection agency in the Department of Mines and Minerals are the only two controls over gravel pits."

Meyer: "Well, I...I..."

Skinner: "That's the problem."

Meyer: "I thought mines and minerals controlled them, I'm sorry. But this is a hazardous waste Bill, it doesn't have anything with mines and minerals."

Skinner: "Okay, I'll keep hoping the administration will fulfill its promise although I don't expect too much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentlemen yield for a question?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Mautino: "This Amendment now becomes the Bill?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Mautino: "You're putting the site procedures in all rules and regulations in the agency for....for total procedures on all hazardous waste as I read this. Is that correct?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Mautino: "You are also addressing the question of transfer of land and disposition of land where there are hazardous materials in a site such as the Sheffield site."

Meyer: "No, Sir. That's public health, that's nuclear waste."

Mautino: "There is also hazardous chemical waste in that particular facility and you have a provision in here for the changing and the allowing of a continuation as I read this Amendment. Now, I just got this Amendment out of my desk. I would like to have somebody explain this one to me."

Meyer: "What page and what line are you on?"

Mautino: "I'm on...line....page 11, line 25. Explain that paragraph please."

Meyer: "That paragraph has to do...where hazardous waste....after the environmental protection agency shall say that certain material are hazardous waste. They then go to the Pollution Control Board. There is a hearing and at that hearing the Pollution Control Board may determine that a

compound or a substance of such in the hazardous that it cannot be landfilled in the State of Illinois. It would prohibit the land...."

Mautino: "That's...that's excellent. My point is, they would also have the provision to...in the case of an existing hazardous material. How does that paragraph affect that facility where there are hazardous materials there already. Would that prohibit...what does that mean, that prohibit use. I can see prohibiting future use but what are you doing with the one that is already there? Are you putting them under this Act that they could no longer dump anything there but in fact, they would be tied into of always having it there. I don't know, I wonder what this Amendment does."

Meyer: "No, this has to do with future prohibition of material that is deemed to be hazardous waste that you can't dump...you can't landfill it in the State of Illinois."

Mautino: "Are you...do you consider leaving this 3365 on Second Reading or are you going to move it back to Third? If you're going to move it back to Third, I object. I want to at least look at this Amendment. But if you're going to leave it on Second, I would be most happy to accommodate you."

Meyer: "Well, I don't want to leave it on Second, I...we can work something out if that's what you're concerned about, the word, use."

Mautino: "No, what I'm saying is, you've probably got in my estimation one of the most important pieces of legislation here. You're making an Amendment at 9:30 on a Friday morning and you're going to move this Bill to Third. I don't think it is quite fair. I for one don't know what is in it and I do have some questions upon what's right here."

Meyer: "Well, that language was...the only change in that

language which was on the next page. You know, that's the Bill as introduced."

Mautino: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion?. The question is on the motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. They 'ayes' have, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Second Reading on page 2. House Bill 1295. Is Flinn on the floor? Out of the record. 2705, McPike....out of the record. 2762...out of the record. 2845, Representative Henry....out of the record. 46...Henry....out of the record. 2932, Representative Griesheimer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mobile Home Landlord Tenant Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Griesheimer, amends House Bill 2932 on page 1, line 1 and 5, by changing 7 and 11, to 3, 7 and 11 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw floor Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 1 and 2 are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Griesheimer. Amends House Bill 2932 by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 clarifies the provisions with regard to the requirement for a lease for parties living in the park. It also clarifies the rights with

regard to sale of mobile homes. This Amendment has been worked out with both the Democratic and Republican staff of the Judiciary Committee. I believe it clarifies a number of points that have caused a great deal of confusion, this Amendment is also agreed to by the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association, the representatives for the mobile home industry in the State of Illinois. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentlemen's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment....floor Amendment #4, Griesheimer. Amends House Bill 2932 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4, also is a clarifying Amendment, there have been two or three instances where certain instances have arisen where consumer complaints have been made to the Attorney Generals Office for violations of the new Mobile Home Landlord and Tenant Act. The question was whether the Attorney Generals Office could even look into this since they were not mentioned in the original Bill. This is merely permissive language that would allow the Attorney Generals Office, upon request, to involve themselves in mobile homes. It is not exclusive and for Mr. Getty's consumption, if he is on the floor, it does not touch the subject of State's Attorney. I know that he indicated last year, he did not want this turned over to the State's Attorney, it is an additional responsibility. I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the motion

for adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2994...out of the record. 3024, Rep....read the Bill 3024."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3024, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Department of Administrative Services. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Any motions with respect to Amendments 1 through 6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7 was withdrawn previously. Floor Amendment #8, Leverenz. Amends House Bill 3024 on page 8 by inserting immediately after line 28 the following: Section 6A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'm on. Thank you, I will be with you....give me the Amendment. Mike...the Amendment has arrived. Amendment #8, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would amend in two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the Department of Administrative Services for the operating cost of a Elgin office building. Up until now this office building has been functioning both for Administrative Services, the Department of Law Enforcement and the Secretary of State. The money has been spread, or the cost has been spread and what we are trying to do is put the state building that is in Elgin...totally into to one specific budget and that's Administrative Services. I will respond to any questions you might have and I would move

for the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "We will accept the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for acceptance....for the adoption of Amendment #8. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Winchester. Amends House Bill 3024 as amended on page 2, line 15,"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 restores a hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars that Committee Amendment #4 took out of the Bill in Committee. I discussed it with both sides of the aisle, Representative Matijevich and his staff and the Republican Minority Staff and Representative Wolf agree..concur with the Amendment and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, I would move for the adoption of Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the motion to adopt Amendment 9. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Vinson. Amends House Bill 3024 on page 8 by inserting immediately after Section 6, the following: Section 6.1, the sum of two hundred thousand dollars are so much thereof may be necessary to appropriate the Department of Administrative Services for use of the Department of Soldiers and Sailors children school. The purpose of security and maintenance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "This Amendment, Mr. Speaker, is an Amendment offered by Representative Vinson. He is not on the floor at the

time, we're in support of the Amendment. I suppose the proper thing would be to hold the Bill on Second until he gets here to offer the Amendment. Since we are in support of it..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you offer it, if you think it is a good Amendment."

Winchester: "It would put approximately two hundred and seventy-one thousand...two hundred thousand dollars into Administrative Services budget for the operation of the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors children school. I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #10. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3027, Representative Hallock."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3027, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expense of the Institute of Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Madigan. Amends House Bill 3027 on page 7, line 24 by deleting a million five hundred thousand, inserting in lieu thereof, three million."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty on Amendment #1...Amendment 2, pardon me. You read the Amendment haven't you Mr. Clerk. Mr. Getty are you in position to handle the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2...I've read the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Take this one out of the record. 3035...that one is out of the record. It's a bad time. It's gone to first aid. I'll get back to it. 3035."

Clerk O'Brien: "House bill 30....."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll get back to it."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3035....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock"

Hallock: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We are going down in progression here and it seems to me that 3026 was next after 3024 and there are some Amendment offered to that Bill and I would like to hear it at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it was taken out the record by...."

Hallock: "Well, no, I was here and was ready to go on the Bill and you skipped over 30....."

Speaker Redmond: "Not ready to call it. We will go away from the Order of appropriations and get to the regular substantive of Bill then. 3127...no, I've change the categories."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3127, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #2....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to table Amendment #2 by in....."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. Any discussion? The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, McCourt - Hallstrom. Amends House Bill 3127 as amended by deleting the title, inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 is actually the Amendment I explained

yesterday only I....we numbered it that at that time Amendment #2. There was some problems in the drafting and it's the same Amendment that we adopted yesterday and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3140...Representative Dunn will you please sit down...Representative Donovan, Stuffle....Representative Pierce is recognized."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3140, a Bill for an Act in relation to holding of funds collected pursuant to the personal property tax replacement taxes...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions in respect to Amendments 1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments form the floor? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, now this Bill has received some revision and I would move to table Committee Amendments 1 and 2. We pick those up with later Amendments, 6 and 7. So I would at this time move to table Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that, Representative Pierce?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Table Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendments 1 and 2. Any discussion? The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and 1 and 2 are tabled. Are

there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140 as amended...."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to withdraw Amendments 3, 4 and 5..."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments 3, 4 and 5 are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #6 is now the principle Amendment. It is similar to Amendment #3, but it's undergone some revisions. It directs that the corporate personal property tax replacement revenue be paid directly to the personal property replacement tax fund rather than to the General Revenue Fund. This will eliminate the inflation in the General Revenue balance at end of each quarter which were really misleading and will make sure the interest earned on these revenues will accrue to local governments and school districts. The second thing that it does is provides for the Department of Revenue cost of collecting and distributing the tax. And says it will repay from replacement revenue collected. The expenses shall be limited by appropriation and the complicated formula has been worked out on both sides of the aisle with the Department of Revenue. And it's an agreed formula. The third thing the...Amendment does is make sure that the death service and retirement fund allocations are collectable government units and they don't have to over allocate to these funds. And I would move the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the motion to adopt Amendment 6. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried,

Amendment 6 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140 as amended by Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Yes, Amendment #7, is similar to Amendment #1 adopted in Committee. It insured that municipalities receive replacement revenue due them, corporate personal property taxes formerly levied for them by a township government. I think it's a matter that Representative Ropp was very interested in. He introduced a separate Bill on this and in Revenue Committee he was kind enough to allow his Bill to be....incorporate into House Bill 3140 and he really deserves the credit for Amendment 7. I guess it was put up there under my name but really, it's Representative Ropp's idea and he should take full credit for it."

Speaker Redmond: "And he wants to amend Amendment 3 and I understand Amendment 3 has been tabled. So..."

Pierce: "Amendment 3 has been withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn..."

Pierce: "We're now on Amendment 7."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but 7, doesn't it amend 3 and there is no 3. So, Representative Ropp should be ashamed of himself. Maybe we better...dress this one up."

Pierce: "Not the Amendment....7...the Amendment 7, I have doesn't do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Clerk....read it, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, amends House Bill 3140 as amended by Amendment 3 on page 8, by inserting immediately after line...."

Pierce: "You have a different 7 than I do."

Clerk O'Brien: "The next one...my Amendment #8 says, it amends House Bill 3140 as amended by Amendment 6 on page 8, line 4."

Pierce: "Maybe we better take that out of the record for a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record until we...."

Pierce: "We could move it....we can go through the other Amendments and move it to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it was adopted....how do we stand now?"

Pierce: "Well, so far we've done all right. We've...."

Speaker Redmond: "We've adopted 6. Now what's your preference?"

Pierce: "I think we should..."

Speaker Redmond: "If you're going to have additional Amendments, the Clerk recommends that we hold it on Second."

Pierce: "Yeah, we'll hold that on Second. Why don't we proceed...alright."

Speaker Redmond: "And we'll take....hold that one on Second. How about 3211? Going to read 3211, Mr. Clerk."

Pierce: "We're ready for 3211."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3211, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3211 on page 1 and line 30 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Do you want to take over, we're on this one now...Skinner's got..."

Skinner: "Would you please recognize Representative Pierce. Yoo-hoo, Mr. Speaker. Super Speak. Anybody up there? Would you please recognize Representative Pierce."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that Representative Skinner has graciously agreed to withdraw Amendment 2, that's a floor Amendment. And we proceed....I mean Amendment 1...floor Amendment 1, that was just read...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Pierce - Skinner. Amends House Bill 3211."

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

Pierce: "Yes, Amendment 2 is a technical Amendment that does what Amendment 1 also attempted to do. And it makes clear that when taxes are paid under protest, the protest form on the L.A.B. attached to the second payment. And that would cover the whole tax bill. That has been the practice in the past years, anyway and this makes it clearer that you pay your second installment taxes under protest and it covers both installments. I move the adoption of Amendment 2."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has Amendment #2 been distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it has."

Piel: "Because none of us around here have gotten it yet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is shall Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3173."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3173...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Yes. House Bill....House Bill 3474."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3474, a Bill for an Act creating the Local Government Finance Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Getty."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know we have another Amendment coming on this Bill which isn't here yet. Maybe we could move this Bill to Third, then I'll bring it back to Second when the Amendment comes."

Clerk O'Brien: "He said there is another Amendment coming but he wants to move it to Third. We're on Amendment 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Getty on Amendment #1."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is an Amendment #2 on this. I don't know whether that's....I know he had it drafted yesterday, I thought it had been filed. The Clerk..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Clerk, has Amendment #2 been filed? Has it been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Getty, Amendment #2 has not been filed."

Getty: "Well then, I just ask that it be held on Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not your Bill."

Getty: "Well, I'm asking the Sponsor to hold it on Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels. Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3513. Has the fiscal note been filed on that Bill, Jack?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it has not been filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The fiscal note has not been filed, take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 3539. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewing: "Did you just pass up 3513?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did I what, Sir?"

Ewing: "Did you pass up 3513?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, I asked if the fiscal note was filed and it was not."

Ewing: "There....there are a couple of Amendments pending on that Bill.Would like to handle them if we could."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We couldn't move it anyway because the fiscal note has not been filed."

Ewing: "Well, if we handle the Amendments and then the fiscal note is filed, does...do we still have to go back...can it be moved automatically to Third?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It still has to be called again."

Ewing: "Would you anticipate that we'd get back to that today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I hope so."

Ewing: "I mean, I'm ready to take the Amendments if you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. House Bill 3513."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3513, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 has been adopted previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Ewing. Amends House Bill 3513...."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This is a Bill which makes and put into the statute a definition of real estate so that we can avoid transferring what was formally personal property to real estate now and ending up with a double taxation on business in the State of Illinois. Amendment #2 takes out two of the most objectionable sections of this Bill which were raised earlier when we discussed Amendment#2. I mean...sorry, when we discussed Amendment #1 and I would ask for the adoption of this Amendment. Would be more than glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What two areas does it take out?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, there was a definition in there which...the wording was as follows: A structure which essentially an item of machinery or equipment or is an enclosure which is so closely combined with the machinery and equipment which supports houses or serves that it must be replaced, retired or abandoned. Contemporaneously with such machinery or equipment, is not a building. That has been removed."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Amendment. One of the most objectional parts of the Bill...or at least to me, was a sentence which seems to exempt every nuclear power and coal fired and oiled filed electric power plant in the State of Illinois from real estate taxation. This sentence would deal serious blows to the tax face of every community which has an electric power plant. And I congratulate the Sponsor for offering the Amendment to take out that rather gaping loophole."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is shall Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor signify by say 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment#2 is adopted. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading.....no, we're going to wait for a fiscal note. House Bill 3539."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3539..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Just so there is no question, House Bill 3513 will remain on Second Reading until a fiscal note is filed. House Bill 3539."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3539, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Piel."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the last couple of days we've brought this up twice we've had some....questions on taking it out of the record both times. I've cleared up any problems that it would have with Mr. Henry and Mr. Huff, in reference to 3539. I talked briefly to Representative Kane yesterday. What I have agreed to Representative Huff and Representative Henry, if they want to add an Amendment at a later date I would bring it back from Third for the purpose for an Amendment. And I would ask....I will answer any question, if there is any question in reference to what we discussed yesterday and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #1 on 3539."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #1 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3540."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3540, a Bill for an Act in relation to state housing emergency. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Piel. Amends House Bill 3540..."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just noticed that Representative Kane has come on to the floor, I was trying to talk to him earlier this morning. What this basically defines is what the emergency period is...this Amendment defines the emergency period. I would move for the adoption of this and if Representative Kane

has any problems with any definition on that I can bring it back from Third, Monday or Tuesday and clear that up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #1 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Backing up to House Bill 3140. Third Reading on 3540. House Bill 3140."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3140, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #6 was adopted. The next Amendment is Floor Amendment#7, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140..."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker...2...1 and 2 were tabled and 3, 4 and 5 were withdrawn, 6 has been adopted. We're now on Amendment #7. This is Representative Ropp's concept of a Bill that he had introduced and had read in Revenue Committee. We had to amend the Amendment on its face because we withdrew 3 and I move to...on the line 3 of Amendment 7, to say were...as amended by Amendment #6 rather than Amendment #3 which was wrong. And then on line 4, to say immediately after line 28 rather than line 24 and I ask leave that the Amendment 7 be amended on its face to recognize the fact there is no longer an Amendment 3 and there is an Amendment 6...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pierce, does page 8 remain the same on the Amendment?"

Pierce: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #6 on page 8 by inserting immediately thereafter line 28 the following."

Pierce: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Is there any discussion?"

Pierce: "I would move adoption of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to amend it on its face? Hearing no objections it will be so amended."

Pierce: "I will now proceed with Amendment 7 and perhaps Representative Ropp might at this time wish to explain the need for it...which is in his area..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Pierce: "Amendment 7 insures municipalities receive replacement revenue due them on corporate personal property tax formerly levied for them by a township government. Representative Ropp, do you want to explain that further?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Pierce...in what this actually does, when we made the correction for the replacement of the personal property tax, about a year ago. This particular provision was left off, it is a situation which used to occur and we just failed to include it in the Bill at that time and this takes that correction and puts it into effect again. And I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Amendment #7 be adopted. All in favor signify by 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #7 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140 as amended by Amendment 6, on page 8, line 4 and so forth."

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

Pierce: "This Amendment is similar to Amendment #2 which was adopted in Committee, which we tabled. It provides that the number of distributions to local government of the replacement tax would be increased from four a year to eight per year commencing in 1981. With the first distribution after December 31, 1980. And it will help the

cash flow of our municipalities and schools and I urge the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #8 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Pierce. Amends House Bill 3140 on page 20 and by inserting between line 13 and 14..."

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

Pierce: "Yes, by the way, I want to say that...Representative Ewing on the previous Amendment was most helpful in working it out, in fact the main Amendment 7 was suppose to carry his name and by...or 6 was suppose to carry his name, it carried mine by mistake. Amendment 9 is an Amendment that...technical Amendment to this personal property tax Bill that makes sure that the municipalities abate that part of surplus which is obtained from personal property tax which was our intention in January of this year when we passed the tax legislation...homestead legislation. And Amendment #9 clarifies that and again makes certain that municipalities and school districts abate any extra funds they may have received, any surplus funds they may have received because of collection of personal property replacement tax. And I move the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pierce, would you take a look at Amendment #9. I don't believe it says, as amended. Leave to correct the Amendment on its face. Hearing no objections, the Amendment will be corrected on its face."

Pierce: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #9. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #9 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading."

Pierce: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Calendar on page 18, on the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 3040. Yeah, let's have a attendance Roll Call. The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, we were on Second Reading progressing very fine and as I'm sure you're well aware, two Bills down lies one that I think is pretty important. It was held yesterday on a controversial ruling of the chair and I would appreciate it if we could proceed in that order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll get back to that, Sam. Would the record indicate that Representative Laurino and Mulgalian are excused because of illness. Mugalian and Laurino because of illness. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, do you have excused absences? Mr. Ryan. Any excused absences?"

Ryan: "Representative Ebbensen is absent today due to a death in the family."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The records will so indicate. Take the record. I'm sorry, put Mr. Conti on...as present...and in the chamber...as usual. And Mr. Katz is here. Concurrence, House Bill 3040, Mr. Ewing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3040, a Bill for an Act to amend certain appropriation Act for the fiscal year, June 30, 1980. Concurrence with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Revenue, it was passed out of this House and sent to the Senate. They've put two Amendments on it, Amendment #1 cuts that appropriation to the Department of Revenue for ordinary and contingent operating expenses by seven hundred and

forty-two thousand, five hundred dollars. And I would move to concur with Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about Amendments 1 and 2?"

Ewing: "All right. Do you want to take them together?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please."

Ewing: "Amendment #2 is an Amendment put on in the Senate which divides up an authorization appropriation for the Department of Conservation. Prior to this time it was in the amount of three million dollars, this breaks it into a two million dollar and a one million dollar authorization. This is to go along with the bond authorization of two million dollars. While the bond authorization was only two million, the appropriation of three million. They were unable to issue and sell the bonds and use the funds. This Amendment will allow them to use the two million dollars which had previously been authorized. Again I would move for the adoption of the concurrence motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Sanagmon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "How much of the bond authorization is left unexpended?"

Ewing: "There's two million dollars."

Kane: "Why are we appropriating three million dollars then?"

Ewing: "Well, we're not appropriating. This was a prior appropriation and with the appropriation....three million dollars and only an authorization of two million. They were unable to move on any of it. They cannot go ahead with the other million dollars without a bond authorization."

Kane: "Why wasn't the appropriation then just simply reduce from three million to two million?"

Ewing: "What we're doing here is breaking up the bond....the

appropriation into two different segments a two million dollar one and a one million dollar one. I was not privy to why they didn't just wipe out the one million dollars."

Kane: "I mean, it seems rather strange when they have for land acquisition in related cost. We sent it out of here at three million dollars, they changed it to two million and then added an entirely separate line item that said, for land acquisition in related cost one million dollars. I mean they would either make sense or it doesn't make sense. I think that....Mr. Speaker, could I address myself to this Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well.."

Kane: "Or this concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment...."

Ewing: "Is that a question or..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, no, he wants to address himself to the Amendment. Please proceed, Sir."

Kane: "I think two years ago or it might have been three years ago. We passed a law in this General Assembly which I think was...was a good law which said, that we could not appropriate or that the Capital Development Board could not encumber money for a project unless there was a completed bond authorization to complete that project. I think that that was the right way to do it. Right now we have an appropriation at the three million dollar level which exceeds the bond authorization and the Senate has tried to get around that statute and the Department of Conservation is trying to get around that statute by breaking up the authorization into two different line appropriation. I think that we ought to limit the appropriation to what the bond authorization is. If we decide to increase the bond authorization later for next year, then we can give them the additional appropriation. But to give them the

appropriation without the bond authorization, I think is bad and I think that we ought to refuse to concur and let the Senate take this additional money out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentlemen from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would again renew my motion to concur and in support of that, I would like to make a couple of comments. First of all, there is thirty million dollars in this appropriation to pay refunds to our taxpayers throughout this state. There is no chance of having these fund available if we don't act today because the Senate has adjourned and gone home. The prior speaker discussed the appropriation of funds without bond authorization. We still have control of these expenditures. These bonds cannot be authorized and issued without a vote of this House. The appropriation of one million dollars cannot be expended because we haven't authorized the bonds. So in fact, we really have what the prior speaker wanted. We have control over this one million dollars. The two million dollars for acquisition of recreation land has long been blocked by the Senate. I think it is very good that this money is now available and with the bond authorization and with the appropriation and with it being broken apart as it is in this concurrence motion, we'll be able to proceed. And I would certainly ask for an affirmative vote of this House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider Senate Amendments 1 and 2, in one Roll Call? Objection. We'll take them one at a time. The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3040. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."

On this question there is 125 'ayes', 1 'nay', 7 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3040. Now, on Senate Amendment #2. Now, on Senate Amendment #2. Does the House concur with House Bill 3040? All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 21 'nos' 7 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Could I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you may, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Yourell: "Is it too late to explain my vote on this issue?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it is, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson, Bell, Bluthardt, Capparelli, Catania, Cullerton, Darrow....Darrow votes 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Darrow votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dawson, Deuster, Domico, Donovan, Ebbesen, Ewell, Garmisa, Getty, Goodwin, Hannig, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Keane, Kelly, Klosak, Kornowicz, Krska, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Lechowicz as 'aye'. Kindly Keane as 'aye'. Kindly Kelly as 'aye'. Pierce as 'aye'. Wolf as 'aye'. Kornowicz as 'aye'. Krska as 'aye'. Goodwin as 'aye'. Leon as 'aye'. Ronan as 'aye'. McClain as 'aye'. Ask for a new Roll Call. The question is shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3040. This is final action. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Buzz, get my button. Get Jones. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk

will take the record. On this question there 122 'ayes', 14 'nos' 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3040. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar Second Reading appears House Bill 3555."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3555, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Priority of Call, dated May 16, page 3, appears House Bill 3259."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Priority of Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 32..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "59."

Clerk O'Brien: "...59, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act requiring hospitals to render hospital emergency services in case of injury or acute medical condition. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Member of the House. Right now hospitals in the State of Illinois that provide emergency medical services are required to provide them without respect to the clients capacity to pay. House Bill 3259 would merely require the hospitals to post notices in the emergency rooms so that conspective consumers would know that they may not be turned away if they are in need of acute medical care on the grounds they have not clear capacity to pay the bill. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House bill 3259 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Marco 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 116 'ayes', 11 'nos', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3291."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3291, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to Landlord and Tenant. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz. Excuse me, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Darrow: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've noticed now on a number of Roll Calls that Representative Hanahan's 'present' light has been on and I don't see him in his seat. Perhaps he isn't here today and it may appear that he will be paid for today and I know he would not want that if he is not in the building. So...I feel that we should not be voting him 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken, Sir. House Bill 3291, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the House to move this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, bring the Bill back to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Marovitz. Amends House Bill 3291..."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is an Amendment that

was prepared and suggested by the Illinois Association of Realtors. It clarifies somethings in the Bill so that the notice required in the Bill would not have to be maintained so that if somebody tore it down the owner would not be liable, it would have to be posted and notice could also be given by having the....by being sent through the mail or included in a lease. The realtors felt this was a reasonable method to give notice as long as the individual actually received the information. I concur with the realtors and ask for adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3315."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3315, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Uniformed Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3315 deals with unclaimed property in the State of Illinois. The way it is right now in the State of Illinois, if a lending institution in the State of Illinois has a dormant account, where there is no activity in the account for seven years. After seven years...after seven years the money escheats to the state. The state then invest these funds on a daily, monthly, yearly bases with institutions throughout the state. If a person turns around after receiving notice that the state has these funds and claims the funds the state gives them their money back. We're talking about approximate...the state is investing approximately seven million, five hundred

thousand dollars a year. And they do not pay the people interest on these accounts and what this Bill basically states is, if the state has acceded an interest bearing account that they will....and the people claim this account the state will pay them 5% if it was an interest bearing account before the state claimed it. I think it is only fair that if the person had an interest bearing account the state should have to pay them the interest that they had coming in the original situation. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Dunn, J.: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? The question....I think I heard you say, that the council pays 5% interest and my question is, why not whatever the prevailing rate is. I think your idea is excellent but does the Bill actually limit the interest payment to 5%?"

Piel: "John, what we had, we had a problem with the Department of Financial Institutions you would have a fluctuating situation. Because, you know, the person didn't pick it up for two years where the rate would be fluctuating and they....the only problem they had was, if we could establish a specific rate and they asked us to put it in at 5%."

Dunn, J.: "Okay, I...."

Piel: "So the people are receiving something for their...."

Dunn, J.: "Maybe we can work on that, you're certainly taking a step in the right direction."

Piel: "Thank you."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Excuse me. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, this is a situation where a Legislator is asking for the state to pay interest on funds that are unclaimed by someone, an individual or some other person. After there has been no activity in an account for seven years. And the limitation on the interest is that the interest on the part of the state would not build up for more than ten years. That is if the money is held by the state for ten years and the person then claims the money back they would be able to get ten years worth of interest. Now these abandoned funds are well advertised by the state, the state makes expensive effort to find people who have abandoned their property before the money escheats to the state. We're all acquainted with the fact that that the Department of Financial Institutions sends us a list of people who may be under this living in or near our district and they ask us to help locate the people. When I have sent out letters to people on this, I find a great many responses. Which indicates to me that they are still there and the financial institution just hasn't been able to find them even though they are still at their same address. I even got one back from the village of Skokie and I don't think the village of Skokie has moved. These people are very grateful for me informing them of it and they really are still there. So the state has taken many ways of locating people and advising them that they do have abandoned property that is soon to escheats. If the person does not respond to this, it seems to me their own responsibility and for the state to lose money in the form of interest to people after they have taken every effort to locate the person, doesn't seem to me a very responsible position for this House to be taking. And I would urge that we defeat this Bill."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Just to sort of clarify what the previous speaker said. First of all the state does not take any action during the first seven years. The bank does not obviously does not want to get rid of funds that are going out of their bank. They want to keep the funds in their banks. The banks do go to great lengths to contact these people. If they do not contact the people, the people do not contact them they do have to give this money to the state. Where you run into a problem lots of times is, let's say that a husband has a small little saving account or mad money, say two or three hundred dollars, he dies, the wife never knows about it. This type of situation could happen. Also, it might be a charity of some sort where they formed an athletic fund or they formed a fund for a fund raiser and the fund was abolished or the organization was abolished and they never closed the account, this type of a thing. I definitely do not feel that the state has the right, if it's my money, your money, to sit here and give me my money back where they've been investing it at anywhere from 5 to 10% a year and not pay me interest on my account. True, it's an oversight on the persons part but don't penalize the poor individual who has two, three, four, five hundred dollars coming back from the state where the state does not have to pay them money. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on 3315."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall the House pass House Bill 3315? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Kindly record, Mr. Taylor, 'aye'. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 26 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3333.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3333, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Authur. Mr. Telcser. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kraska: "I think they ought to get back in the press box....action on the floor here. Their talking to....right in front, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. Ma'am. There has been objections. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3333 is one of the Bills which Representative Marovitz and I and others worked on as an outgrowth of a series on arson. In our judgment this particular piece of legislation, probably one of the most meaningful Bills in the series and it deals with taking...in our view with taking the profits out arson and this is how it works. Insurance policies will pay off on arson based on the replacement cost of the property less depreciation. So if someone owns a piece of property that has a replacement value of less deprecation of let us say, one hundred thousand dollars and because of economic conditions and or location, they can purchase that property for twenty five thousand dollars...they can therefore purchase the property for twenty five thousand dollars, insure it for the hundred thousand dollars and collect the hundred thousand dollars. They would collect a hundred thousand because that would represent the replacement value less depreciation. Obviously then, that could create for some people a motive for a arson for profit fire. Now what we've done in House Bill 3333 is alter that. Let us assume someone buys a building which costs a hundred thousand dollars to replace less the depreciation and they buy it

for twenty five thousand dollars. If that building should burn...what we're saying is the insurance contract would have two tiers. The insured would have the option of one, only receiving the market value of the property which would be ascertained by the appraisals and in this example would be about twenty five thousand dollars, take the money and leave and the remains of the building would stay. The insured in this instance could not then obtain the profit of seventy five thousand dollars that would only receive the market value of the property. If on the other hand, the owner of the property wished to repair the fire damage and rehabilitate the building and the apartment, the owner could then take the second option of the policy and that is, to receive the money to do the rehabilitation and the upgrading which could come up to the hundred thousand dollar level. That, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House is the essence of House Bill 3333, we believe it to be a striking innovation in the area of arson for profit and I'll be glad to answer any questions I can. I think Representative Marovitz would."

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

Kosinski: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Kosinski: "Mr. Telcser...here...Kosinski. Now in this example you gave us, hundred thousand vs. twenty five thousand dollars in settlement or reappraisal of the property, rehabilitation of the property. Would the owner of the property be paying a premium then on the hundred thousand dollars before the fire or an appraised value of twenty five thousand dollars?"

Telcser: "He paid the premium on the hundred and if he settled for twenty five, there would be an adjustment back to him at the time of settlement to make up for the premium

difference."

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Jones, E.: "Representative Telcser, this Bill deals with the fair plan and I don't recall having this Bill in the Insurance Committee. I know we have been working on the fair plan in the Insurance Committee of the insurance of legislation. Could you tell me how this piece of legislation went to Judiciary when it involved so much...insurance in the insurance fair plan. I don't understand that."

Telcser: "Representative, I absolutely have know ideal how. I guess the Committee on assignment of Bills referred it there. And you're right about the fair plan Bill, it deals with fair plan building."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jones, please."

Jones, E.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very complex piece of legislation in dealing with the fair plan. I know Representative Wyvetter Younge from East St. Louis has several pieces of legislation concerning the fair plan and for this piece of legislation to go to the Judiciary Committee and this is not to say that, the Members of the Judiciary Committee is not competent but when you are dealing with a merit concerning insurance and you have Legislators on that Committee that have been working for many years dealing with this here very issue, I'm very shocked that it came out of the Judiciary Committee because it is a very complex piece of legislation."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a conflict of interest but as always, I'll vote my conscious."

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

Borchers: "Will the Gentleman yeild?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Borchers: "I was just curious about one thing, Art. Let's use that twenty five thousand dollars and let's assume that the person who owned the building doesn't want to do anything but take that twenty five thousand dollars, wouldn't this just be an idea to maybe....reduce that amount for the guarantee that the building will be removed instead of left as a hulk. I understand some of them are just left as a hulk and I was wondering how you might be able to perhaps get around to help Chicago and I believe this is mostly in Chicago, clean up the debris."

Telcser: "That's a good point, Representative and I would be delighted to the Senate Sponsor and have them amend that in, to leave some money out for the clean up and removal of its debris."

Borchers: "I think something along those lines should be done."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Anderson: "Now this is for designated areas only?"

Telcser: "Fair plan."

Anderson: "Fair plan. A home in LaSalle County is a private owner living in his home, it would not affect them one bit."

Telcser: "It....Representative Marovitz....Representative Marovitz....Representative Anderson, this Bill deals with properties over four units and fair plan only, is that right, Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who wants to close? One more question...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "Art, one of the problems in the arson and with the fair plan the way it has been operating, is the inability of the State's Attorney to follow up on some of these cases and actually prosecute. Many cases go by the board, will this...how will this help the State's Attorney to follow through. Is..."

Telcser: "Representative, frankly I don't think that this Bill will help the State's Attorney in his prosecuting duties. What this Bill is intended to do is to take the profit out of it. To take away the reason for doing it. If it helps the State's Attorney in some way I'm unaware of it, Bill. I don't want to mislead you."

Mahar: "Thank you."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As Representative Telcser says, this Bill is probably the most important of the Bills in the arson package. It is a Bill which removes the profit motive from arson. It will prevent a slumlord from coming into a community in order to reap a huge cash windfall, taking that windfall and banking the money and leaving a community with an eye sore. It creates a incentive for an landlord to rebuild or rehabilitate his property and help stabilize and revitalize the community. There will no longer will be a profit in arson if we pass

added incentive to encourage business to expand in Illinois or to locate in Illinois. This is in...there are five other states that have this program. It has been one of the major ingredients in attracting new business into their state. In the State of Virginia they attribute fifty five thousand jobs in the past three years to this concept. I think it is important, it is important for creating jobs in Illinois and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Check it. Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 3401 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'ayes', no 'nays' none recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3403."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3403, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Natural Resources, Research, Data Collection and Environmental Studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, 3403 expands the powers and duty section of the Institute of Natural Resources. By necessity, about six different agencies of state government do have some role in relation to alcohol. We know that there has been a great deal of interest here in recent months and as a result of this some of those who seek information now...in the manufacture of that product find themselves by necessity having to deal with various agencies. It was our thought with this legislation to pin point one agency of government as being responsible to the public in this area. What it does is to merely say that the institute shall be....the agency responsible for conducting research to serve as a clearing house for information on alcohol

technology and also to coordinate the activities of the other agencies of state government and to centralize that authority with the institute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Will the Sponosr yeild?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Reed: "Is there a fiscal note filed on this Harlan?"

Rigney: "There is not."

Reed: "Have you discussed this with the agency in relation to the cost?"

Rigney: "I had talked to the Legislative liaison from the agency, yes. They are in agreement with the intent of the legislation."

Reed: "Do they have the money?"

Rigney: "I cannot specifically, as I say, answer your question concerning the amount of money that might be necessary to carry on these activities. I do not think it would be a large amount."

Reed: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How small would it be?"

Rigney: "There was some talk that it might entail perhaps another thirty thousand dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Harlan, I have no problem with notion of exploring alcohol fuel, all right. My concern is that...have we deleted the provision which asks this agency to evaluate the impact on farm and food production. Cause my concern and maybe you will understand the answer...how to answer it better is, if we're going to start promoting let's say, grain for purposes of creating alcohol in turn to be used for fuel. I would like to know...to make a reason judgement about what the impact is on food production and food supply, you know. I'm willing to make some choices, I

happen to believe I would rather feed people than drive around in Jack Davis' big car. Can you give me some feedback on that a little. to do what was removed by an Amendment, I would certainly be happy to support that type of legislation."

Rigney: "The reason for deleting that particular Section. This was the general powers and duties Section of the Act. What you're talking about the specific language that talks about a study, that talked about a Commission to report back to the General Assembly and so forth. Perhaps, this too would be good legislation, but it was our feeling after we had it drafted that it really did not belong in the powers and duties section of the Act. So that was the reason it was taken out by Amendment. If you would want to come back with legislation to other agencies of state government and to centralize that authority with the institute.."

Schneider: "Well, you know me, I don't like to introduce many Bills. I just think you ought to be aware of....or at least I be aware as a city person about what the impact is going to be on food and if you're talking about promoting....the use of alcohol for fuel. It is an incentive to utilize grain for that purpose, somewhere you're going to lose it. I don't know if we can hike production greater in order to satisfy both needs or not, that's my concern. I'll vote for the Bill but I think we ought to be aware of our other options and choices and concerns..."

Rigney: "You might like to know, as I understand, there has been an eight hundred thousand dollar federal grant to do a lot of this type of activity. And I think probably that will be carried out in this....in the near future." Schneider: "Okay, thanks."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would Representative Rigney, yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Bullock: "Representative Rigney, I certainly understand your need to try and centralize information on this very important subject. But, my question initially is, isn't the Department of Agriculture presently undertaking such a program."

Rigney: "I guess one of the problems with the alcohol program is that it has kind of grownup in a topsy-turvy fashion within state government. And, yes...Larry, specifically to answer your question. The Department of Agriculture does have a staff person that does relate to various farmers who have questions in this particular area. That's why the one section of the Act says, that the institute is going to be responsible for coordinating all of those various agencies of government and you will notice that agriculture is specifically mentioned."

Bullock: "Representative Rigney...Mr. Speaker, if I could address the bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Bullock: "Representative Rigney, it certainly appears laudable that you're interested in the subject at the time. But my staff analysis indicate and certainly your Amendment #1 alludes to the fact that the Department of Agriculture not only is gathering such information but that they are in fact pursuing almost identical programs that you suggest here for the Department of Natural Resources. And I would think that based on the experience that the Department of Agriculture has in this area, that what we would be doing is unnecessarily duplicating. The expertise of that department by....diverting this to a new agency that tends to have limited expertise in the area of agriculture,

particular as it relates to alcohol."

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

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney to close."

Rigney: "Well, I think what we have here is an attempt....beg your pardon.... I've had a request from Representative Robbins to close. I think perhaps I've said enough on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins to close."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been working very hard on this program of alcohol for our area. The questions that were raised on food and the alcohol is the fat of the grain. The protein which people needs comes from the....grain...the part that is left. The departments and I met this....two weeks ago Tuesday, and this was agreed by all of the departments to go ahead with this Bill, including the Department of Agriculture. So, this Bill is with agreement to put all of the coordinating agencies together and the Department of the Institute of....has the federal funds and control of federal funds so, therefore, this is the agency which should handle this and the Department of Agriculture is cooperating with them fully."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3403 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I

think in regard to this Bill, there are too many aspects of the production of gasohal not to have it coordinated under one department. I think this is actually the department that we should use, we have the energy aspect of it, we have the business aspect of it. We have the agriculture aspect, the impact on foods, it should all be coordinated under one department so that people like myself, the farmers out there can come to one area and get all the aspects of the information that they need. I suggest a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Because I am persuaded that the whole program under which we proposed to use food....use alcohol in supposed satisfaction of our energy demands will in fact deprive people of food in the world that we will have a new version instead of let them eat cake....let them eat oil. I'm going to be voting 'present' with regard to this and I caution everyone with regard to the long run impact of this entire undertaking."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite to explain her vote. The time is on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that this Bill has enough votes to pass and I'm supporting it. But, I think the record needs to be clarified that studies show that diverting corn into alcohol production in no way diminishes the food value of that corn. What we do, is to take the starches and sugars from the corn to produce the alcohol. The protein which is the pertinent part for animal feed supplements is still there, can still be utilized and I hope we soon get that message across. It is not diminishing the food supply by producing alcohol for fuel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 144 'ayes', 3 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3406. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, we're not making very much headway and I don't believe we should have anymore explanation of votes today. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. 3406." Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3406, a Bill for an Act relating to the advance disbursements of programs funded under Title Acts of Federal Social Security Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schneider...out of the record. 3421, Mr. Daniels. 3421, Lee. Out of the record. 3427."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3427, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3427 makes changes in regard to the requirements for the position of the Director of the Department of Public Health. It allows a non doctor to be director of that department and in the event the non doctor is appointed to that position. It puts into place a mechanism of a determination board to assist the director in rule making and it also provides by Amendment offered in Committee that should the non doctor leave the original requirements come back into place and the medical recommendation board is dissolved. I would respectfully request support for this measure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 3427....the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Will the Sponsor explain what the medical determination board is and what it does?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly repeat your question, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Yes. The question is will the Sponsor please explain under what circumstances a medical determination board will be established and appointed and what that board will do. What its responsibilities will be."

Peters: "Representative Dunn, you're asking why we need the board?"

Dunn, J." "Yes."

Peters: "One of the problems that has been encountered in other states, is the difficulty in finding physicians who will take the position as Director of Public Health because of basically the low salaries. A number of states, some twenty-one now have different forms that they have excepted in terms of having a Director of Public Health who is not an M.D. In eight or nine of those states they have gone to a system where you have a non M.D. plus a medical advisory board to back up the director when it comes to setting rules or regulations that relate directly to the medical....medical practice. And part of the thought there is, that any rules which might be set by a director who is not an M.D., dealing with medical matters could be subject to attack in court on the basis that he does not have the medical judgment to make that kind of determination. So the thought here is that those determinations then would be made by this board or they would end up assisting director in making those determinations. And that's followed in about eight or nine states, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Did you say that, that there is some federal requirements for establishment of such a board. I couldn't hear..."

Peters: "No. No, I did not. No, what I did say is that, some

twenty-one states now have a director who is not an M.D. And they have various combinations of trying to protect that director and making sure that sound medical judgments are made, in eight or nine of them the idea of medical advisory board is one of the things they have used and it's one of the things that has been generally agreed on here in Illinois with the people in the department of the medical community...as the way we would like to proceed here."

Dunn, J.: "What happens in the event the director and the medical review board disagree? Who wins?"

Peters: "The Review Board. Or the Medical Board."

Dunn, J.: "Yeah, okay. How can we just....who reviews the Medical Board then? Anybody?"

Peters: "I would assume that rules set down by the....they are appointed by the Governor and confirm by the Senate and I would assume that any rules that are made would be subject to the administrative rules procedures in a system that we set up here. Much the same as any other place, but let me say, Representative that the fact that a director must submit to the approval of a board is not something new here in Illinois. As an example, the Department of Registration and education detours the suspension of any kind of licenses, that has to be approved by the boards that we have set up within the department before the director can move. And it seems to me with the health facilities planning board we have the same kind of operation. So it is not something that is new in concept, it has been working and apply to other departments."

Dunn, J.: "Okay, I don't want to prolong this. I am somewhat confused, I think the examples that you've given me are situations where an administrative agency is properly charged with gathering evidence in making administrative decisions. But I think we're talking about policy here and

this looks to me like the first example I'm aware of, where state agency is placed under the control of someone who is not directly responsible to an elected official."

Peters: "The Medical Advisory Board, Representative Dunn, does not have veto power over all actions of the director. The Medical Advisory Board comes into play when the director issues a rule or regulation that applies strictly to medical matters. Now, I will grant you that in the determination of medical matters we might have some...some play and we'll have to frankly feel our way through this to see where we're going on that and to figure out how it really works."

Dunn, J.: "Okay. Well, I think this place is a number of us in the horns of a dilemma. I think we have great respect for the current director, I would like to help out that situation but I have some reservations about this program. Thank you very much for answering my questions."

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

Alexander: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Alexander: "Thank you. Representative Peters, I'm looking at the digest and I'm a little confused. It reads that, when the Medical Determination Board is created in the absence of the director being a physician, that there would be no compensation for those persons. My question is, at what point if any would...."

Peters: "Mrs. Alexander...."

Alexander: "Yes."

Peters: "I just can't hear you." Alexander: "Oh, let me talk a little louder for you. Of the Legislative Digest reflects that the Medical Determination Board shall not be entitled to any compensation or reimbursement for expenses if the

director is a license or practicing physician in medicine or surgery. My question is, in the event that the medical director is not a physician, would the Board then be entitled to compensation?"

Peters: "Yes."

Alexander: "Okay. That's what I wanted to find out. Am I correct in saying that analysis show that the compensation would be a hundred and fifty dollars a day upward to ten thousand dollars earned?"

Peters: "It's up the maximum of ten thousand, you're right."

Alexander: "And they would be immune from criminal or civil liabilities for acts or missions in connection of their duties except for willful or wantful misconduct."

Peters: "Yes, which is the normal language."

Alexander: "Thank you."

Peters: "Thank you, Ma'am."

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

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yeild?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Peters: "No."

Willer: "Representative Peters, we discussed this in Committee of course and I'm strongly opposed to this Bill but I was wondering if you would refresh my memory as to what we were talking about before. I think Representative Dunn covered it well. In the final analysis this board has the final say, is that not so?"

Peters: "In matters which deal with rules or regulations as they apply to a medical judgment. This board is constituted to assist the director in making that judgment but should there be a difference of opinion between the director and the board, the board would prevail."

Willer: "But there is....but am I not correct, there is nothing in the Bill that delineates the differences in where the

board has the final say and where it does not."

Peters: "The Bill....the exact language in the Bill, Representative Willer...."

Willer: "I have it here."

Peters: "And it says, to approve all proposed rules and regulations affecting medical operations. Now, I know that's....that's pretty wide ranging and we're trusting that with this director and with a board and a new kind of concept, that they will understand the problems of one another and we fully expect that there will be....will be some problems. And we're hoping people of goodwill will work them out."

Willer: "Well, to speak...."

Peters: "If not we'll be back here next year to make a change."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Ma'ma."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker. I think it could have been delineated in the Bill, exact powers and duties of this board. If you will notice they are all M.D's. We do not have any kind of health provider on this board other than M.D's. And that is what the doctors wanted, they will have final say over our director. I was delighted when Representative Kempiners was made director of this department, I think he is very qualified. I feel sorry for him with this kind of a board. I think that we should, if necessary, vote it down, try amend it if possible. I think we're going to rule the day and the director especially will rule the day in less than a year, if this Bill goes through as is. And I think it's a terrible posture to put him in, I do not object to an advisory board, that certainly is necessary but as written, is going to tie the hands of Director Kempiners and mark my word, I know that in one year from now, we're going to hear a lot of howls about it. I vote 'no', I commend a 'no' vote."

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

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there has been adequate discussion on this matter, I would solicit your approval of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3427 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Go vote me 'aye', please. Buzz, give me an 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in explanation of my 'no' vote. Bill Kempiners is certainly one of the more outstanding directors of this department and this Bill will go an awful long way to insure that he is in compliance with the statues. But the Bill has a second provision which causes me the same problem that the Chairman of the House Human Resources just elegantly stated. I fear that the medical determination board will have the authority to preempt the directors decision. I think this is an awful bad precedence, particular in light of the fact that the Medical Determination Board will not be confirmed by the Senate and would be no opportunity for the legislative body to really give any indication as to whether or not this board is in fact fit. And for that reason, I reluctantly vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 123 'ayes', 12 'no', 10 recorded 'present'. This

Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Winchester: "We have a very special guest, I think, on the House floor with us today that I would like to introduce to. Particularly the younger Members, some of the older Members will remember him. Particularly also we are honored to have Representative Clyde Choate on the floor too. But, my good friend C. L. McCormick from Zion, Illinois is here and many of the older Legislators will remember C. L. for his famous speeches, so let's give a good hand to C. L. McCormick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Where is the other half of that dynamic duel? Where is Choate? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Choate, thought that he would turn me around on this. There is the real reason, C. L."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome back, C. L., good to see you. House Bill 3432."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3432, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3432 would establish a statutory schedule for parent fees in the Department of Children and Family Services for services to children in foster care. It changes the fee schedule as it now exists, somewhat, by raising the maximum fee so that those of higher income levels would be paying a higher fees than the hundred dollars that they are now required to pay. The maximum

under this Bill would be two hundred and fifty dollars per month. And it does set the schedule in statutory form which is the recommendation of the Auditor General. I ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Vinson: "The effect of the Bill is to raise the fee on wealthier people?"

Pullen: "No, that is a secondary effect, the effect of the Bill is to establish a statutory maximum fee schedule rather than the....department adopted one that is not in statute."

Vinson: "But that secondary affect does occur with the Bill?"

Pullen: "Yes, it would have people at a thirty thousand dollar income level paying a higher fee than those at eighteen thousand and they are paying the same fee now."

Vinson: "Is there a higher cost associated with the care for their children?"

Pullen: "No, the fee schedule is based on the ability of the parents pay. So that those who are especially needy would not be charged unreasonable fees by the department."

Vinson: "It's a....sort of income redistribution scheme, is that right?"

Pullen: "Not at all."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. Would the Doorkeepers kindly enforce that rule. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction. In

the rear gallery is Mr. Rich Preston, the principle and his Beecher Elementary School children who are visiting us today. From the district represented by Representative Jack Davis, Harry Leinenweber and Leroy Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Now, back to House Bill 3432. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Would the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Bowman: "Would....you may have mentioned this in your opening remarks, Representative Pullen, but would you enlighten the House as to how this fee schedule which you proposed in your Bill compares to the existing fees schedule."

Pullen: "Representative, at the lower family income scale it is virtually exactly the same. The major change is that the higher income scale where it would add new categories on top of those that now exist so that wealthier people would be paying a higher fee. For example, currently, some one who has thirty thousand dollars income a year is paying the same fee, a hundred dollars as a family with eighteen thousand income. This would put new categories above that eighteen thousand to bring the maximum up to two hundred fifty."

Bowman: "I see. And one further question, I am not accustomed to seeing Mr. Rubenstein on that side of the aisle but, since he's there can I presume that the department is in support of this legislation?"

Pullen: "Yes, they are."

Bowman: "Thank you."

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

Dunn, J.: "I was distracted, Mr. Speaker, maybe the question has been answered. What change will this make, I realize the Bill says maximum but, what are the current payment levels that can be required now. How much more or less can a

family expect to pay if this becomes law."

Pullen: "I'll say it again. Currently the maximum fee is one hundred dollars per month regardless...and that's at the highest income level which kicks in about eighteen thousand so that even people with thirty thousand income would be paying the same hundred dollars and so it would raise the maximum to two hundred and fifty."

Dunn, J.: "All right. Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn. Ralph Dunn, please. All right, the Lady from Cook, Mrs Pullen to close."

Pullen: "Well, I think the Bill has been explained, Mr. Speaker. I simply ask for your favorable consideration and adoption please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3432 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Al, get me over there will you. Give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 122 'ayes', 3 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3434."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3434, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of an Act to authorize the transfer of certain state lands to the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3434 is a Bill supported and sponsored by the Department of Mental Health to clear up some legal confusion regarding park property in the City of Alton. Some years ago property was conveyed by the State of Illinois to the City of Alton in total. Two years ago,

Public Act 80-500 was passed which the attorneys for the Department of Mental Health say was improper and illegal and only clouds the title. This Bill nullifies that law and it restores the property to its original condition as it was originally intended and conveyed. It passed by the Committee 11 to nothing, it is sponsored and supported by the Department of Mental Health. And I ask for a favorable roll."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Steele: "Yes."

Getty: "I had understood that there was still negotiation going on concerning this, is that the fact?"

Steele: "No, there's not to my knowledge, Representative Getty. We've been told by legal advisors of the Department of Mental Health that there is a cloud on the title and that this measure here would clear up the legal problem that otherwise remain."

Getty: "We had a notation in our analysis that indicated the state was still negotiating the issue of the exchange and was seeking....to know that services would be provided if there was a total conveyance. That's not the fact?"

Steele: "No, there's no substance to that at this time. The property was conveyed seven, eight years ago in total, all rights and conditions were included with the conveyance. A couple of years ago there was a subsequent piece of legislation which had no legal standing. And this removes that subsequent legislation which had no legal standing and put the property back in its original condition, as originally conveyed seven, eight years ago."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from

Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf."

Wolf, Sam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3434 for all of the reasons given by Representative Steele. The property covered by this Bill contains the project that all of us in this district are extremely proud of and has been the subject of national recognition. I would sincerely urge your support of this particular legislation. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3434 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Give me an 'aye' over there, Jack. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 133 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3439."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3439, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3439 is offered by the Procurement Division of the Department of Administrative Services, it's a administration Bill. It would allow the Procurement Division to enter into multi-year contracts for purchase of coal. It's all subject to the appropriation by the General Assembly and a term not to exceed ten years. Presently, we have six Illinois Coal Companies as providing the State of Illinois with their total coal needs. Which is approximately a hundred and forty six thousands tons of coal and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman

yield?"

Winchester: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates, he will."

McClain: "Mr. Winchester, would you talk about fuel are you talking about only coal?"

Winchester: "Yes."

McClain: "Only coal."

Winchester: "Yes."

McClain: "Does it say only coal in the Bill?"

Winchester: "Well, that I don't know but I brought the question up with the Department of Administrative Services. Their only intentions is to procure coal because apparently, oil and....fuel oil and gasoline is....and the prices are escalating so quickly that they couldn't find or wouldn't be able to find any contractors who would be willing to enter into these type of contracts. So, the intentions is to purchase only coal."

McClain: "Okay. If you look at page 1, line 19, of your Bill."

Winchester: "Yes."

McClain: "It says, to exceed ten years for delivery of fuel, which is plural."

Winchester: "All right. Well, the intention is to procure only coal. If we could put the Bill over in the Senate, I can assure you that we'll amend this out to where it would read, coal. Because I was specifically told, we're only interested in a long term contract for the purchase of coal."

McClain: "Okay. I can have your word on that?"

Winchester: "You can have my assurance. Your can have my word...my assurance, my word."

McClain: "What's wrong....I trust him. I trust him. Your don't trust....Giorgi doesn't trust him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3439 pass?"

All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'.
Bruce...Bruce. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this
question there's 132 'ayes', 5 'no', 4 recorded as
'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional
Majority is hereby passed. House Bill 3465, Mr. Greiman.
Greiman, out of the record. 3469, Mr. Jaffe...out of the
record. 3470, Mr. Greiman, out of the record. 3471, Mr.
Brummer. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3471, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of
Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer.
Out of the record. What about 3472...out of the record.
3475, Mr. Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3475, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act.
Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Peters: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House, last year this General Assembly,
House and Senate, passed what is probably and is considered
now a model Act for the United States in terms of the
requirements for abused and neglected child reporting.
That Act is now being implemented and we have come up with
one problem with the Federal Government. And that is, that
according to the standards set by HEW, we have to make some
change in the definition in this Act in order to continue
to be able to receive federal funds. The change was
approved and discussed in the Human Resources Committee and
let me also indicate that the change is one that we are
still trying to work out in terms of the people working in
HEW for a more accurate definition of exactly what they

want. But in terms of the Act itself, this change is necessary, otherwise, we are in jeopardy of losing some federal funds. So, I would appreciate as would the, all of the people who worked on the Act and its implementation last year, your approval of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow. Incidentally, whoever has license number POB, his lights are on. And that's the truth. Proceed, Mr. Darrow."

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

Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Representative Peters, when does a threat become real? At what point?"

Peters: "I'm not sure, Representative Darrow, except to indicate that...that is something that is going to have to be defined by regulation once we begin to implement this portion of the Act. There's a lot of language, as you well know and a lot of statutes which we end up leaving to the regulatory agencies to interpret. The changes that we made in here were required by the attorneys in HEW, who felt that, unless these changes were made we would not be in compliance with "accepted national standards"."

Darrow: "Well, I'm not opposed to the Bill but I think we ought to have some indication of our legislative intent. What we have is a threat as well as actual impairment of physical and emotional health as child abuse and this could include such things as, telling your child, get in the house or I'll give you a licking. Something along those lines, I think we ought to have it either tied down with an amendment or have some specific ideal as to what we intend to as our legislative intent."

Peters: "Representative Darrow, I think that in terms, if we laying the record for the intent, it would certainly not be

the intent of the department nor I think of this General Assembly to prohibit any of those acts...actual threatened, real, that a normal responsible parent and community would consider to be proper in terms of rearing their child, disciplining their child. If you will, calling their child's attention to whatever particular problem may be around. There is certainly no attempt here, nor do I think this General Assembly would approve any attempt to put on any kind of super standards which would take away from the traditional rights of the parents in rearing their children."

Darrow: "Well, you would then be saying, something to the effect that the child would have to have a reasonable belief that the threat will be carried out and will be of such a nature as to cause physical or serious mental harm to his well-being. Something along those lines?"

Peters: "And I think it would probably even go further than that, Representative Darrow. That in terms of the threat part of it, it probably would have to be over some period of time as opposed to one instance. In a sense, we all fly off the handle once in a while."

Darrow: "Well, I just hope that some, do good, social worker with Children and Family Services doesn't get carried away with this and go out in the field and start charging everyone with child abuse that threatens their children for not going in...or coming in for supper or things like that. I wish we could tie it down with an amendment, but I hope this will work out. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Dunn. Who's over here that screaming? Okay."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Peters: "Representative Dunn, I'm beginning to feel that you don't like me today."

Dunn, J.: "I like you best of all and you know that. Our objective is good government. Doesn't the present Act say, that an abused child is one who is subject to either impairment of physical or emotional health, or someone who is subject to something which creates a substantial risk of physical injury. Now, if we have that in the current Act, why do we have to add anything more?"

Peters: "What is being added and again, Representative Dunn, this is based on the requirements that came down to the department from HEW. Is the inclusion of the mental aspect of possible injury to the child. So, that in response to Representative Darrow's question, we certainly would not want to take an instance of a parent saying to a child, you better not do this or you'll get a spanking. As being mental cruelty to the child, but the federal people seem to feel that there must be something in the statutes that protect the child against a series of and a prolonged kind of mental cruelty, if you will, to the child that really stops short of any kind of physical injury that you could prove in a court room. But still has a very serious effect on the child."

Dunn, J.: "I thank you for the answer and Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the Bill. Sometimes in trying to comply with the federal regulations, we do things that we really wouldn't otherwise do and might not require. And for example, whether you support the motorcycle helmet law in this state or not, you know we were told that we would lose our federal highway funds if we didn't have such a law and we don't have a law and we didn't lose our highway funds. And I think this is the same kind of situation, the current statute does provide for a charge of criminal...child abuse to be made when there is a substantial risk of physical injury. Or where there is infliction of something

which causes impairment of physical or emotional health. And I submit to the Members that that definition and standard, those definitions and standards are adequate. We need not go beyond those to cover situations and I think we'll just create more of a bureaucratic nightmare if we try to expand on the current definition in the existing law. And I would urge the Members of the General Assembly to vote against this Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker was absolutely right. He said that, there was a threat a few years ago to cut off federal highway dollars if we didn't have a motorcycle helmet law, we didn't pass it and we still have the federal highway dollars. And I have never seen a Bill that is more worth challenging the Federal Government over than this one. The Federal Government is totally, criminally wrong to tell the State of Illinois to make this change in our statute, in our definition of child abuse. There was a very good reason for the Bill that was passed last year, it enjoyed overwhelming support in this House and some petty bureaucrat is now telling us that we don't know what child abuse is. Without even given the statute an opportunity to show how well it can work. The purpose for the change in the definition last year was, so that the Department of Children and Family Services would focus on real cases of child abuse. Where children are seriously endangered and not go into nit picking nothing type of cases. This Bill will widen the definition so that people will be subject to harassment such as Representative Darrow, suggested. So that the social workers in DCFS will have their attention deflected from real cases of child abuse where children need help. The possible loss of federal funds is two hundred to three hundred thousand

dollars, I would like to see the Federal Government cut off funds to this state for the treatment and services to children because they didn't like our definitions. I don't think they would do it, I think that we would very well get away with calling their bluff and I think that the mischief that would be caused by this Bill is well worth the risk involved for three hundred thousand pieces of silver from Washington. I urge you strongly, please defeat this Bill, uphold the position that this House took last year, that children that are truly in trouble should served. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "As I read the Bill, one of the changes is to delete the word 'serious', as it modifies the word 'injury' in the existing statute?"

Peters: "Correct."

Vinson: "My concern is, will this change in anyway prohibit a parent or subject a parent to state regulations for spanking a child?"

Peters: "Representative Vinson, the answer I think is unequivocal 'no'. There is absolutely no intent or intent by this legislation or by the Act that we passed last year, to take away from the parents those rights which society has traditionally granted the parents in terms of bring up their children. What we are attempting to do, in a sense, because of the problems that we have in society today. Is to bring into the language of the law some actions that we find to be reprehensible. And in doing that we run across a very difficult task of writing a definition that takes into account the cases that we would like to cover but

still not infringe upon traditional family rights. Let me give you another example. One of the other changes that we have made here is, we have expanded the language, the definition of neglected child to include a child who is deprived of food and shelter. Now, we have children and we have cases in the state where children are not beaten, they are not physically abused. They are not sexually abused, they are not mentally abused in terms of psychological traumatic, in family kind of pressure. They're just not let into the house for two or three days. Now somehow we've got to end up dealing with this, now some people might make an argument that it's part of the parent rights to keep his kid out in the garage for three days, I'm not sure that in 1980, we would expect that or accept. But it is a difficult area that we're in and I think, you know from my traditional family background, I certainly would not espouse anything that would infringe upon traditional family value or the rights of the parents."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Marovitz: "Representative Peters, I just want to clarify something because maybe something was said on the House floor that may have been misconstrued or may I misconstrued it. Is the word 'serious', taken out of the existing legislation by this Bill?"

Peters: "Yes, Representative Marovitz and you may recall that when we had the issue brought up the first time last year you were very instrumental in making some changes in the law when we tried to define exactly what was a physical injury to a child. I mean, is a broken leg serious, is a torn ligament serious, is a cigarette burn serious. Or

what. And it became very difficult as well know, so the word 'serious', came under question as to what 'serious'. And I think again we have to go by the acceptance of what is normal and traditional, accepted standards of bring up children and over and above that would be considered serious."

Marovitz: "All right. I concur with the intent of this legislation, certainly mental abuse can as damaging and in many cases, more damaging than physical abuse and one doesn't know how threats and lack of food and proper shelter will affect this child. And certainly the experts who are far more qualified than we, should make that determination. And I whole heartily concur with the intent of this legislation and would request an 'aye' vote in support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to draw the line between protecting a child and impairing a family. I think that there is such a tendency on the part of some professionals to see stern parental actions as in implying some kind of mental harm to the child, but I believe that this would be a danger and accordingly I have to oppose the Bill as subjecting the family to some strains that I think we shouldn't move into without any adequate standards as to what, in fact, constitutes mental harm."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all vote who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 91 'ayes', 44 'no'. The Bill....Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to verify the Roll Call please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there is 91 'aye', 44 'no'. A

request has been made for a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Any request for the poll of the absentees? Verify the affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. Representative Chapman desires to be verified, is that...Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen, Representative Chapman in the center aisle desires to be verified, is that all right?"

Pullen: "Sure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Darrow recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Darrow: "Please vote me 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'present'. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, change my 'no' vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock from 'no' to 'present'. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, please change my 'no' vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun to 'present'. Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan to 'aye'. I think maybe the better way to proceed here is to proceed with the affirmative Roll Call of the affirmative Roll Call in response to the Ladies request. When we keep jumping up and changing all the time we kind of get out of phase. Verification. It is suggested that another Roll Call be taken. Representative Pullen, is that meet your..."

Pullen: "I don't see why really."

Speaker Redmond: "Well instead of going through the time on the verification, to dump it and then perhaps maybe the absentees will stay absent."

Pullen: "Well, that would be pleasant. It's up to you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Pullen: "It would be pleasant if the absentees would stay absent and it is up to you."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that's what would happen on a new Roll Call. So why don't we clear this Roll Call. And now, the question is on the...shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'aye' vote, it seems to be entirely too much is being made of...."

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

Brummer: "Yeah. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. We had taken a Roll Call, we were finished with debate and explanation of vote. The only reason we're taking another Roll Call is that it was to attempt to get a Roll Call that did not have as many absent people voted on it. And now I think it is grossly improper to go through an explanation of vote on this second Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. The question is...the question is on the passage of the Bill. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 40 'no'. Representative Peters requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt, Capuzi, Casey, Deuster, Ebbesen, Ewell, Flinn, Garmisa, Hannig, Jaffe, Klosak, Laurino, Matijevich, Molloy, Mugalian, O'Brien, Polk, Preston, Sandquist, Schisler, Schlickman, Schuneman, Slape, Stearney, VonBoeckman, White, J. J. Wolf and Woodyard."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? What is the count?"

Clerk O'Brien: "88 'ayes'."

Speaker Redmond: "88 'aye' and 40 'no'. Representative Catania. Representative Catania, 'aye'. Representative Flinn,

'aye'. Representative Karpziel, 'aye'. Representative Watson, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "92 'ayes'."

Speaker Redmond: "92 'aye' and 40 'no'. The request for verification, is that...is there anyone request...somebody requested a verification, I don't recall who it is now. Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley request a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Affirmative Roll Call. Abramson, Anderson, Barnes, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Borchers, Bower, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Conti, Cullerton, Currie, Daniels, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Epton, Farley, Flinn, Virginia Frederick, Goodwin, Hallock, Hallstrom, Hanahan, Harris, Hoffman, Huff, Huskey, Johnson, Emil Jones, Karpziel, Keane, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kucharski, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leon, Margalus, Marovitz, Matula, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McGrew, McMaster, McPike, Murphy, Neff, Oblinger, Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Pouncey, Bea, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Ronan, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Sharp, Stanley, Steczo, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Swanstrom, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tuerk, Vinson, Vittek, Watson, Wikoff, Williams, Williamson, Winchester, Sam Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Sharp...Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Sharp here? He's here."

Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry, I couldn't see him behind thing. Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ronan, he's here."

Bradley: "Krska...."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to be verified, Mr. Johnson?"

Johnson: "I want to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're on a verification, we'll get back on that one. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Who is it, Bradley?"

Bradley: "Krska."

Speaker Redmond: "Here he is. He's here."

Bradley: "Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Bradley: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Kelly recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he here? Remove him. Any other questions?"

Bradley: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe. He's down in front here."

Bradley: "McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "There's Representative McGrew."

Bradley: "Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Domico, is he here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Wait a minute."

Bradley: "I can't see if Bianco is back there or not, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He's...Bianco is back there."

Bradley: "Fine, I couldn't see him."

Speaker Redmond: "What are you pointing out? Terzich, oh, here he is. Proceed, Representative."

Bradley: "Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Bradley: "Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Cullerton here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Bradley: "Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Bradley: "Huff. I see him in front."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff is down in front here."

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Bradley: "Williamson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in front here."

Bradley: "Conti."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Conti here? There he's in the aisle."

Bradley: "Did we...."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Bradley: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the back. Representative Mautino for what purpose do you arise?"

Mautino: "I would like to change my 'present' vote to an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "To what?"

Mautino: "Aye"

Speaker Redmond: "Change Mautino from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Cullerton has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Representative O'Brien for what purpose do you arise?"

O'Brien: "I would like to be recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien, 'present'. Hannig, 'aye'. Representative Leverenz, 'aye'. Dawson, 'no'. Representative McCourt, 'aye'. McCourt."

McCourt: "Aye"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Burnidge. Burnidge, 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Johnson, 'no'. Any further changes or additions or subtractions. Representative Collins, 'aye'."

Representative Ropp, 'aye'. Any further changes, additions, deletions, subtractions, multiplications. Representative Donovan, 'aye'. Any further questions, Mr. Bradley?"

Bradley: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boom, is he recorded? What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "95 'ayes'."

Speaker Redmond: "95 'ayes'...."

Clerk O'Brien: "And...excuse me, 37 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "37 'no' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, a Member here has called the chairs to task in the order in which things have been called. So, I call on Representative Friedrich with respect to House Bill 3101. Will you tell me your grievance, Sir. Representative Conti."

Conti: "The purpose of an introduction, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery on the Democratic side we have the Academy of St. Martin. Represented by Representative Currie, Braun and Epton, Bernie Epton, up in the left-hand side. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to call 3101 for passage if that's in order. I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 3101. I guess we started at the wrong place and we left you with the starting gate, is that correct?"

Friedrich: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3101, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to establishment of medical center district in the City of Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of a series of Bills sponsored by the Legislative Audit Commission. It has to do with Chicago Medical Center. It has been amended to increase the amount of money to be retained locally to a hundred thousand dollars. It also provides for the payment of items during lapse period. This is another effort on the part of Legislative Audit Commission in corporation with the Auditor General to see that money spent by these agencies are appropriated funds and I believe now that this Amendment takes care of any problem it had. I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, when we published the schedule we said we would be in Session from 9:00 until 12:00 today. There have been three or four Resolutions filed that are of most serious moment, that challenge the possible integrity of this Body and some of its Members. There is nothing in the rules which provides for this kind of proceeding. There is, in the rules, a proceeding that in the event someone files a disciplinary petition, which is Rule 80, it provides we pass that after we have had that experience once before in which there were censor Resolution filed against a Member. Certain safeguards and certain protections were built into that rule. We don't have any such provision with respect to the Resolutions that have been filed. That rule provides that the matter will be taken up within five days. I noticed in this mornings paper that the State's Attorney of Sangamon County has

begun an investigation. In my studied judgment, and I think I am borne out by the statutes, that anything that this Body might do might very easily grant immunity to people before a criminal prosecution. It could be used as an artifice if somebody was guilty of some kind of an offense to adopt a Resolution and commence a hearing and preclude criminal prosecution from going forward. So for that reason I am going to prevail upon this Body to afford me the privilege that...Rule 80, that I will take it up within five days after its filing. I do not intend to take it up today. It would seem to me that the matter of such serious import, that every Member of this Body should be given the opportunity to be here at the time the matter is called. And you know mighty well that we do have some absentees. So that is the intention of the Chair. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would concur in just about everything that you have just said and certainly will exceed to your wishes. I would just like to point out though, that some of the Members of...and Sponsors of those Resolutions, in apparent agreement with your position, have introduced one Resolution which would merely direct the State's Attorney of Sangamon County to...to initiate the type of investigation that he has indicated that he is going to do. I think we are in accord, and I think, as the principal Sponsor of that Resolution, I think it's imperative that we, as a legislative Body, acknowledge the severity of the allegations that have been made and that's the light in which that particular Resolution was introduced. And I...as I said at the onset, I think that which you said and what I am saying are pretty much in accord and obviously we'll exceed to the desires...".

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's too dangerous to us to in any way appear to be interfering or in any way getting ourselves into the prosecutorial part of the thing. So that is the decision of the Chair."

Collins: "And we...I certainly would agree with you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, again, in keeping with your admonition, House Resolution 789, which...which would direct the Judiciary Committee to...to hold appropriation hearings, only makes that subject to the prior approval of the...whatever prosecutorial authority is involved, namely the State's Attorney of Sangamon County. So those wouldn't take effect nor would they proceed until...until the legislat...or until the testimonial immunity problem was solved."

Speaker Redmond: "In my judgment, the matter is too sensitive. Any time that you're...you're involving the prosecutorial Body, it seems to me that to do anything which might in anyway interfere with his duties, he's taken an oath... I am perfectly willing and I'm sure that every Member of this Body is willing to cooperate fully with the State's Attorney of Sangamon County if he desires to go forth. I feel it's a very delicate, I think it's a very sensitive for us to in any way, to take a step which might interfere with..."

Johnson: "Well, let me... I don't disagree and I agree with what Representative Collins said. Both Resolution 784 and 787 simply request that the, in one case, the U.S. Attorney and in the other case the State's Attorney undertake investigation of this matter. I don't know how that would interfere with it... That's fine..."

Speaker Redmond: "I've told you my feeling and I may say this, Mr. Johnson, that after we'd had that other discussion, I

don't recall whether you were a Member of the Body at the time. I don't think that you were. We asked some of the Members to consider establishing a procedure in this Body comparable to the procedure that they have in the Congress of the United States. And I would suggest that after we get through with this thing that we do it so that we know how to proceed in the future. Quite frankly, I'm feeling my way on it. I'm using as a guidestone, Rule 80, which is...we adopted for that purpose. So that's the ruling of the Chair, Sir. Representative Madigan. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "On Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "On Agreed Resolutions. Well, do they have to be agreed? I guess they do, don't they."

Giorgi: "He needs to take it home."

Speaker Redmond: "Huh."

Giorgi: "That fellow needs to take it home."

Speaker Redmond: "Who has to take it home?"

Giorgi: "Keane."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh."

Giorgi: "One of our better Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you identify some of the others."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 790, Representative Braun. 791, Keane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "House Resolution 791, commends the Beverly Area Planning Association for their 10th anniversary and Representative Braun's Resolution talks about the birth of Helen Bailey Mitchell in 1980 and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Anything

further? Any announcements? Any announcements? Any introductions, Representative Conti? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Does the Clerk require time for a perfunctory session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Do you require any time, Mr. Clerk? Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 934, Pierce. A Bill for an Act in relation to cigarette tax stamp. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1799, Cullerton. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything...do you need....how much time do you need, Mr....doesn't need any. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Will the records show that Representative Mugalian and Garmisa are excused because of illness today."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections?"

Madigan: "And Laurino. That's directly from Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "And Laurino also. Anything further? Any excused absences on the Republican side? Representative Conti for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of inquiry has been made of what kind of a week we're going to have, next week. How many pairs of shorts shall we bring. Are we going to work a full week next week?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well we work.....it depends on your....you know, on your personal cleanliness. I mean, some people can be here with one shirt. But there are others who need one every day."

Conti: "We'll work until Friday, is that your answer."

Speaker Redmond: "We work through Friday, Friday is the last day to get House Bills out of here and we've got an awful lot to do. Late Tuesday night. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to remind the

Members we're going to have our poppy day so, bring them dollars you know, so we don't hear a sound when we pass the plate....the tin plates around."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan have you moved to adjourn yet?"

Madigan: "No, Mr. Speaker. I now move that we adjourn to 12:00 noon on Tuesday."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The House now stands adjourned until 12:00 noon on Tuesday."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 16, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0059	3RD READING	PAGE	36
HB-2822	2ND READING	PAGE	8
HB-2932	2ND READING	PAGE	13
HB-3024	2ND READING	PAGE	15
HB-3027	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-3040	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-3101	3RD READING	PAGE	81
HB-3127	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-3140	2ND READING	PAGE	19
	2ND READING	PAGE	28
HB-3173	2ND READING	PAGE	23
HB-3211	2ND READING	PAGE	22
HB-3216	2ND READING	PAGE	9
HB-3291	2ND READING	PAGE	37
HB-3315	3RD READING	PAGE	38
HB-3333	3RD READING	PAGE	42
HB-3365	2ND READING	PAGE	9
HB-3401	3RD READING	PAGE	47
HB-3403	3RD READING	PAGE	48
HB-3425	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-3427	3RD READING	PAGE	54
HB-3432	3RD READING	PAGE	61
HB-3434	3RD READING	PAGE	64
HB-3439	3RD READING	PAGE	66
HB-3475	3RD READING	PAGE	68
HB-3513	2ND READING	PAGE	25
HB-3539	2ND READING	PAGE	26
HB-3540	2ND READING	PAGE	27
HB-3555	2ND READING	PAGE	36
SB-0569	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0934	1ST READING	PAGE	86
SB-1480	1ST READING	PAGE	9
SB-1506	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1521	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1524	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1557	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1588	1ST READING	PAGE	8
SB-1616	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1617	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1620	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1623	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1625	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1627	1ST READING	PAGE	3

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 16, 1980

PAGE 2

SB-1628	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1630	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1634	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1655	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1658	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1663	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1667	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1705	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1710	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1713	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1726	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1728	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1741	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1750	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1760	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1799	1ST READING	PAGE	86

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 16, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	6
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	31
EXCUSED ABSENCES	PAGE	31
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	85
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	87