

Speaker Madigan: "The House will come to order. The Members will be in their chairs. We will be lead in prayer by the House Chaplain, the Reverend Krueger."

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. Johann von Goethe wrote: I am the enemy of long explanations; they deceive either the maker or the hearer, and generally both. Let us pray. ALMIGHTY GOD, our Creator and Heavenly Father, we give to Thee our joyful thanksgiving for the manifold blessings which Thou in Thy infinite wisdom has bestowed upon us. We come to Thee, O Lord, for guidance and prudence this day as we serve as Members of this Illinois House of Representatives. Engage our minds in the pursuit of truth and equity as we consider the legislation before us; direct our temperament that we never loose sight of our objectivity; and, O Lord, dispel from us any thought of personal recognition or glory in all that we may say; that the effectual process of orderly government may be achieved both to Thy glory and the good name of the peoples of this State. We ask this in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We will be lead in the Pledge of Allegiance by Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "I Pledge Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with Liberty and justice for all."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "We will delay the Roll Call for a bit."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill number 6, Marovitz. The Bill for an Act to make



an appropriation for the Hospice for the Elderly: (664)
 Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 746,
 Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code
 of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
 Bill 767, Keane. A Bill for an Act to amend the
 Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
 Bill 884, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to make an appro-
 priation of the Department of Public Health. First
 Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 923, Griesheimer.
 A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First
 Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 927, Griesheimer. A
 Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First
 Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 963, Giorgi. A Bill
 for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading
 of the Bill. Senate Bill 964, Giorgi. A Bill for an
 Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the
 Bill. Senate Bill 1201, Leverenz. A Bill for an Act
 to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to private
 employment agencies. First Reading of the Bill.
 Senate Bill 1262, Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend
 the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
 Bill 1331, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend the
 Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill.
 Senate Bill 1377, E.M. Barnes. A Bill for an Act to
 amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. First Reading
 of the Bill. Senate Bill 1268, Woodyard. A Bill for
 an Act to amend the Illinois Drainage Code. First
 Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1335, Griesheimer.
 A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the
 Courts of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. Further
 Senate Bill First Reading. Senate Bill 133, Daniels.
 A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of
 Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill.
 Senate Bill 708, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend
 the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. First Reading



of the Bill. Senate Bill 1002, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to create the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1176, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1342, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1354, Daniels. A Bill for an Act in relation to protection of corporate names. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 514, Deuster. A Bill for an Act in relation to persons alleged as minors, otherwise in need of supervision. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1242, Daniels. A Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1260, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Financial Institution Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1328, Bower. A Bill for an Act to amend the Anti-Pollution Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Is Mr. McClain in the chamber? Representative McClain. Is he in the Chamber?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Matijeich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to which the following Bills were referred, action taken, May 30, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' Senate Bills 90, 161, 340, 489, and 549. 'Do pass as amended' Senate Bills 248 and 841.

Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Getty, do you have any excused absences?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd ask leave that Representative Roman Kosinski be excused. He is in Washington on official business."

Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that Mr. Roman Kosinski is excused for official business. Are there any excused absences from the Republicans?"



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, would you please excuse Representative Kempiners for personal illness?"

Speaker Madigan: "Let the records show that...Mrs. Barnes is seeking Mr. Polk's attention. And...Giddy Dyer. Let the records show that Mr. Kempiners is excused for official business, and that Mrs. Dyer is excused because of an illness in the family. Any other excused absences? Have all voted who wish on the Attendance Roll Call? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. McClain. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, page 2 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 269, Mr. Getty.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 269. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 269 is a Bill which is exactly identical to a Bill which came out with very strong support from the House Judiciary Committee. That was House Bill 830. And was not quite reached on the order of Third Reading last week. The Bill provides for the option, purely optional, of independent, that is outside of court, of probate procedures. It provides that this can be done if the interested party of the decedent...the representatives of the estate, the heir...wish to have independent administration. It only would be in effect for estates that do not exceed \$150,000. The purpose of independent administration is to facilitate the closing of estate and cut the enormous paperwork backlog that bother many of our probate courts. It eliminates this paperwork and saves the estates much cost and much more quickly brings to a close the estates of a decedent. The philosophy behind House Bill...or Senate Bill 269, embraces the philosophy that the owners of the estates, which are the heirs, the devisee...should control the



the estates, and this includes the executor, the creditor, or administrators who would have legitimate interest in it. How much court supervision would be required is up to these people in interest. They can have it opened at any time to full court administration, or they can keep it to the simple requirements of this Bill. I would suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this is a Bill which is very strongly supported by many of our senior citizens groups. It enjoys the support, the wholehearted support, of both Bar Associations. It is a Bill which at one time, I will tell the Members, had some criticism because of the lack of... bonding requirements. These objections have now been withdrawn. I know now of no objections to it and I would ask for a strong Roll Call on this important Bill.

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Getty, a Bill such as this, or on this subject was debated and discussed in a previous session of the Legislature and I don't think, well, obviously it didn't pass, there was considerable objection to it in various areas, including the bonding companies that I can recall, for example that the eminent...retired jurists from Cook County came down to testify strongly against the Bill several times. You're telling us that these objections have been withdrawn. Is that correct?"

Getty: "That's correct. That is my understanding. The bonding provision... do.. still required. The provisions of the Bill as it is before the Body now. Limited independent administration to estates that are below \$150,000. The original forms that were objected to would have had no limit and would have not had the



re...provisions for bonding required at all."

Leinenweber: "Alright, did...this...Bill...or this proposal...lose in Committee last session? I am having trouble recollecting what the history of the subject."

Getty: "Representative Leinenweber, the Bill that is before us, although it deals with the same subject matter, has been very very substantially changed from the Bill of 2 years ago, that you recall. The Bill that is before the Body now is identical to House Bill 830, which was heard at great lengths in both Subcommittee of Judiciary I on at least 2 and possibly 3 separate hearing dates where many of the objections were considered and met and amended into the Bill so that it came out in a manner which I believe had all objections withdrawn to it. It was then considered by the full Committee where it received a very substantial affirmative vote."

Leinenweber: "You mentioned that this is an optional procedure. Who's option is it? The testator or the heirs next of kin."

Getty: "The heirs next of kin...in other words they can be put under complete supervision...by having a creditor come in, for example, and seriously object to the independent administration. Any heir would be entitled to come in and object to independent administration."

Leinenweber: "What do you mean by seriously object?"

Getty: "Raise some meaningful objection."

Leinenweber: "Is that subject to discretion of the courts then to weigh that objection, or..."

Getty: "Well, I don't think somebody could come in with a frivolous objection. That's all I meant by that."

Leinenweber: "Well,...I'm just trying to get clear in my own mind, suppose the decedent dies owing me \$200 and I was concerned over being paid. In checking of the court dockets they found that there was no estate"



open and the checking further find that is is subject to independent...administration outside of the court. How would I go about protecting myself?"

Getty: "First of all, you would have already proved up heirship and had the will admitted. So that you as the \$200 creditor would be able to ascertain if there was an estate open. You would merely file...with the court, setting forth whatever your reasons, whether it was \$200 or \$2,000,000 that you claimed and the court could then bring in the parties and open it up to full supervision. Thank-you."

Speaker Madigan: "A question has been raised to the Chair. Mr. Clerk...Mr. Clerk have copies of this Bill been distributed? Senate Bill 269. Democrats indicate that they have been distributed. Apparently the Bill has been distributed. Is that correct? Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't raise the objection. The Sponsor of the Bill asked me earlier if I had any objection to the hearing of the Bill today, and I said no. But I simply confirmed that I don't have a copy, but I'm not raising the objection."

Speaker Madigan: "No objection had been having been raised. We will proceed with the Bill. Mr. Jaffe on the order of discussion."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Memebers of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. As Representative Getty indicated, this is the same as House Bill 830 that was before the Judiciary I Committee. That Bill had extensive hearings that went before the Probate Subcommittee, was passed out unanimously, and then came before the full Committee, and then again it passed out of Committee 11 to nothing. I must say that I believe that this is a necessary reform, that most people in the state of Illinois believe that it is a necessary reform, and I think that we ought to commend Representative Getty for his work in this particular area, and I would



urge an 'aye' vote on this particular legislation.

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Schlickman: "The Illinois...does not have the uniform Probate Act, but Illinois, in the minds of many people, has a model Probate Act. Now under that Act, if there is a will or whether or not there is a will, we first have proof of heirship. If there is a will, we have a will admitted to Probate. We have an administrator or an executor appointed. Within 60 days the administrator or executor is to file an inventory setting forth all the assets of the estate. In the mean time, there is publication for the protection of creditors. After 6 months, the estate can be closed by the filing...of an account. This is a very simple procedure, and as I indicated previously, a model procedure in the minds of a number of people. And I simply ask you what is the nature of the reform that is contained in Senate Bill 269."

Getty: "The nature of the reform is that a shortened version of the things which you indicated would be provided for. The estate would be opened by proving up heirship and having the will admitted. The estate would be closed upon the filing of a simple varified report indicating that all the proper steps of the estates administration had been performed. And the requirements as presently are in our law concerning a Probate Bond or Surety would...as they currently are would continue to apply. In addition, I would again restate that at any time, any party in interest has any objection, would like to raise some contest, the entire thing could be opened up to full court supervision. This might be termed as the Rerform Act would have it, a limited court supervision."

aniels: "Isn't it true...excuse me..."



Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Daniels arise?"

Daniels: "Sorry to interrupt, but we've had a lot of people come over here asking questions on this Bill, including parts of our leadership, and we would respectfully request of the Sponsor if he could take this out of the record so we could discuss it further. Representative Stiehl has some questions. Representative Conti, Representative Leinenweber, myself, we would like to talk to you further before you proceed with this."

Getty: "This is identical, Representative Daniels, to... House Bill 83..."

Daniels: "No, it's not..."

Getty: "...which came out."

Daniels: "...because there are differences in here. The 150 level is different."

Getty: "The 150,000 level?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Getty: "That is exactly as this Bill was amended..."

Daniels: "That was put on in the House on the floor. Right?"

Getty: "That is correct. It was the same as House Bill 830 was as it stood on Third Reading."

Daniels: "We would like further opportunity to look at it. The Bill was discharged from Committee without our support. I...support the Bill. Some people have questions on it. We just got our analysis, if that would be alright with you."

Getty: "Representative Daniels, I have no objections to taking it out of the record. Possibly we could even get back to it today. Thank-you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be taken from the record. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 586. Mr. Vinson."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 586. A Bill for an Act amending sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a transfer appropriation...transfer authorization for the Governor's Office of Manpower. Now...in Committee... in the Committee for appropriations, when the full Bill for the next fiscal year comes up, it is going to receive the closest possible scrutiny and portions of that office may, in fact, not be funded if the will of this House is going to be worked. I would urge people not to take out their justifiable emotions and feelings on this particular Bill. As I say, this is simply a transfer authorization for the current fiscal year which corrects the mistake in the original Appropriation Bill from last year. What this one does is to permit contributions to be made thru the appropriate retirement funds for people already placed in CETA jobs. It was assumed that they would be placed in state employment. They were not. They were placed in university employment and to make the contributions to the appropriate retirement system for those individuals, this Bill is required. At the appropriate time we can do what is necessary with the Governor's Office of Manpower. I would suggest that that's...this is not the appropriate time, and we should adopt this Bill, and I would urge it's adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There be no further discussion. The question is shall Senate Bill 586 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?...Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 6 'nos', 3 voting present, and Senate Bill 586 having received the Constitutional majority is here by declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 668. Mr. Terzich."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 668, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation of the Illinois Public Employees Pension Laws Commission. . . Third Reading of the Bill."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 668 is a deficiency appropriation for the Pension Laws Commission, also the Law Revision Commission of total amount of \$15,000. There is approximately... over 200 requests for pension benefits. The Pension Laws Commission had to make a number of trips downstate for their meetings. All of this involves interstate travel and there is also the hiring of one additional actuary which caused a deficit, and I would appreciate your support of Senate Bill 668."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Friedrich: "Is there \$5,000 in this for Law Revision Committee?"

Terzich: "Yes, I mentioned that, Representative."

Friedrich: "Alright, is this \$5,000 for additional travel or is this for 'Harry Finns'. I...understand..."

Terzich: "No, no, no. We had a very small amount, I believe it was less than \$2,000 for...travel expense. We're on a very small budget of \$30,000, and we had a number of trips because of the...we had approximately 80 and 90 Bills, and all of this is for interstate travel."

Friedrich: "That's \$2,000, but what about the 'Harry Finns' part...where...does..."

Terzich: "There is nothing in there. This is all for travel. 'Harry Finns' is... set on a contract basis, and...this has all been in the..."

Friedrich: "I didn't understand your answer."

Terzich: "I said Mr. Finns, our legal counselor, is on a contractual basis, and none of this is for any additional salaries."



Friedrich: "What is the amount of the money he is being paid on contractual service?"

Terzich: "I believe his salary is \$12,000."

Friedrich: "Is that on a part time basis?"

Terzich: "I wouldn't call that part time. Mr. Finns contributes a substantial amount of hours involved with this Commission. I know for a fact that just on the... one set of Bills he put in over 100 hours of his time. We've had approximately 80 or 90 Bills, and whatever the amount that Mr. Finns receives, it is a very inadequate amount for the amount of work that he produces."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eslick."

Eslick: "Well, my problem with this is that the revisionary process was carried on for 100 years by the Legislative Reference Bureau, and I'm trying to figure out why we keep adding money to this Commission for...to do the same thing is duplicatory."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Would Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Wolf: "Okay Bob, I don't want to hold this up for you, but did you say that there is an additional actuary hired by the Commission?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. 'Sander' Goldstein, I believe, was added on to the staff, and Mr. Goldstein has been at all of our meetings and it's caused travel and so on. This is one part of the deficiency."

Wolf: "Okay, I'm not going to hold this up now, because the budget is coming to Appropriations next week. We'll talk about it then."

Terzich: "With the main Appropriation Bill?"

Wolf: "Right."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?"



There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 668 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye', 23 'no', 5 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 668 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. All right, on the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1266. Is Mr. DiPrima in the chamber? Mr. DiPrima? Take this Bill from the record."



Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 944, Mr. Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 944. A Bill for an Act to amend the fiscal year '79 appropriation for the State Fire

Marshal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters. Excuse me. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the agreements made yesterday I would ask leave to have House Bill 944 brought back to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of an amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for purpose of amendment. Is there leave? Leave being granted the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Pullen. Amends Senate Bill 944 on page one by deleting line one and two and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who's the sponsor of the amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Madigan: "Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 would remove from the supplemental appropriation for the State Fire Marshal, \$20,000 which was inserted into this Bill in the Senate for activities related to international year of the child which is a U.N. promulgated activity for which there has been a task force appropriated in the State of Illinois. This appropriation was attempted to be tacked on to a Bill last December which this House did not approve because of the appropriation and I do not believe that it is appropriate to have this appropriation in this extremely important, urgent Bill for the State Fire Marshal, and I move the adoption of amendment #1 to remove this appropriation."

Speaker Madigan: "The lady moves for the adoption of amendment



#1. Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I just wonder if it would be possible for you to gavel the Assembly to order sir and ask Mrs. Pullen to repeat her explanation of the amendment. I think a lot of people missed it and it's very important."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson requests that Miss Pullen explain the amendment again. And would the Membership please give their attention to Miss Pullen. Please give their attention to Miss Pullen. This amendment will dramatically affect the future of State Government. Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "I'm very pleased that the Chair recognizes the gravity of this matter. The Bill is for a supplemental appropriation of the State Fire Marshal which are told is very urgent. The Senate put into the Bill \$20,000 for activities related to International Year of the Child which the U.N. promulgated activity in which the Governor of this state decided to participate without any involvement of the Legislature. Last December he attempted to put this type of appropriation into another Bill in a Conference Committee report which this House did not approve because of that appropriation being in there. This amendment would remove that appropriation which is inappropriate to this Bill and might injure its chance of passage even though it needs to be signed by the Governor no later than tomorrow in order to be truly effective and the amendment also adds the effective date that would take effect immediately upon its becoming a law. I move the adoption of the amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Just a parliamentary inquiry regarding the germaness of... I realize a appropriation Bill can be amended with another appropriation but I'd like a ruling on that if that's correct we have a Fire Marshal's Appropriation with another department appropriation amendment attached



to it in the Senate."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley, the Clerk informs me that the amendment in question was adopted in the Senate and it's the opinion of this Chair that that question is not properly before the House. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the sponsor of the amendment yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Friedrich: "Is there any conceivable connection between the Year of the Child and the Fire Marshal's office? I can't figure out why there should be."

Pullen: "Absolutely none."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kane:"

Kane: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Kane: "Is your objection to participating in something having to do with the United Nations and based on some kind of ideological feeling or is it based on some particular usage of the money?"

Pullen: "I think that it is inappropriate for us to be making this appropriation. It is unnecessary. The task force has been operating for several months without an additional appropriation and I leave it to any Member to vote on this on the basis of his own philosophy or reaction to this kind of thing."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would reluctantly rise to oppose a Member on our side of the aisle in regard to this amendment, but I fully believe that the money will be put to good use and proper use by the state. It is an appropriation of \$20,000 for the, really the Office of the Child Advocate in the State of Illinois to participate in various programs to engage in various public gestures, so to speak, draw attention to the problems of child abuse, the



need for immunization of children, the need for education of children. It seems to me it's money well spent and I would oppose the amendment to withdraw this money."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, I join the Minority Spokesman of Appropriations II and urge all the Members to vote against this amendment. We all know that it is really not compatible with the Bill in its present form, although; we also know you can put all kinds of appropriations on other measures and so forth, but I would urge the Members to treat the sponsor of this amendment much like she's treated everybody that has handled an appropriation measure. If we followed her lead, government would stop today and, and I think that as much as we all know that there may be some excesses in government, we must operate so, therefore; I would urge a resounding no and then maybe one of these days she'll find out she has to vote yes too."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "I rise on a point of order. I think the rules in the decorum of this House restrict us from engaging in personalities and I don't think that the remarks directed toward the conduct of the sponsor of this amendment have any relevance to the merits and I would ask that the Chair rule that we refrain from making personal remarks about other Members. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair will ask all Members to please confine their remarks to the issues and to avoid the invocation of personalities into the debate. Mr. Barnes:"

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to echo the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriations Committee I concur with his assessment of this amendment and with the situation at hand. This issue was looked into in some depth in the Senate where this amendment was added to this particular Bill and it is of emergency nature. We're trying to get



these measures down to the Governors Office no later than tomorrow if at all humanly possible. I would concur with Representative Peters and his directions to our colleagues here in the House to oppose the move on the part of this amendment to delete this provision from this Bill. It's much needed. We... They had the whole debate and discussion in the Senate. I think we should concur with the Senate action and I would ask the Members of the House to oppose the amendment, amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk to the Bill. I did ask we have an inquiry of the Chair but it appears that we're running into the power of the Committee Chairman of the Appropriations, both Appropriations Committee. I have a similar amendment to the one being offered by Representative Pullen and the reason I have that amendment in this time, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is they held a convention in the Year of the Women last year in the Bloomington- Normal area. Never did we do so little for State Government at least the image of State Government as happened at that particular convention at least in my district from the repercussions throughout the district in the way in the manner in which that convention was held in so far as the fairness towards some women as opposed to others. It was, at least from the news media and the women that I knew that went out and tried to participate in the convention, it was a very one-sided convention and, therefore; if that... those dollars that were appropriated to that convention were very similar to the appropriation we're seeing here today, it's certainly not needed to hold any more conventions in the Bloomington-Normal area for those type of one-sided conventions and that's why I put the amendment in to delete the \$20,000. If that's what these dollars are going for then I'm certainly opposed to them and I know



that the Members of the House if they were aware of the type of the convention that was going on in so far as the fairness to some members as opposed to others and the ability of some to participate in the convention as opposed to others and the new media reports are the same. We would be supporting Miss Pullen's amendment to delete the \$20,000."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this good amendment. At a time when our citizens at home are asking us for tax relief, it certainly isn't the time to come up with a new commission and something that can be done by us in the Legislature. Thank-you. I urge your support of this amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to clarify... in response to a remark made by Representative Bradley, not one penny of state money went into the International Women's Year Conference in Bloomington-Normal. But that is only just one point where Mr. Bradley does not have his facts straight. Bus loads and bus loads of people who have represented the minority were bussed, if you'll excuse the expression, into Bloomington-Normal with these federal...with these federal dollars. So, Mr. Bradley may live in Bloomington, but he doesn't have his facts straight on the International Women's Year Conference. I hope you'll vote 'no' on this amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Having concluded the debate... For what purpose does Mr. Telcser arise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, simply reaffirming what the last speaker said, she's absolutely right. It wasn't... our money, the government paid for it."

Speaker Madigan: "Having cluded the... having concluded... the debate, Miss Pullens who closed... Miss Pullens."

Pullens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the



the Members of this House about International Women's Year, because we all know what happened at International Women's Year, and now this is International Year of the Child, which is brought to us by the same people that brought us International Women's Year, but this one will involve people who have less opportunity to speak for themselves. It was very nice that there was no state money involved in last year's events. I think that we should keep it that way. The Gentleman who spoke about the urgency of this appropriation and urged the defeat of this amendment, because this appropriation is so important and must be delivered to the Governor's desk tomorrow, I would ask you to keep in mind that if this money stays in, that very well might delay it going to the Governor's desk, because I think it will certainly cloud the issue. If we can adopt this amendment, then we can address the issue of the need for the supplemental appropriation for the State Fire Marshal. There are several weeks left. Perhaps they can find some other place to put this money, but I don't think that it should be on this Bill. And if you care about children, I strongly urge you to vote 'yes' for this amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is 'shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 944 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to allay the fears of some of the people, I have a calendar of events which are being presented by this appropriation. We...we're talking about a program from the Piatt County Mental Health..."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose is Mr. Brummer arised?"

Brummer: "I think the Gentleman who is speaking spoke in debate and is...the rules preclude him in speaking in explanation of vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Your point is well taken, Mr. Brummer.

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Deuster you spoke



in debate also, didn't you? You were on your feet. Mr. Steele to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker. I rise to urge 'yes' votes on this amendment. To keep this Senate Amendment in is really wasting the tax payers money in my view, and it might very well jeppardize an otherwise good Bill. I would urge 'yes' votes on the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of the Amendment primarily for the fact that I think we're getting off on a bad precedent if we add to Bills all kinds of Amendments that are really not germane to what the real intent of the original Bill is. And I think that had it been better been wiser to have a separate piece of legislation dealing with this particualr issue, and we would deal with it. For now, what we're about to develop is a program where who knows what kind of Amendment will be on every swinging Bill that comes through this Body, and I urge a favorable vote on this to prevent that from happening."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Neff to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote I would like to see more green lights up there. I think what we're doing here is proper, and it's been brought out here by the lady that we were...there's no tax payers money being spent. I hope that we all realize that whether it's federal or state money, that money comes out of the same pockets, and I get discouraged sometimes to hear people say 'Well there's no state money, but it's federal money'. I would hope that we would give more green lights up here on this Amendment because we're affecting the Bills here with an Amendment on it that shouldn't be on this particular Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Macdonald to explain her vote."



Macdonald: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Wishing not to get in the middle of a debate of International Women's Year, and what did or did not happen, I think this is a matter simply of dollars and cents and the fact that it does not...the appropriation does not, in this particular Appropriation Bill and I really do have some reservations about the state funding this particular issue at all. I think there are a number of other ways that we, in Illinois, can address ourselves to the Year of the Child by meaningful legislation to protect children, to protect families, and to protect those whose fathers are failing to pay alimony. And there are a number of other ways that we can address ourselves to help children, but I do think this a waste of taxpayers money, and for that reason I am supporting your...Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Borchers to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, again as it has already been stated, what I am interested in is saving money, and this is a useless expense for the people. All this money is our money out of our pocket, yours and mine and all the people we represent. It's just sensible not to waste money, and this is a waste of money."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hudson to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that...Representative Pullen should be commended in this case for...acting as a...in a sense...a sort of watchdog on this particular expenditure of money. It would seem to me that we as State Legislators might consider whether it is proper to appropriate...taxpayers money as a sort of a knee jerk reaction in result of some action that the United Nations has taken. Now the United Nations has got plenty of problems. It has got plenty of problems of it's own. And if we are going to react to every



proclamation that the U.N. puts out, then Lord knows they put out some hairbrained ideas. But if we are to react in...in our states and spent money every time they come out with a proclamation, we're going to go... eventually going to go broke. I think this is a marvelous chance to not only protect this Bill which is needed, but a chance to save a few dollars here in the state of Illinois. And we can...we can eliminate the \$20,000, and believe me it will never be missed. And I would urge all of you to consider if you're voting red, to reconsider and vote green."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, there is a number of ways that we can speak to this proposed Amendment to withdraw the Senate Amendment #1, but, you know, in the last week this House suspended rule after rule after rule and created true chaos on Friday. And I only suggest to the Membership today, can you think of any suspension of rule that is so far out of reason as taking an Appropriation for the State Fire Marshal's Office and appropriating money by Amendments to the Department of Children and Family Services for a function of the International Year of the Child. If we want to throw this House into total chaos, then we should leave this Amendment on there. If we want to follow some degree of uniformity, some degree of rules, some degree of germaneness, then we must remove this. It is truly a terrible Amendment. It just doesn't belong on this Bill. Let the Sponsor of this Amendment, whoever it was in the Senate, come forward with their own Bill. I think a 'no' vote is the only appropriate...or a 'yes' vote is the only appropriate vote for this particular Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes'."



79 'nos', no voting present. For what purpose does Mrs. Chapman arise?"

Chapman: "A verification, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Chapman, could you repeat your request?"

Chapman: "...I would ask for a verification of the affirmative vote, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Would you like to poll the absentees first?"

Chapman: "Yes, please."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall poll the absentees. The... Chair recognizes Mr. Dunn. Ralph Dunn wishes to change his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Would the Membership please maintain some semblance of order. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, kindly change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Change Mr. Lechowicz from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Dawson, did you seek recognition? Proceed with the...Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Getty as 'no'. Mr. Domico."

Domico: "Record me as 'aye', please."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Domico as 'aye', from 'no' to 'aye'. Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified as 'yes' at this time, as I have to go to the hospital."

Speaker Madigan: "Verify Mrs. Kent as 'yes'."

Kent: "Thank-you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell. Please record Mr. Ewell as 'aye', from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Vitek. Change Mr. Vitek from 'no' to 'aye'. There are several requests for a change of vote, and the Chair suggests that we take a new Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, take a new Roll Call... new Roll Call. No explanation of vote, just the Roll Call. New Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. The question is 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 944 be adopted?'



all those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recognized."

Speaker Madigan: "You're going to win, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Madigan: "You're going to win."

Collins: "I hope to win. I just want to make a point that Mrs. Kent was given leave to be verified, and I hope..."

Speaker Madigan: "And the leave will permit that she now be recorded as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 92 'aye', 59 'no', no voting present. For what purpose does Mr. Peters seek recognition?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, this is...the Appropriation for the Fire Marshal, and I just want to indicate when it's moved back to Third, I have no intention of having this Bill called."

Speaker Madigan: "Ninety-two 'ayes', 59 'nos', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bradley. Amends Senate Bill 944 on page 4 by deleting lines 3 thru 13."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley withdraws #2. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Any...for what purpose does Mr. Peters arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, that's now in order, I move to table Senate Bill 944."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table Senate Bill 944. Is there leave? Objection has been raised. Does the Gentleman move to table the Bill? Mr. Peters moves that Senate Bill 944 be tabled. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. The Membership should be aware that this requires a simple majority, more 'ayes' than 'nos'. Have all



voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes', 55 'nos', 1 voting present, and the Gentleman's motion that Senate Bill 944 be tabled carries. The Bill is tabled. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1266. Mr. DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1266. A Bill for an Act to make a supplemental Appropriation of the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave that this Bill be placed on the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Is there leave being granted? The Bill shall be placed on the order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk. Mr. DiPrima, the Clerk informs me that an Amendment has just been...Okay..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Bower, amends Senate Bill 1266 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an emergency supplemental appropriation for the Department of Public Health. It has already been passed by the House once, but it is necessary that this be submitted again to correct some technical errors in the original Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that question, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Schlickman: "You indicated that you were changing the title, and I'm wondering what the nature in the change of the title is."

Bower: "It merely adds in the Department of Public Health supplemental."

Schlickman: "It adds in the Department of Public Health?"



Bower: "Supplemental. That's what this Amendment is. As I say, it passed originally through the House, but there were some technical errors regarding the misnumbering of sections. And this is merely to correct that."

Schlickman: "Okay, I think I know what it's about. Thank-you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I was looking at the digest on Senate Bill 1266, and I'm wondering if we don't have a misnumbering on the Board. Are we...1266, according to the digest deals with the Department of Veteran's Affairs and the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bower."

Bower: "That is correct. This is an Amendment that will put the supplemental on this Bill. As I say again, this was already once passed through the House, but it is necessary that it be resubmitted to correct technical errors in the misnumbering of Sections in the original Bill."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield? What is the amount of the supplemental for the Department of Public Health?"

Bower: "3 million, 488 thousand, 100 dollars. The same amount that was originally passed. This is for payroll."

Brummer: "Does this have anything to do with the...does the supplemental have anything to do with...some of the alleged scandals that were recently...uncovered with regard to the 'WIC' program in the Department of Public Health?..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?"

Brummer: "I'm waiting for an answer to my question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bower."

Bower: "As I say, yes it does."

Brummer: "Would you explain the Amendment then. Since it has to do with that scandal that was uncovered, I'd like to know what we're doing with regards to supplemental



appropriations concerning that agency and that program."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker,...Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative Peters on that question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Representative Brummer, this Amendment was discussed, this Bill was discussed once before. It went to the Senate, and the Senate found that there were technical errors in the Bill itself as prepared by the Senate, and in the Amendment. This appeared to both sides of the House, both sides of the isle to be the best way to resolve the particular problem. The Department of Public Health needs this Amendment passed by June 4, or they are not going to get paid. In regards to your specific question...in regard to your specific question, the Appropriations Committee had hearings on the alleged improprieties and the awarding of contracts in the Department of Public Health for several weeks. One of the recommendations that was made by the Department was that the Legislative Investigating Commission looked into the awarding of the contract as is the U.S. Department of Agriculture, HEW, and the Auditor General. In view of the fact that some improprieties may be uncovered, it is necessary, should the present contractor not fulfill his obligation, that we continue the program of providing the coupons to the women and infants in this feeding program for children. If this appropriation is not passed, that program comes to a halt. If it is your desire to vote 'no' or to halt the 'WIC' program, that is entirely your decision. That is the reason both sides of the isle, both staffs, and both Representative Barnes and myself have approached a solution of the matter in this way. Hopefully, dispassionately, quietly, and in solving the problem, rather than making it a big tumult, which it appears to be being made."

Brummer: "Who is going to administer the 'WIC' program?"



"I take it that you aren't going to have the...individual, with whom the... contracts were involved administering the 'WIC' program, who is going to administer the 'WIC' program for the distribution of the coupons and so forth..."

Peters: "The Department...the Department of Public Health administers the 'WIC' program. The contractor...who entered into agreement with the Department of Public Health was to provide the data necessary through collection of that data in various communities and making an assessment determination of how many women are eligible, how many children were eligible, and to provide the computer programming to keep tabs and keep checking on it. That contract is a contract that is in question. That contract is the one which we are not certain that the contractor is going to be able to fulfill on. In the event, again, that he does not fulfill on it, we are going to be left with no information, and no program, and no way to distribute the coupons to some estimated 43,000 women in the state. The \$200,000 is in there for that contingency. Who that program will then be awarded to, I have no idea. I would assume it would have to go out immediately for a bid and a determination by the department."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I have a small question of the Sponsor. With regard to the 'WIC' program, has the state completed or signed a contract with Cook County so that that money can now pass through and go to the grocery stores that have submitted the claims?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Representative Leverenz, I am...not certain. I can not give you a positive answer. As far as I know, the 'WIC' program does not go to the various stores. It is...they are coupons provided through the various health departments to women for use. And that program is in



existence in the city of Chicago. But you're talking about some expansion, and I'm not familiar with what you might be referring to."

Leverenz: "I'm talking about the current 'WIC' program that is run by Mr. Hughes, who operates...is the executive director of CEDA, C-E-D-A in Cook County. That program is managed by them and Mr. Hughes refuses to sign that contract, I understand, so that the grocery stores that are processing the coupons are not getting reimbursed and have not been reimbursed since December 31, '78."

Peters: "Representative, I am...I am not familiar with the... the information that you bring. I will be happy to have the staff look into it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank-you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again to echo the Minority spokesman. This is, in fact, this amendment is taking care of technical error that develops in the Public Health Appropriation that went through the House here, through our Committee. We discussed this both with the Senate staff and with the Senate appropriation head and decided that this was the best manner and to correcting that error that had occurred. That's all involved here. There is other questions that have been brought up, but I think we should try to address ourselves to exactly what this Amendment is doing. And this Amendment, in fact...in fact is only making the corrections of the error that went through that was not caught until it got over into the Senate and this Amendment is merely correcting that error. Representative Peters is absolutely correct, there were some other issues that were brought up here, but if this error is not corrected as of June 4 of next week coming up, there will simply be no fund...no fund to keep this current program moving. That's all this Amendment is addressing itslef to. It does not address anything else, and I think we should act on this Amend-



ment based on it's merit. Any other questions relative to the 'WIC' program or relative to the Department of Health can be cleared up at some later time. This is merely insuring that the current 'WIC' program and all of the problems that revolve around that certain contract that was involved here during the spring, that that would have some continuity and that it would continue to function. That's all this Amendment does. We should address that Amendment and should support that, because, in fact, we are merely trying to correct an error."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "The Sponsor yields to a question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Ewell: "This \$3,000,000 doesn't really have anything to do with the Department of Veteran's Affairs scholarships, does it?"

Peters: "This department has nothing to do with the Department of Veteran's Affairs scholarships. Representative Ewell...I'm sorry, go ahead."

Ewell: "Is this one of the modern miracles known as flexible Legislation?"

Peters: "Representative Ewell, you and I have been here a little period of time, and you well know that when we come in certain times of the year there's only certain ways that we can get certain things accomplished. It is entirely within the rules to lump Appropriation Bills together. We have done it in the past and this is the only sensible way to do this."

Ewell: "I agree, and I am totally with you, but I just didn't want to shock the sensibilities of the freshman who are here. And we have to sort of ease them into it. Thank-you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank-you. Would the Sponsor yield for question, please?"



Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Van Duyne: "Representative Peters, you know in Committee.

This, by the way, if I can voice a mild protest, this is exactly the reason why they should not have bypassed our Committee. Because we had..."

Peters: "Excuse me, this Bill did not bypass Committee. We heard it in Committee, and we...Public Health...and we heard it in Committee. It was voted on House floor and passed on to the Senate..."

Van Duyne: "Okay, then the supplementary is the Senate Bill."

Peters: "No,...and we passed the supplemental here. We did that here. What had happened is that when it got to the Senate, when the House Bill got to the Senate, they found that there were technical errors in the Bill itself and in the Amendments which we put on..."

Van Duyne: "Then they're trying to correct this through a Senate Bill."

Peters: "We are trying to correct this by phrough putting the Bill through the entire process rather than having a nonconcurrence and Conference Committees going back and forth. We are going to simplify the procedures..."

Van Duyne: "As you know...as you know the House Bill version we have terrific amount of conversation about contractual services where 75% of the money is going for the contractor himself. He didn't put these things..."

Peters: "Representative Van Duyne, if I might interrupt, this is exactly the same Bill we passed in the House, exactly, 100% the same, exactly the same. All that has been corrected in here is some wrong line items that were made in error. The amounts are the same, the purposes are the same, the totals are the same."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion. There be no further discussion. The Sponsor of the Amendment will close the debate. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would just, along with Representative Barnes, appreciate an affirmative Roll Call."



Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1266 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all vote who wish? Have all vote who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', no 'nos', no voting present, and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1266 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 248. Mr. Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 248..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to suspend Rule 33A and Rule 8 to move Senate Bill 248 to the order of Second Reading, second Legislative day, immediately. This is a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Transportation that has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and with Chairman Matijevich of Appropriation #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf, I believe we should inform the Membership that this Bill was just read in a Committee report from a meeting of the Committee yesterday, Appropriations #1, and now you have moved to place this Bill on the order of Second Reading, second Legislative day?"

Wolf: "Yes, the Bill was heard in Committee yesterday and recommended 'do pass'."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "May I assume there's no money in here for the Franklin Street subway or the O'Hara extension of the CTA...or RTA?"

Speaker Madigan: "You're right on the first two. On the second, there is RTA money which has to be appropriated. The money has been already collected."



Matijevich: "I object."

Speaker Madigan: "There is an objection. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the money that Representative Skinner objected to are monies that are in the Governor's budget as though...the amount that's left over in the... transportation fund which, by law, must be appropriated to the Department of Transportation for use by the RTA. Not that they can use the amount of money, but it must be appropriated in that fashion. So there's nothing devious about it. It's got to be done. This Bill is an urgent Bill and must be passed. And what Representative Wolf is trying to do...it's gone through Committee, and he's trying to put it in shape that it can be passed tomorrow, and I would urge the Members to support Representative Wolf on his motion to put it on Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Parliamentarian please come to the the podium?"

Skinner: "I have a question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I've been hearing this...this verbage from the administration and defenders of the RTA for too many years. The verbage goes this way, if I may put it in the terminology of the Governor's famous chalk talk. He talks about nondiscretionary increases in expenditures which can not be altered by the General Assembly. Those nondiscretionary expenditures always include the extra money that we are dumping in the Regional Transportaion Authority. Well, I'd like to suggest that we do have a choice. We don't have to give money to the RTA just because the state law now says that that money automatically goes to the RTA before it gets to the State Road Fund, or before it gets to the State General Fund. We can pass a law which says



that money will go to potholes, or it will go to protect railroad grade crossings, or it will go to build Route 51. All we have to do is say no to the Appropriation Bill and change the authorization language. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question to tell us how much money is at stake here, and I presume it would be a House Amendment. How much money will be going to the RTA because of this Bill, Representative Wolf?"

Speaker MADigan: "Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the last Gentleman who spoke for it doesn't want to vote for it on Third Reading, I suggest that we do that. If you don't want to vote for it, don't vote for it. All we're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is..."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, could the question be answered? He may argue to his point later."

Wolf: "What was the question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf."

Skinner: "I would like to know how much money is going to the RTA and from what sources. How much is from the Roads Fund, and how much is from the General Fund?"

Wolf: "Eight million, five thirty, and it's all from the Public Transportation Fund. This is earmarked money for the Public Transportation Fund."

Skinner: : "Alright, how much of that money came from sales tax money, and how much of it came from license fee money? ...Before it got to the Public Transportation Fund..."

Wolf: "I am advised it's all sales tax money."

Skinner: "It's all sales tax, alright let me continue my argument if I may. When the RTA was passed in 1974, the state of Illinois made a very significant policy decision. We decided that mass transportation was more important than education. Now you haven't heard that perhaps if you are new in here, but that's...



indeed what the decision was all about. We decided that we were going to fully fund the RTA through this formula of nondiscretionary money, but we weren't going to fully fund education. Education has been shorted as of a year ago, the last time I had the staff update the analysis...has been shorted by exactly the amount that went to the RTA, plus 50 million dollars. That is, the money that went to RTA would have gone to fully fund the state education formula each and every year since 1974, and \$50 million would have been left over. Now that is a lot of money. It averages over \$100 million a year out of the State General Fund. What Representative Wolf is sponsoring here, and I know Representative Wolf was not a proponent of the Regional Transportation Authority, and I am embarrassed for him...to have him sponsor the Bill, is that we should take \$8.5 million out of the General Fund, that is...it never made it to the General Fund. It was siphoned off the General Fund and went into the Public Transportation Fund before it ever made it to the General Fund. Right out of sales tax collections, we should give the RTA another \$8.5 million to pour into the bottomless tunnel of programs. It seems to me we have significant choices to make on this Bill. One of the choices will be on Third Reading, as Representative Wolf points out, but another choice can be made today, and that is to let the Bill just wait another day. The longer we make the RTA wait for it's money, the more they're going to sweat, and the more they might come up with services to areas which were promised service during the RTA referendum. So I would hope that the Gentleman's motion to advance without... to advance immediately would be rejected for the reasons I have stated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf moves to suspend Rule 8 and 33A which would suspend the requirements of a supplemental calendar and also would move the Bill to the order of Second



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Reading, Second Legislative Day. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The...Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Vote...how many votes does this take?"

Speaker Madigan: "This will require 89 votes. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 38 'nos', 2 voting present, and the motion carries. The Bill shall be placed on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. The Clerk shall read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 248. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation. Amendments 1,2, and 3 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Has the Bill been read a second time? The Bill shall be placed on the order of Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 1266. Mr. DiPrima."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1266, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Department of Veteran's Affairs, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes Sir, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is of emergency nature, and it contains appropriations for the Public Health on this Amendment #1, and 25 thousand appropriations for the Department of Veteran's Affairs supplemental appropriation it is, and 2 million 800 thousand for the Department of Banks. Would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Totten. Would the Parliamentarian come to the podium?"

Totten: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker. I am not opposed to hearing this, but I think we have to suspend a rule in order to hear a Bill that...wasn't this on Second Reading prior."



Speaker Madigan: "Do you so move?"

Totten: "I so move...Suspend the appropriate rule so that we can hear..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Totten has moved to suspend the appropriate rule to hear this Bill immediately. The Bill having been amended today. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 140 'aye', 3 'no', no voting present, and the rules are suspended to permit the consideration of this Bill on Third Reading. The Bill having been amended on Second Reading today. Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes Sir, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I explained the Bill system a moment ago, I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that Senate Bill 1266 pass. Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members, with particularly emphasis on the part that has to do with the commissioner of banks. This is a setting up procedure where the banks, the supervisor of banks, will be paid solely by the banking industry. And I think it is a step in the right direction beginning this revolving fund. I'd appreciate your vote, too."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to address my comments to the part that where we...just added the Department of Public Health money to this. Now, when we had this Bill in Committee, or the other Bill, whichever one we are talking about, there was supposed to be at least an allegation that there may be a misuse of funds up to \$17 million, 3/4 of which went to the contractor, and only 1/4...going to the recipient. Also, Mr. Peters, and I'd like to use his name in debate so he'd get up and talk a little bit about this, told us that this money, this \$3 million that was added to



this Bill now, was supposed to be going directly to the recipients, and one of our staff people ran up to us... Monica where are you?.....And told us that absolutely none of this money is going to go to the recipients. It merely is going to go for a redefinition or something else relating to the extra contracts. Now the person who has the contracts now for the 'WIC' program will not give us his records. He has put these out without bid, and so now it's needed that we go through more bureaucratic red tape in order to check up on these persons. I'd like to have Mr. Peters reply to this. In other words what I'm saying Pete, is you gave us false information. You are telling us, 'Well, that's what our staff is telling us'. You said that this \$3 million is going to go directly to the recipients because of all the harangues that have been going on for the last year. Now our staff tells us that this money, in fact, is not going to the recipients. I'm talking especially about the 'WIC' program."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "First off, Representative Van Duyne, I would hope that the staff goes back to you and restates the case because I certainly did not mistake, or give wrong information in regards to what is going on in that Bill.

Van Duyne: "It is going to go to some printer for printing new coupons. That part is not going to the recipients at all, it's going to the..."

Peters: "Representative, I indicated that the extra \$200,000 is in there in the event that the individual, who has the contract can not end up fulfilling that contract. Now, you know, if they want to print them on blue paper or pink paper, I'm not familiar with all the operations of that department or how the bidding operates. All we're trying to do is forestall a situation which could be disastrous in terms of some 43 thousand people in the state."



Van Duyne: "Well, nevertheless, it just goes to serve my previous comment that, you know we really haven't done a thing about changing the misuse of the funds of the Department of Public Health. All we're doing is aiding and abetting it by going along with the theory that Matijevich puts out, 'Here we are at the eleventh hour, even though we didn't do anything before, now we're put in the position that we are going to fund these people, no matter how erroneous it is because we are at the end of our rope. We can do no more. I've been here only 5 years, and I've heard Representative Matejevich at least 4 or 5 times say the statement that 'Well, here we are at the late hour and we've got to fund these... this appropriation, otherwise these people are not going to get any money. They're not going to get any paycheck, and we're always put in the position of the ogre that we're going to short change these poor people who work by the hour, and they get a paycheck every Friday. Now, philosophically speaking and practically speaking, you can't keep doing this one year after the other, after the other, after the other. If the time comes where the people who the administrators of these programs do not adhere to at least the intent in the theory of the law or the Legislation, then sometimes the only weapon the Legislation has in its...available to them is to shut the money off. Now, if it had to be where somebody has to go with 2 payless Fridays or 3 payless Fridays, well, you know, I'm not against that. Let's do it, but I don't like the idea of you people getting up here and saying, 'Holy mackerel, here we are. June 1 is going to be here any day, and if we don't make this appropriation go through, well, nobody's going to get paid'. I think it's time...we've done this in appropriation, You sat there along with me.

Peters: "Representaive Van Duyne, let me just repeat, and you can talk to the staff and they can fill you in on it. We



already passed this appropriation once. We already heard it in Committee once. This was already debated and discussed on the floor not once, but twice. I know the concern that you have. We all share those concerns. What we are trying to do by the Amendment we added is to insure that in the event the operation falls apart, we will be able to pick it up, and the 43 thousand people will not get hurt. The Investigating Commission is looking at it, The Auditor General is looking at it. The HEW is looking at it. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is looking at it. And if those 4 agencies can't make audits that are strong enough to give recommendations to the department, plus the fact that we've only passed a 6 month appropriation for them, I don't know what else we can do."

Van Duyne: "Okay, and that's my whole point in summarization. We...it was so bad that we only funded it for six months, so I'm not crying wolf into the dark, you know. Thank-you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank-you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to try to put this in the proper perspective. Representative Peters is correct. What has occurred here, so everyone can clearly understand, is that the contract that was in question, the contract that we dealt with in the appropriation process, has, as of now, been terminated. But that termination and that contract could very well be tied up in litigation. The money that is here is merely money to insure that the 43 thousand people that benefit from the 'WIC' program could continue to receive the stamp necessary for them to get the additional supplemental food that they get under this program. That's all that this Bill with the Amendment does. I hope that no one in the House would confuse this with the issue of the contract that is...



that controversial contract that is being investigated by 4 different agencies. That contract has been terminated. But so the program will continue, we have to appropriate this money so that those people, women and in...that's involved in the women and infant care can continue to get those stamps for that program. That's all this Bill does. Don't confuse the 2 issues. This is only a continuation of the program. None of this, none of this money goes towards aids or abets, anything, or base anything that was involved with that controversial contract. It needs the support of House Bill 1266."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I...I hope that everyone listened to what Representative Barnes, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, just said. The...this is necessary, not to fund the contract that was controversial, but because the department entered into this contract with apparently an inept and inadequate contractor who is now not performing his job, and therefore we are going to appropriate additional funds to reconstruct computer lists to reprint coupons because that contractor was not doing his job as a result of the lack of oversight apparently of the Department of Public Health. This is a worthwhile program and should be continued, and we ought to vote yes. I think it's important to realize that the reason we need this supplemental appropriation, particularly with regard to the 'WIC' program, is because of the inadequacy and ineptness of the Department of Public Health in the first place in supervising the prior contractor. In summary, we do need these funds. It is a worthwhile program, but the reason we need it is because of the prior ineptness of the department."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1266 pass?' All those in favor signify



by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 11 'nos', 4 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 1266 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 269. Mr. Getty."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 269. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is a Bill which will have a very significant impact in making the administration of Probate far better than it presently is. A little while ago Representative Daniels asked me to take it out of the record. I discussed the matter with him and other Members, and he has now asked me to have it called again. Just to refresh your recollection, I'd like to mention that as a practicing lawyer over many years, it became apparent to me that people fear Probate Court. The result of that, they enter into joint tenancies and so called Totten Trusts without consideration to the tax consequences or to the eventual distribution of the estate. What this Bill would do, would provide a simplified system which is much needed to benefit the heirs of an estate. It would be of great benefit, especially to our lower and middle income families, and to senior citizens. I'd like to point out again, that this is optional only. Any heir, even a creditor, could put this into full supervised estate if it were required. The bonding requirements are intact. I suggest to you that this will significantly reduce the cost and the time involved in the administration of a family type of estate. This is supported by the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Retired Teachers Association, Judge Walter Dall of the Circuit Court of Cook County,



Probate Division Chief strongly supported this Legislation. At this point I know of no opposition to it, and I would ask for your affirmative support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, call for your support for this very forward Legislation. This is something that has been needed for a long time...as Representative Getty says, it is optional. It is limited to those estates below \$150,000. It is going to be something that all people need in the middle income area. It...any opposition to it has now been removed, and I think we should pass it, and pass it today, and I urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of the Bill said he knew of no opposition, and the Gentleman from Cook who just spoke said no objection. Perhaps they should have prefaced their comments with the word meaningful, because I do stand in opposition. Previously, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was posing some questions to the Sponsor and at that time the Gentleman from DuPage requested that it be taken out of the record, and I would like, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to pursue the questioning that I have of the Sponsor, and would request that he yield."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Schlickman: "Previously I had indicated that according to a number of people, while Illinois does not have the uniform Probate Act, we do have an Act which is a model Act, and in fact, just a few years ago was codified. Under that Act, when it comes to the administration of the state, we have a very simple procedure. There is proof of heirship following notice to heir. There is admission to will...admission of will either based on testimony or by affidavit. There is the appointment of executor or administrator, all done at



one time, and it's about a 15 minute procedure. Sixty days later inventory is filed and inventory that is vital to the administration of our income...or inheritance law. And then notice in the mean time has been given to creditors. They have 6 months, and thereafter the estate can be closed based on a final account where the fiduciary, the administrator, or the executor reports to the court what receipts there have been, what expenditures there have been. The fact that taxes, inheritant and federal, have been paid, claims have either been satisfied or rightfully rejected by approval of the court...and if there's proper distribution. Now, to my way of thinking, this is a very logical, a very rational approach, and I ask...as I asked earlier, what is wrong with this approach, and what is the reform that is contained in Senate Bill 269. And, for example, let's start off with the admission of the will to probate. Under existing laws, all heirs are first to be notified,...and they have the opportunity to object to the admission of a will, either on a count of coercion or duress, being imposed upon the testator, or because the testator did not have the capacity or confidence at the time of the execution of the will. Under House... Senate Bill 269, without notice to heir, without their having the opportunity to object prior, the court would admit the will to probate. And I ask you, where's the reform in this change?"

Getty: "Representative Schlickman, the reform comes in permitting a family, permitting the heirs, permitting a testator, if that is the case, to handle the estate in the way that they wish to, while still protecting through the reduced necessity and expense of total court supervision, still protecting these people in permitting the opening of the estate at any time that any heir would request, or any creditor, for that matter, would so request. It provides for a shortened manner



of opening the estate so that the heirship can be proved, and the will admitted. It would provide for the filing of a simple verified report indicating that all proper steps of the estate's administration have been performed. It is in cutting down of the time and the expense, the lawyers expenses and fee, that we would make a significant step forward without losing any of the essential protection, without losing the ability to have any interested party put this into full court supervision at any time."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, but you didn't answer my question. I pointed out to you that under present law, before a will can be admitted to probate, except that is being valid and forcible by the court, heirs have to be notified, and they are given the opportunity to object to the admission of the will on a count of either coercion or duress or incompetency. Under Senate Bill 269, you reverse the situation and without any notification to heirs, without any opportunity for them to object to the admission of the will to probate, the will is admitted to probate, and then subsequently the burden is placed upon the heirs to come in and say, 'Mr. Judge you shouldn't have admitted this will to probate'. And I simply ask you, and request a direct answer, where is the reform in reversing the present rule, and where is the protection given to all heirs without their being notified beforehand or without their consenting voluntarily to the admission of the will prior to its admission."

Getty: "Well, I'll answer that in two ways. As a practical matter almost universally its in the practice that the heirs do waive notice, and that is filed. The vast majority of estates that are open, that is done. This would still give that protection in that the notice would be sent out and there would be a period of time



where any heir could come in and object. It cuts down the time, the waiting period. If for some reason you have an heir who is out of state or not readily available to come in and sign the waiver, to come in and appear for himself, this gives gives that heir an opportunity, after the will has been admitted, to come in and object, to come in and raise some objection which the court would entertain."

Schlickman: "But, as I pointed out to you, you are having a will admitted to probate prior to notification to heirs, and I ask, where is the reform? And I point out to you, mischief can result. It's like trying to lock the barn door after the horse has escaped. Let me ask you another question, under present law, and we have reform and probate law. We have reformed it a number of years ago with respect to the evidence that is necessary for admitting a will to probate. It used to be that 2 of the 3 witnesses, or 2 of the witnesses would have to come into court, and under oath with a court reporter present, would have to state that they were there, and that in their opinion the testator was competent, wasn't under duress, and then he would ask them to be witnesses. We engaged in reform by saying that all that is necessary in the alternative is for an affidavit, which can be executed by the witnesses at the time of the execution of the will, or an affidavit that can be executed subsequently. Now, under Senate Bill 269, for the admission of a will, you're eliminating both testimony and affidavit. Where's the reform there?"

Getty: "There would be no change in the affidavit form that would be used in the execution of the will."

Schlickman: "Isn't it true that Senate Bill 269 provides that a will can be admitted to probate without any testimony or affidavit from the attesting witnesses?"

Getty: "The wills, ... a will is admitted to probate based upon its appearance on its face. The attesting witnesses



having attested that they saw the testator execute it, and it was executed in the presence of one another. That is under affidavit, Representative.

Schlickman: "Attestation differs from affidavit. You know that, and I know that. Now, you indicated earlier... that attorney's fees are going to be saved. Is that correct?"

Getty: "I'm sorry I didn't hear that. There is a little noise level here."

Schlickman: "Didn't you indicate earlier that under Senate Bill 269, this...this new appendage to the Probate Act, that attorney's fees are going to be saved?"

Getty: "It is my feeling that there would be a significant reduction in the amount of time required...appearances in court, in that regard, yes. The people could do more themselves. The family, the heirs of an estate requiring an attorney in less instances, and thereby reducing the amount of time an attorney would have to spend in making needless routine rote court appearances. And thereby reducing the consequent fee."

Schlickman: "Well, isn't it true, under Senate Bill 269, that as under present law, that there would be an attorney who would have to draft and file a petition?"

Getty: "That hasn't changed. That's right."

Schlickman: "And the attorney would have to go into law...or go into court representing either the proposed or applying administrator or the nominated executor and have the will admitted."

Getty: "Yes, but it would be done in one step rather than two. In that instance."

Schlickman: "It's one step now."

Getty: "No, you would have to go out and get all the waivers first, or actual appearances."

Schlickman: "We're talking about court appearances. You got one court appearance. Presently you got one court appearance under a proposed Bill."



Getty: "Under present situation it could be two court appearances. This would insure that it would only be one."

Schlickman: "Under your Bill there would be an inventory. Is that correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. McGrew rise?"

McGrew: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

McGrew: "I'm sure this Gentleman does not intend to be dilatory, but if he has specific objections to the Bill, I would much prefer hearing it instead of this stuff back and forth, and I'd just as soon him go proceed and speak on the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman..."

Schlickman: "A question for the Speaker, and then I'll address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank-you. Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "The...as amended, the Bill provides that an inventory may be filed."

Schlickman: "So as amended we have an inventory to be filed here as we do under existing law. And then under existing law, a final account, and under proposed Senate Bill 269, an account to close the estate."

Getty: "Under 269, all that would be required would be a verified statement...report indicating that all the proper steps had been complied with."

Schlickman: "Which involves a court appearance."

Getty: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Finally the one last question that I promised the Speaker. Under existing law, an attorney has to seek court approval with respect to his fees."

Getty: "No, that's not correct, Sir."

Schlickman: "That is correct. He files a final account, his attorney's fees are set forth, and the judge then looks at attorney's fees. That's practically the first thing he does, and determines whether or not it's within the standards for the size of the estate."



Getty: "No Sir, that's not true. Possibly, Representative, you missed Judge Dall's testimony in court,...I'm sorry, his testimony before the Committee. As a matter of fact, unless there is a contest, an objection between the attorney and the...administrator, executor, or an heir of an estate, it is considered by the court to be a matter of contract between the parties. If there is any disagreement, it is a matter of dispute, then the court will resolve the matter."

Schlickman: "Well, it's true under Senate Bill 269, that there is no court supervision of fees. Isn't that correct?"

Getty: "There is no court supervision of fees under present existing law, Sir. And that the same situation that I indicated to you would be the law. If there was any disagreement with the fee to be charged, then the court would immediate the dispute. That would be the law as it is today. Without this Bill, that would be the law as it would be if this Bill were to become the law." Thank

Schlickman: "Thank-you very much. Mr. Speaker may I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Often times, we are prevented, or presented with a Bill under the guise that it constitutes reform, and on that basis, and on the basis of faith, we're asked to vote for it. Just a year ago, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we were asked to vote for and to pass a Bill amending the Probate Act dealing with what was then referred to as incompetent persons, now disabled persons. We had at the time, a very simple procedure relative to incompetence and the protection of their interests. Very simple, requiring minimal attorney fees, and at the request of some of the same people who are attempting to thrust this kind of reform upon us. We passed the Bill with respect to them, known as incompetent,



now known as disabled persons, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can tell you that there has been a tremendous increase in procedure, a tremendous increase in bureaucracy, and a tremendous increase in attorney's fees. We have here another amendment to the Probate Act, and you've got to realize that the Probate Act is very vital; very sensitive to the interest of citizens of this state because it involves the proper execution of a deceased person's will. How that person wants his or her estate to be distributed, and also, the manner of the state interest, not only in terms of the performance of the fiduciary, but also the payment of claims and taxes. This bill, this procedure, optionable as it may be, is fraught with danger. I pointed some of them out to you. A will can be admitted to probate without notice to heirs. A will can be admitted to probate without testimony or affidavit. And what I find very interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, all of the protections of the court supervision are removed for small estates, relatively small estates, that are under \$150,000. Court supervision and protection would be preserved for the larger estates, those over \$150,000. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in conclusion, we have a model Act in Illinois. It is a very simple procedure, and as the Gentleman pointed out, the Sponsor of this Bill, the procedure in Senate Bill 269 is basically the same, but it's without court supervision, without the protection that should be given to the intention of the executor without protection, built in protection, to the heir. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we don't have reform here. We do have a response on the part of some people to the criticism that some attorneys are rightfully subjected to on account of the way they handle estate, but it's nonsubstantive in nature, but substantive, with respect to procedures,



but substantive with respect to removing court supervision, court scrutiny relative to the administration of an estate, and I urge a "no" vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Daniels: "Representative Getty, as I understand the basic concept of your Bill, you are, in fact, simplifying the court procedures for independent administration of estates. Is that correct?"

Getty: "That is correct."

Daniels: "And that would be for estates under the value of \$150,000."

Getty: "That is correct."

Daniels: "And through that method, you would require less court filings and less court order. Is that correct?"

Getty: "That is correct."

Daniels: "And consequently then, is it your conclusion that we would be subjected to less attorney fees as a result of this. Is that right?"

Getty: "That is correct,"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have heard some rather extensive questioning of the Sponsor of the Bill regarding independent administration of estates. Basically what is involved is a effort to take an estate less than \$150,000 and to reduce the number of court filings and court orders necessary for estates in these sums. This is, in fact, a reform measure and an effort to reduce the amount of attorney's fees that one might expect in a normal estate. I only regret that the Sun-Times isn't here right now to listen a little more carefully to some of the debate that is going on in view of the editorial that they wrote yesterday, because what, in fact, we have here is one of the leading lawyers of



the House presenting to the Members of the House a Bill which would, in fact, reduce attorney's fees, and a Bill that is not necessarily in the best interest of the legal profession; but one that affords people the protection and the ability to seek independent administration of their estates, and consequently reduce the cost connected with probate. But yet, Bills within this Legislation of the safeguards that would give an interested party the ability to seek court protection and court supervision if necessary. I think this is a great area to pass into law, an area that is needed in reform, and I compliment the Sponsor of this Legislation for bringing it to our attention. I suggest that it's worthy of your support, and certainly an area that will be supported by the constituency of this state, and I recommend a green vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Getty, I've heard some of the protagonist to this Bill suggest that it is such a radical departure from existing procedure that it may even suggest that it may even suggest that you can file wills of the people, and prove them up, and disburse the funds before they die. I would hope that's not the case."

Getty: "It certainly isn't. I believe the Bill in the present form is, if anything, possibly more conservative than some of the proponents would like to have it. We met many objections. I think objections that were well founded because of some of the concerns Representative Schlickman had, and we met many of those objections. And I think made this a very conservative approach, and yet a very good step in the right direction."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Getty, is Senate Bill 269, in its present state, the same as the House Bill that was debated at great length in the House Judiciary Committee



tee and then voted out, very favorably out, of this House just a week ago or so?"

Getty: "Well, we...we didn't get to vote on it. It was about 4 or 5 Bills short of having been voted on. It is the same Bill that was heard in Subcommittee, 3 separate hearings, very long, with a great deal of debate, unanimously voted out of Subcommittee, and subsequently heard by the full Committee, before the full Committee on 2 separate days receiving a very favorable Roll Call in Committee."

Griesheimer: "Thank-you Mr. Sponsor. I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This particular Bill should be supported by all attorneys. One of our responsibilities, those of us who are attorneys in this Body, is to render a service to our clients to accomplish the end as quickly and efficiently as possible. Not only is this part of the legal service, but also affects the legal fees. And if the public is concerned about any feature of legal representation, it's certainly legal fees. An attorney can earn his fee on an hourly basis, I believe this will reduce the number of hours that are necessary, and thus provide a better service at a lower cost to those particular clients. I feel it is a good step forward and should be supported."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I obviously have a conflict of interest, and before it gets any greater, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. Mr. Getty to close the debate."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I indicated before, this Bill does not change the basic Illinois



Probate Act as it presently is. It merely gives us an alternative. A much needed alternative. It does not remove court supervision. It permissibly permits the owners of the estate, the people in interest, the heirs to reduce the court supervision, otherwise it would be required, and it would cost quite a bit more to the average estate. I suggest to you that this is indeed, because of the very permissive nature of this Act, this proposed Act, a very good step forward. A step that is much needed by our senior citizens. It is recognized by the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Retired Teachers Association, as being something which they strongly endorsed. It is a Bill very similar to the Bill which was strongly supported 2 years ago by the Chicago Daily News, where they said, 'Truly worthy of the name probate reform'. It is a Bill strongly supported by our chief judge, Judge Walter Dall, in Cook County, chief judge of the Probate Division. And one that is supported, and I'm proud to say it as a lawyer by both Bar Associations, notwithstanding the fact that this very...that this will cause a reduction in legal fees. I think this is a Bill that not only should be supported by all of the Members of the General Assembly, but especially by all lawyers in the General Assembly, and I would ask for each of your favorable support."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Flinn in the chair."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 269 pass'. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin is recognized to explain her vote. One minute, timers on."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. This is the reform that has been called for by the public for many, many years. For years the legal profession has been criticized for adding to the time and cost of probate. Today, many



members of the legal profession bring you a Bill in which the inventory would not have to be filed with the court, only with the interested parties. The administrator would be given broad powers relative to the disposition of the property. Including the power to distribute the property without court order. The independent representative would be...not be required to file an account with the court. These are all needed reforms, and I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pat Grossi to explain his vote, one minute. Timer's on."

Grossi: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my vote. I have a conflict of interest here, but I will vote for the benefit of my constituents, and not for my personal interest."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing. Do you want to explain your vote? Representative Ewing, one minute. Timer's on."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am the chief Cosponsor of this measure. I think it's something that the people of this state are demanding that we do. It's good Legislation. It's been considered for 2 terms down here, and I think, and would encourage even more 'aye' votes up there. Thank-you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and 5 voting present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "I wonder if we can have a copy of this Roll Call sent to the Sun-Times, in view of their editorial yesterday. I think they need a little bit of education."

Speaker Flinn: "You will be able to obtain a copy of that in the Clerk's office, and you can mail it under yours."



On page 2 appears Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate. Senate Bill 26."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 252."



Speaker Flinn: "Senate Bill 252."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 252. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Brokers and Salesman License Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1...adopted in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Any motions pertaining to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, amends Senate Bill 252 on page 3 by deleting lines 1 through 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Daniels on Amendment #2. Schlickman? Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I haven't discussed this Amendment with the editorial staff of the Sun Times, but I am sure that they would solicit your favorable consideration of it. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a very sensitive area in this state and one of great concern to Members of this Body is the matter of licensing and regulating professions and occupations. There is, I have observed, a growing sentiment within this Body to oppose licensing and regulating of occupations and professions on account of the fact that licensing too often leads to monopoly and self-serving effects with respect to the object of licensing and regulating. I notice, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for the second time today..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment please..."

Schlickman: "I'm being interrupted by the Gentleman from DuPage..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Daniels, for what purpose do your rise?"

Schlickman: "...and I yield."

Daniels: "If the Gentleman would limit his comments to the Amendment which does not deal with the subject of



licensing but deals with another area involving the Commissioner of Real Estate, I think we would be better off and be able to move on with the business of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 252 is an Amendment to the Real Estate Brokers and Salesman Licensing Act and the Commissioner of Real Estate is the regulator of individuals within the real estate profession. So my remarks are germane and to the point. What happens, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so often, is that we leave to the fox the guarding of the chicken coop and that's exactly what some professions desire. Now I believe a regulator should be objective and independent of licensees. And when he is one of them and chosen by them, I ask you, what kind of effective regulation can there be and how can the public be served? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm asking by Amendment #2 to delete this language within the existing Act, quote, 'In designating the Commissioner of Real Estate, the Director shall give due consideration to recommendations by Members and organizations of the profession.' I would say two things with respect of that language. To my knowledge, we do not give members or organizations of any other profession the statutory right to determine who their regulator will be. It's exceptional to do it for real estate...the real estate profession. Number 2, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it came to surface within the last couple of months, that the real estate profession believes that they have not only a God-given right, but a statutory right, to determine who the commissioner of real estate is going to be and also what those qualifications will be. And it was rather paradoxical that the Gentleman whom I have long respected and esteemed, took the position



that the regulator, the Commissioner of Real Estate, had to be a broker. When that Gentleman himself, who heads up the Illinois Association of Realtors, has never had issued to him a license to either to sell or to work as a broker. What I'm doing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by this Amendment is simply striking that language which gives to the brokers, the real estate brokers, the statutory right to determine who their regulator is going to be. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Director of Registration and Education ought to be uninhibited, ought to be unfettered by special interests in determining who should regulate the real estate profession. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 252."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, is recognized."

Friedrich: "Well, I was merely going to ask if the...one... the last Speaker wanted to extend his remarks? I'd assume we'd have no lawyers on to regulate lawyers, we would have no judges to regulate judges and maybe we would make some progress. If he wants to make this across the board I think I might go for it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Daniels: "Representative Schlickman, where in the law does it say that they have the statutory right to demand that the Director of Registration follow their dictates or their demands or their concerns?"

Schlickman: "What I said, Sir, was that this is unique language not contained in any other law with respect to the regulation of a occupation or profession. And I then also said that the real estate profession has taken this language and interpreted it to give them the statutory



right to determine who the regulator would be and that was evident by the debate over in the Senate as to the confirmation of the present director."

Daniels: "But if they determine what they wanted the law to say and how they interpreted it, that did not mean that the Director of Registration has to follow that. Isn't that correct?"

Schlickman: "Literally speaking, yes."

Daniels: "You mean the Director of Registration would have to follow what they say?"

Schlickman: "The Director of Regula...the Director of R. and E. has to follow what the brokers say or she doesn't get confirmed."

Daniels: "Well, isn't it in fact, that really the basis for your concern and the reason you presented this Amendment?"

Schlickman: "The reason that I offered this Amendment results from a profession, I have listed...given the...identified the profession and my resentment or rejection of the posture that they took that their regulator has to be somebody that they select or the director doesn't get confirmed."

Daniels: "But isn't it a fact that you have an interest in the person that is selected as Commissioner of Real Estate, you're an interested party in that?"

Schlickman: "I have an interest in the director, I have an interest in the person whom the director wanted to select but somebody whom I did not propose, somebody that I did not promote."

Daniels: "But somebody that you supported?"

Schlickman: "Supported her because...on the basis of the knowledge that I have relative to her com...competency."

Daniels: "And somebody from your district."

Schlickman: "Yes, she lives in 4th Legislative District."

Daniels: "May I address the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, Representative Daniels."



Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately we have injected into this Bill a subject that I would prefer not to be injected into Senate Bill 252, an Amendment that I do not want attached to Senate Bill 252 because it involves the confirmation of the Director of R. and E. It involves the person that she may or may not appoint as Commissioner of Real Estate and involves a totally separate issue than the very simple language that is contained in Senate Bill 252 on a very simple Bill that at this point has absolutely no opposition. I suggest that the Gentleman that is offering this Amendment is doing it for a purpose other than for the legislation that's put forth before you right now and for a purpose that he has an interest in and a personal stake in the sense that he is opposing some of the concerns that have been expressed by the real estate industry and the appointment of a...and individual who is designated by the department...by the Director of R. and E. I would hope that the Gentleman would not pursue this Amendment, but being the case that he intends to take this to the extent that he has, I would urge you to vote 'no' on the Amendment, leave the Bill in the form that it was filed and amend it on First Reading, Second Reading and in a form that I would prefer it be in and that's a relatively simple Bill without any difficulty whatsoever. And I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall...Representative Schlickman to close. I'm sorry, you're the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm very sorry that the Gentleman from DuPage, the House Sponsor of this Bill, would inject personality. I did not do that. I will admit that based on an acquaintance with the director and with an individual that she



wanted to appoint, I became aware of the problem that results from existing law and did some research. I present this Bill to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, solely on the basis of principle with the P.L.E. concern that if we are going to regulate professions and occupations in this state, we ought to do two things. Number 1, not inhibit, not encumber a director with respect to the appointment of the people that she has concluded or he has concluded are competent with respect to regulating. And Number 2, that we do not give to those to be regulated the right to determine who their regulator will be. In other words, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we don't let the foxes guard the chicken coop. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted to the House...Senate Bill 252? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 23 voting 'aye' and 92 voting 'no' and the Amendment loses. It is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Representative Lechowicz is recognized for the purpose of a motion."

Lechowicz: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Rules Committee met yesterday, and the recommendations of the Rules Committee was to extend the deadline for a substantive Committees from Friday, June 8, to Wednesday, June 13, which would permit addition of Committee meetings on Senate Bills from Monday to Wednesday of June 11, 12, and 13. I'm sure the Membership is well aware of the fact that the Senate Committee deadline on House Bills is Friday, June 15. So now I know that the Minority Leader and the Speaker have agreed that we move to suspend Senate Bill Committee deadlines on Rule 25'D' to Wednesday,



June 13, 1979."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is to extend the deadline by suspending Rule 25'D'. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to varify what Representative Lechowicz has said and add something to it. There are some 1,100 House Bills in the Senate, and they will be considering those up until the 15. There's only 600 Senate Bills over here, and we would not have 2 full weeks of Committee hearings without this change, and I think it should be passed...it has. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 134 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 1 voting present. And the motion carries. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I rise for the purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker. This is the appropriate time...there will be softball practice again today beginning at 3:30 on diamond 8, Lincoln Park. We have to be off the diamond at 5 o'clock, so if you get out of your Committee quickly, we can get an hour or hour and a half practice in, if you can get there by 4 or 5, but the practice will start at 3:30 until 5, diamond 8, Lincoln Park, and the game is next Wednesday for all of you that haven't purchased tickets yet, or know people who want to buy them. They are a dollar apiece, and they go for charity for youth programs in Springfield. Game is next Wednesday night, so all of you House Members who want to get some practice in, please come out today to diamond 8 at 3:30. I might add one other announcement, Mr. Speaker, there is a message in everyone's box...mailbox today about the Legislature's night at Cominsky Park. I went around last week and some people gave me some tentative requests. We're going to start fresh since we now have



a firm date. The date is August 28. It's a Tuesday night against the Boston Red Sox, ...\$12.50 a ticket. If you'd like to come either see me on the House floor, or call my secretary at 8062, her name is Terri, and leave your name and the number of tickets. I understand that the request for tickets is going to far exceed the number of tickets we have. We only have 100 tickets, so it's going to be on a first come, first serve basis. As yet you don't have to worry about your checks, but I need your name and the number of tickets you'd like, first come first serve, when we get to 100 we're going to stop, so if you made a request last week, disregard that since we now have a firm date, August 28, and let me know, or my secretary, how many tickets you'd like. It's a night game, that's right. It's a night game. The buffet dinner is from 6 o'clock to 7:30. Anywhere from 6 to 7:30, buffet dinner. The \$12.50 includes drinks beforehand, buffet dinner, all you can eat, box seat tickets, and drinks afterwards. We'll have some parking spaces reserved for us, but the parking is not included. \$12.50 a ticket, Tuesday night, August 28, White Sox verses Red Sox."

Speaker Flinn: "I would like to thank Representative Katz seatmate for the very brief announcement we just had. I have a couple of thing to announce from the Chair here. One is, the Clerk advises me that there are 52 Senate Bills that still do not have House Sponsors on them. We must have them by ajournment time tomorrow. And right now there is being passed out a memorandum from the Speaker, June's Calendar attached to it, being passed out right now. Are there...I would note that beginning on June 18, that we go right on through Saturdays and Sundays and all up till June 30, through June 30. Is there any other announcements? Agreed Resolutions.

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 327, Waddell, House Resolution 328, Waddell. House Resolution 527, Waddell, House



Resolution 330, Waddell House Resolution 331, Waddell
House Resolution 333, Capparelli et al. House Resolution 334,
Waddell. House Resolution 335, Waddell"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Giorgi, Zeke Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Did we pass 325 and 326?"

Speaker Flinn: "Do you know?"

Giorgi: "Oh we did? Fine, okay." 327 by Waddell, honors
the senior citizens. 328 talks about the 'Bondy-Dundee'
Golf Club. 329 about a senior citizen queen. 330
about the girl track qualifiers. 334 a wedding
anniversary. 333 International Year of the Child.
334 institution of marriage. 335 25th wedding anniver-
sary. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the
Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye. All
those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolu-
tions are adopted. General Resolutions.

Clerk Leone: "House Resolutions 332, VonBoeckman-Schraeder."

Speaker Flinn: "Committee on Assignments. Any further an-
nouncements? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House. I move that the House now stand ajourned
until June 1 at noon. Friday, June 1."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you amend that the House stay in Session
for ten minutes..."

Lechowicz: "The Clerk has ten minutes perfunct recession. I
now move that the House stand ajourned until noon,
Friday, June 1."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is that after a 10 minute perfunct
recession, the House stand adjourned till noon tomorrow,
June 1. All in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed. The
House is adjourned."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 157,
E.M. Barnes. A Bill for an Act making certain appropri-
ations. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 298,
Rigney. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act,



to license and regulate grain dealers that engage in the business of purchasing grain from the producers thereof, and making appropriation and connection herewith. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 482, Reilly. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create the Department of Children and Family Services, codifying its powers and duties. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 492, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the County Home Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 501, Harris. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 542, Johnson. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission.. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 550, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 323, Watson. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Game Code of 1971. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 579, Hallstrom. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget for ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 593, Schisler. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Game Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 730, Johnson. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 765, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 892, Domico. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nonprofit Health Care Service Plan Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 931, Schneider -Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 939, Mulchahey. A Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of the agricultural district. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1061.



Abramson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Banking Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1109, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Home, Health Agency Licensing Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1124, Beatty, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1125, Beatty, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1166, Beatty, a Bill to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1208, Leon, a Bill for an Act to increase the State Currency Examiner's fee from \$50 to \$75 per day, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1223, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Physician's Practice Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1237, Katz, a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of public accounting and to repeal certain Acts therein, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1238, Kucharski, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1338, Kornowicz, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens Disabled Persons Property Relief Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1374, Bluthardt, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1386, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fair Employment Practices Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1393, Brummer, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1395, Yourell, a Bill for an Act in relation to the influentation of consolidation of election, First Reading of the Bill.



Committee Reports, Representative Emil Jones, Chairman from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following Bills were referred. Taken... Action taken on May 30, 1979, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Consent Calendar, Senate Bill 347, 'do pass' Short Debate Calendar; Senate Bills 353 and 354, 'do pass as amended' Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill #8. Representative Leon, Chairman of the Committee on Financial Institutions to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken May 30, 1979, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 635, 681, and 733, 'do pass as amended', Senate Bills 658, 'do pass' Consent Calendar, Senate Bills 188, 426, and 651. Representative Williams, Chairman from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken on May 30, 1979 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 145, 162, 292, 394, and 430, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 142, 'do pass' Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill 67, 365, 415, 434, 435, and 463. Representative Schneider, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken on May 30, 1979 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bill 653, 'do pass' Consent Calendar, Senate Bills 343, 369, 517, 666, 718, and 753, 'do pass as amended' Consent Calendar, Senate Bill 754. Being no further business, the House now stands ajourned."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

5/31/79

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 31, 1979

PAGE 1

SB-0006	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-0026	2ND READING	PAGE	57
SB-0133	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0157	1ST READING	PAGE	66
SB-0248	2ND READING	PAGE	37
SB-0252	2ND READING	PAGE	58
SB-0269	3RD READING	PAGE	3
	3RD READING	PAGE	43
SB-0298	1ST READING	PAGE	66
SB-0323	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0482	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0492	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0501	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0514	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0542	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0550	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0579	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0586	3RD READING	PAGE	9
SB-0593	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0668	3RD READING	PAGE	11
SB-0708	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0730	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0746	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0756	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0767	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0884	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0892	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0923	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0927	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0931	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0939	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-0944	2ND READING	PAGE	14
	MOTIONS	PAGE	25
SB-0963	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0964	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1002	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1061	1ST READING	PAGE	67
SB-1109	1ST READING	PAGE	68
SB-1124	1ST READING	PAGE	68
SB-1125	1ST READING	PAGE	68
SB-1166	1ST READING	PAGE	68
SB-1176	1ST READING	PAGE	3

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 31, 1979

	SB-1201	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1208	1ST READING	PAGE	68
<i>SB 1223 1st ADJ pg 68</i>	SB-1237	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1238	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1242	1ST READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1260	2ND READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1262	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1266	3RD READING	PAGE	37
		CONFERENCE	PAGE	26
		MOTIONS	PAGE	38
	SB-1268	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1328	1ST READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1331	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1335	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1338	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1342	1ST READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1354	1ST READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1374	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1377	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-1386	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1393	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	SB-1395	1ST READING	PAGE	68
	HR-0327	3RD READING	PAGE	65
	HR-0328	3RD READING	PAGE	65
	HR-0330	3RD READING	PAGE	66
	HR-0331	3RD READING	PAGE	66
	HR-0333	3RD READING	PAGE	66
	HR-0334	3RD READING	PAGE	66
	HR-0527	3RD READING	PAGE	65

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 31, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER MADIGAN - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER MADIGAN - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
SB248 - SUSPEND RULES 33A AND 8	PAGE	33
SUSPEND RULE 25D - SENATE BILL COMMITTEE DEADLINE	PAGE	63
HR332 - COMMITTEE ON ASSIGNMENT	PAGE	66
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	66
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	69
ADJOURMENT	PAGE	69