

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 15 minutes. ...Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 5 minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Charles Dawes said: How majestic is naturalness. I have never met a man whom I consider a great man who is not always natural and simple. Affectation is inevitably the mark of one not sure of himself. Let us pray. ALMIGHTY GOD, we do give Thee praise and thanksgiving for today and every day in our lives. We are grateful for our talents and abilities with which we have been endowed. And we humbly are aware of the challenges and opportunities placed in our midst. Help us, O Lord, to find in all things the keystone of Thy Love; that our efforts here, as Members of this House of Representatives, may have their foundation surely set in Thee, not for our own glory or personal edification, but to Thy renown and the benefit of the people of the State of Illinois; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Lead in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Polk."

Polk: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for Attendance. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Laurino, Chairman of the Committee on elections to which the following Bills were



referred, action taken June 5, 1979. Reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 930, 'do pass Consent Calendar' Senate Bill 417. Representative McGrew, Chairman of Committee on higher education, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 7, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do not pass' Senate Bill 543, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 147, 'do pass as amended' Consent Calendars' Senate Bill 907, 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' Senate Bill 952 and 990, 'do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar' Senate Bill 991. Representatives Kane and Mugalian, Co-chairmans of the Committee on State Government organizations, to which the following Bills were referred action taken June 7, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 636 and 1314. Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 7, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 399 and 585, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 578, 588, and 590."

Speaker Redmond: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, page 15 on the Calendar. Take the record on the Attendance Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, page 15 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 346, a Bill for an Act in relation to detention of sheltered care for juveniles, Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 550, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 115...Senate Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Oops, skipped one, Senate Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substance Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to increase the



State's Currency Exchange Examiner's fee. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1218, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Library System Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1228, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1260, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Financial Institutions Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1270, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Religious and Charitable Risk Pooling Trust Act...

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, will you come up here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to fire protection training. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. We don't have any... Consent Calendar...page 16, Consent Calendar, Third Reading Second Day."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 16 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 108, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is in the chamber."

Clerk O'Brien: "...The Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 110, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 136, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to bonds of contractors entering into contracts for public construction. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 177, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 210, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Capital Development Board to dedicate a right of way easement and drainage easement



to Tinley Park. Third Reading fo the Bill. Senate
 Bill 442, a Bill for an Act to amend the Family Practice
 Residency Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill
 473, a Bill for an Act to change obsolete references
 from the Repeal Mental Health Code to the Mental
 Health and Developmental Disability Code. Third Reading
 of the Bill. . . . Senate Bill 442 I read should be Sen-
 ate Bill 422, a Bill for an Act to amend the Family
 Practice Residency Act. Third Reading of the Bill.
 Senate Bill 496, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of
 the Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act. Third
 Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 685, A Bill for an
 Act to amend Sections of the General Not For Profit
 Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill
 729, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the
 County Home Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "You've heard the Bills on Consent Calen-
 dar, Third Reading, Second Day. The question is 'Shall
 these Bills pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting
 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted?
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the re-
 cord. On these Bills there are 116 voting 'aye', 1
 voting 'no', 19 voting present. These Bills having
 received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared
 passed."

Clerk O'brien: "Representative Matijevich in the chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bills Third Reading, Short
 Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 26."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the
 Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
 Birkinbine on Senate Bill 26."

Birkinbine: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of
 the House. This is the Bill that was amended yesterday
 to correct some flaws that were perceived on the other



side of the aisle. It allows a private entity to exchange land with a park district as long as a public hearing has been held, two appraisals have been made, and the land that is received by the park district must be of equal or greater value and equal or greater suitability for park purposes. I request a favorable consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 26. This is Short Debate. Is there any opposition? If there's none, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 26 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting present, and Senate Bill 26 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 71, Jane Barnes. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 71, a Bill for an Act in relation to immunity from civil damages in connection with snow and ice removal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this...Senate Bill 71 is identical to House Bill 257 by Representative Klosak that went out of the House with an overwhelming majority of 148 votes, and I would please ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 71...Short Debate. Is there any questions? If not...the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 71 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117...118 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 voting present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Senate Bill 214."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 214, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten on Senate Bill 214."

Totten: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 214 creates a new Section of the Illinois Vehicle Code for regulating traffic approaching highway construction or maintenance area. The language in the Bill will bring the Illinois Vehicle Code into conformance with the Uniform Vehicle Code. I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 214, Short Debate. If there's no question, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 214 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting present, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 265. Is Representative Neff on the floor? I don't see him. Take that out of the record. Senate Bill 289, Representative Getty."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 289, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty on Senate Bill 289."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 289 is a Bill which would further enlarge and give an additional alternative to a sentencing court to provide for confinement in a specific place other than in a jail or imprisonment. Now, this is a Bill which is the pro-



duct..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti is seeking my attention. For what purpose do you rise?"

Conti: "Well, we just got through with House Bill 25...I mean Senate Bill 256 which is on Senate Bills Third Reading, now where's 289 at?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, we just finished with 214. We're on Short Debate on page 2, Elmer, and 265 was taken out of the record because Representative Neff wasn't here..."

Conti: "I'm sorry. I see it now."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll get back to it because I see he is here. Alright, continue, Representative Getty...continue Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bill which implements a recommendation of the Criminal Sentencing Commission to provide further alternatives to a sentencing court that the court may, under appropriate circumstances, provide for a type of periodic imprisonment, a type of confinement to a specific place. For example, especially in the case of a young person, the court could provide that that individual would be confined to a home for a specific number of hours. In the case of a married person with children, again could be confined for specific hours and yet still go to work, support his family, take care of necessary charges. In addition to that, by Amendment, Representative Friedrich put on an Amendment which would provide for restrictions in the release of individuals prior to who have committed the most serious class of felonies prior to 6 months before the expiration of their sentence. And I would move for an Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty has moved for the passage of House...Senate Bill



289. On that the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have just a couple of questions. I'm not really in opposition, but I would like to ask the Gentleman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you have leave? Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Getty, there are 2 Amendments. One of which is Dwight Friedrich's which eliminates the furlough for class X felones. Is that right?"

Getty: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "Alright, what is the other Amendment?"

Getty: "The other Amendment? I'm sorry."

~~Leinenweber: "Yeah, there's the Getty Amendment, #1."~~

Getty: "Well, that was a purely technical Amendment. That was an A instead of a small letter i, small Roman 1, and a d instead of a small 2."

Leinenweber: "Okay, thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 289 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes', no 'nays', no present, and Senate Bill 289 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed: Is Representative Neff here yet? Representative Neff, are you ready on Senate Bill 265? The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 265, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff on Senate Bill 265. Representative Neff on Senate Bill...is that out of the record or..."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Getty asked me to hold this for a few minutes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, out of the record. Senate Bill

308. Representative Lee Daniels here? Out of the



record. Senate Bill 465...7, Carol Braun. I don't see her there. Out of the record. Oh, where is she? Oh, here she is. Are you ready with Senate Bill 467, Carol Braun?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 467,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "...A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act approved June 20, 1963, as amended. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, on Senate Bill 467."

Braun: "Thank-you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 467, the Bill sponsored by Senator Merlo, amends the Illinois Condominium Property Act. It defines improvements and betterments and defines more clearly the interest we are to be insured, pursuant to that Act. It was passed out of the Senate overwhelmingly, and I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, has moved to the passage of Senate Bill 467, Short Debate. If there are no questions, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 467 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'ayes' no 'nays', 4 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 467 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 505. Is Ben Polk here? I don't see him in his seat. Take that out of the record. Senate Bill 507, Representative Neff, are you ready with that one? Senate Bill 507, read the Bill. No, out of the record. Senate Bill 558, Hoxsey. I don't see Hoxsey. Is Betty Hoxsey here? No, out of the record. Senate Bill 651, Representative Lechowicz. I don't see him here either. Out of the record. 732, Betty Reed is ready. 732, read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 732, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for privilege tax on mobile homes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Reed, on Senate Bill 732."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, pretty well a house keeping Bill. It changes the name of the Mobile Home Privilege Tax Act to the Local Services Tax Act. It provides that if a Tax Bill on mobile homes is in error, the owner files with the Board of Assessors or the supervisor of assessment as opposed to the county treasurer, and it eliminates the need of the county treasurer to file a copy of the unpaid tax liens with the Secretary of State, since he currently files the lien with the county recorder. I urge a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Reed, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 732. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not an opponent of this Bill, but I think something needs to get into the record, and that the Lady can put into the record by answering a question, I think. This is not being changed from a privilege tax according to the Illinois Supreme Court, but merely...the only thing you're changing in this is the name of the tax so the people won't be resentful of having to have the quote 'privilege' unquote of paying a tax on their mobile home. Is that correct?"

Reed: "That is correct, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 732 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and



2 voting present, and Senate Bill 732 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill 222."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 222, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 344."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 344, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Religious and Charitable Risk Pooling Trust Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 349."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 349, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motion...any motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 388."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 388, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 421."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Family Practice Residency Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Yourell, amends Senate Bill 421 on page 1 by deleting line 24 through 26."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, on Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 421. He's in his seat. Alright, we'll relax while Representative Yourell digs out his Amendment. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment was suggested...I forget who... but at any rate, all it does is make a provision that whoever gets the annual scholarships under the program established by the Act, agrees to pay...repay in full the amount of the scholarship plus the penalty of twice of the amount of the annual scholarship for each year. I move 'do adopt' on House Amendment 1 on Senate Bill 421."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved for the adoption of the House Amendment #1. Are there any questions? If not, all in favor of...Representative Beatty from Cook, do you have a question on that? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Under what circumstances does this penalty apply?"

Yourell: "I'll read the Amendment to you, Representative. Under Section E, he or she agrees to repay in full the annual scholarships received under the program established by the Act plus a penalty for twice the amount of the annual scholarship for each year he or she does. And if you refer to Section E under the Bill, to not fulfill the agreement."

Beatty: "And what is this thing that they don't...what's the agreement? What are they supposed to be doing?"

Yourell: "Well, they agree to serve for one year."

Beatty: "Thank-you. Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Neff...I mean Huff."

Huff: "Thank-you Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield."

Huff: "Yeah, Representative Ewell., Yourell, I'm sorry. I just need a little bit more clarification on this Amendment. Is this dealing with the scholarships that are awarded to medical students for...in return for community service upon completion of their medical course?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

~~Yourell: "For each year of medical training for which a scholarship under the est...program is established by the Act is received. The maximum required service under this agreement is 3 years. Now, you have to serve at least 1 year, or you have to repay the full amount of the annual scholarship."~~

Huff: "Thank-you very much, thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall Amendment #1 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed... saying 'aye', 'aye'. Those opposed by saying 'no', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments? I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, I didn't see your light."

Robbins: "Amendment been distributed?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, it has...I understand. Has it? Oh, I'm in error. It has not been distributed. Take the Bill out of the record then. I'm sorry. Let's see, where we at? Senate Bill 479."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 479, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Realtor's Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Reilly, amends Senate Bill 479 on page 9, line 27 and so forth."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly, on Amendment #1."

Reilly: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. This is a clarifying Amendment worked out with Representative Getty and the Democrat Staff. It simply adds the words 'or other sellers' to the word 'concessionaire' to clarify the original intent of the Act. I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved for the adoption of the Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', no by saying 'no', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: ~~"No further Amendments."~~

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 562. You ask leave to keep it on Short Debate. Leave, and it shall be kept on Short Debate. Senate Bill 562. Collins is in his seat."

Clerk O'Brien: "562, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in connection with campaign literature. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, ... Representative Mahar, amends Senate Bill 562 on page 1 by deleting line 5 and 6 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, on Amendment #1."

Mahar: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 deals with the change of the primary date from March to May. Now, there are several reasons why I think we ought to consider, once again, the fact that we should change this date from March to May. First of all, all the indications that many of us have had in surveys and by various groups, there ought to be a change in the primary date. Secondly, I think this is about the last chance we're going to have in the 81st General Assembly to consider this particular



very important point. And I think that we should consider it because this legislation is about the only Bill that will be available to consider. Now, there have been 2 basic oppositions to why we should change that date from March to May, or June, or September. One of those considerations is the fact that the farm people will not be able to do their work, and they'll be disenfranchised. I think that is totally wrong, because we have many, many states that have...have a May primary. We have about 9 states, and the closest one is Indiana. And I can't see where the people in Indiana are disenfranchised, the farmers particularly, because I think the way they operate the farms in Indiana are exactly the way they operate the farms in Illinois. The fact that we have a...can move the primary a little bit closer to the general election, of course, is one that is very, very important. One of the other objections that we frequently hear is the fact that we will not be able to complete our business in the General Assembly. Well, I'd like to remind the Members of the House that in the...this particular year, we're dealing with appropriations and revenue matters only, and we do get involved in many of the cat and dog Bills that we don't like to get involved, and I think a shorter Session here in Springfield would cause us to deal with those important measures that we have to deal with, mainly appropriations and revenues, and we'd get out of here. I would urge that the Members consider once more a May primary, and I ask for your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mahar has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition to Representative Mahar's Amendment. This is an Amendment which would put all of us in an impossible situa-



tion to do the business of State Government. As it is now, it is difficult, in the primary years, to wait until after the March primary, because we all know... we all know that we will not get down to the business of State Government until the primary election is over with. What this would do is keep us from being...being able to address serious problems of our State Government finances and other emergency matters until after May. I think that is utterly ridiculous. I think that we would then be placed in an impossible situation. This should be soundly defeated, and Representative Mahar should consider other Amendments, possibly into September."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I couldn't agree more with what Representative Getty had to say. I am sorry to rise in opposition to Representative Mahar, but it occurs to me that over the years we have changed the primary date in this state often enough. April, June, March, now we're talking about May and September. I would simply submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is no perfect time for a primary. What a perfect time happens to be is what one person's opinion is, or one newspaper's opinion. There is no perfect time for a primary. I think the March primary is about as good as any, and it ought to be left alone."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I don't know how many times we have to consider the same question, have the same issue put to us in Bill form, in Amendment form, in another Amendment form, and in another Amendment form. I would think after a while that people would begin to think that the Members of the House had shown what they felt about a particular question, one way or another, but I guess we have to



vote on it a fourth time. In addition to what Representative Getty and McBroom have already said so well, I think there's one additional point worth representing to those people who come from agricultural districts down state, and that is that the time of holding this proposed primary in May is a very inconvenient time, or can be for people who farm. March is a good time. The weather is not at all bad in the third week in March. The reasonable is to create the short primary date... I mean a short primary campaigning time for people who don't want a long campaigning time, and I think as Representative McBroom says in light to the fact that there's no perfect time. There's going to be something inconvenient all the time. It's the best time we can pick, and I certainly urge everyone to vote 'no' and stay with the March primary."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank-you Mr....Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. Let me join the ones who have spoken before me in saying that we've handled this issue enough times. I am a little bit surprised that the Sponsor of the Amendment has had the nerve to bring it up again. We have handled it often enough. Let's put a 'no' vote on this Amendment, and let's forget it."

Speaekr Matijevich: "Channel 20 has leave to film from the gallery, so the lights are on. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, has moved the previous question. All in favor of that...the question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar to close."

Mahar: "Well thank-you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry to irrate my



colleagues this morning by bringing up a very important issue to them that they might have heard a few times before. I think the nature of this Body is that we go over many of these important subjects more than once or twice or three times. And I've seen in my short period of time hear that many after it's the full discussion, we have changed our minds on these subjects. Now we hear constantly about what the farmers are going to do. I'd just like to ask you, what do the farmers in Indiana do who have a May primary? What do the farmers in Nebraska do who have a May primary? What do the farmers in Texas do who have a May primary? The farmers in Arkansas? Now, I think that's a lot of hogwash to say that the farmers can't get to vote, and that's just an excuse. I heard somebody say 'Well, why don't you go to a September primary?'. Well, many of you who've been around here for a few years know I've had a September Primary Bill, but I get the same reasons of...September. It just seems to me that the general public want to change the primary. Everybody I talk to, various labor organizations, League of Women Voters, various citizens, all the surveys, tell me that we should change the primary out of March. Now March is the only... Illinois is the only state that has a March primary. Nobody has an April primary. The earliest primaries in every other state are May, so it just seems to me that we are not really out of step with society when we think in terms of moving this primary out of March into what I consider a better time, and I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, has moved for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 562...Floor Amendment I mean. The question is 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 be adopted?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative



Borchers to explain his vote."

Borchers: "You know, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, you know truth is always a good defense for anything, and truth is always to be desired. Let's tell the real reason why that most of you here, I'm afraid, are afraid to change to May because then we're going to have to go into session more early in the year, we're going to have to make our decision on votes 'yes' and 'no', and you're afraid you're going to make some of your constituents mad, and therefore you won't get elected. Now, that is the real reason you are voting as you are. Not because that's a good political, logical reason, but it is not a good reason in relation to the best interest of yourself and the constituents, instead of in March where there's bad weather. This business of farmers is all hogwash because we farm, and I know it's not going to affect...our family in a slight degree. We'll get out and we'll vote, so I don't 'hold' with that. Just tell the truth, the real reason, and remember, you think the people are going to forget? Well, they aren't going to forget the pay raise for you Gentlemen who voted that way, because I've been talking and listening to them, and though I was not involved in that, I know what they're going to do. Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie to explain her vote."

Currie: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There may be no perfect date for a primary, but the issue before us isn't perfection, only the question whether we'd be better off with a primary in May than a primary in March. I am disturbed to hear that the reasons opposing this state of change have mostly to do with our convenience, our Legislative schedule. We could be a little creative. We could, for example, change



the budgeting process in the General Assembly, so that we go to biannual, but...biannual budgets rather than do an appropriations every two years. There are ways we could change our lives, our schedules, so as to meet the needs of the voters. Those needs are not just what the weather's like on election day, but what the weather's like during the campaign. A March primary means that all the activities are happening during the very worst months of the year. Months when people can hardly get out of their houses in some parts of the state. Why can't we meet this need with our responsibility to respond to what the voters need "leave ourselves a little out of it for the...for a change and vote 'yes' to move our primary date to May."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative... or Lake, Representative Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, I really think that the attack on the Sponsor of this Amendment was uncalled for. There's not a person down here that doesn't realize the people of their district truly want the opportunity of a later primary. Sometimes when I read the opening phrase that is required by the Constitution in each Bill, I begin to wonder if any Member of this House really realizes what it says. It says 'Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois represented in the General Assembly.' I don't know how many of you ever represented any people. I think you're down here for yourself. You're down here for your own personal interests, and you don't really give a damn what the people want back in your home district. If you really want to follow what the people want, I suggest you vote for this Amendment. To those of you that say this can't work, why don't you go over to Indiana. It's working perfectly over there. It works in many other states. When I heard, when we were talking about the September primary, which I've introduced on 3 occasions,



that it couldn't possibly work without destroying the state, I suggest that a few of you go up to Wisconsin where they've been doing it for the past 90 years, and it seems to work alright up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the...I'm sorry, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner is going to turn this around."

Skinner: "I can hardly make it work. It seems to me that those Members who are sitting on this House floor who are secure and think they can get re-elected are voting 'yes'. Those Members who are insecure and think that increased competition might hurt their chances of re-election are voting 'no'. So why would there be increased competition? There would be increased competition because one would be able to file after January 1. Now, everyone knows that people are not figuring out a year...almost a year ahead of the election, 11 months ahead of the election that an election is even going to be held the next year. We don't really give people a fair chance when we ask them to file in December when they're supposed to be buying Christmas presents. In fact, one of my colleagues suggested the best date for a primary election would be on Christmas Eve. So if you really want to be consistent, why don't you hold the Bill on Second Reading if you don't want this Amendment to pass, file an Amendment that will set the primary election on December 24, and then we can all be assured we'll all be back here the next session."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook., Representative Bowman to explain his vote."

Bowman: "I don't know how many of you remember the blizzard of '79, I sure do, and I think a lot of our constituents do. The...we get wiped out by bad snows every year. The one this year was worse than most. It is not at



all uncommon to have really...very bad weather during the month of March. I think we really do owe it to our constituents to move it out of the snow season and into...into the spring. And if this thing doesn't go on...this Bill, I'd like to request a verification of the negative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to comment very briefly on the remarks of the distinguished Representative from Macon County, and I would do this every time I hear the same argument...I'm sorry, every time I hear the same argument made, that if anyone still objects to the pay raise, the Comptroller's office is still open 5 days a week during regular business hours, and if they feel so strongly about it, they can return whatever that pay raise is to the applause of the people in their district."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...the Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote for this Amendment, I just don't understand the red lights up there. Evidently, it's been brought out here, we're not listening to the people in our areas and districts. I just ran a poll on this also, and 90% of the people in my district feel it should be a later date, and as far as I'm concerned, this is all poppycock. I live in a rural area, as rural as anyone does, and...saying that the farmer would have trouble voting, this isn't right, the farmer will vote. And most farmers don't have over 15 or 20 minutes to drive to the voting place, and I don't think this will hurt us a bit on the farm vote. And I'm just real disappointed that we don't have more green lights up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Mac...Lake, Representative Deuster to explain his vote."



Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen fo the House, right now all of us take our oath of office in January, and then in the same year in December, we're filing our petitions to run again. The campaign, in Illinois, is just too long. Now we can all have different ideas on how much it should be shortened. I happened to have gotten involved in this political life, as many of you, maybe 20 years ago, when for years, and years, and years, in Illinois we had a primary in April. I've always felt that April was not a bad month. It was a pretty good month. I think we should move this forward. As it happens now, besides taking our oath of office in January and starting to run in December, we have to circulate our petitions at Christmas time, at a holiday month when people should be thinking about Christmas and not thinking about politics. If we support this Amendment and move the primary forward, we're going to take circulating the petitions out of the Christmas holiday, put it over into January or February. I..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I agree with many of the remarks that have been made previously. I personally prefer a September primary to drastically shorten the entire campaign season. I'm just surprised to see that the Chicago Democrats, who it would appear to me would realize the problems of running a campaign when there's snow on the ground, are voting red on this. I would urge more green lights."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, but as I look at all those red votes in the Chicago Democrats, I wonder if Mayor Bilandic was sitting in this audience as a Representative...this House as a Representative, how would he vote on this issue? If he,



if we had an election in May when Mayor Bilandic was running we'd have Mayor Bilandic as the mayor of Chicago. A snow storm and the bad weather affect elections. Is it what they want? Do you want that no one comes out at the polls due to incimate weather? Search your conscience. What are you doing? Trying to keep the people from voting...voting down the primary vote? So...the pages have turned...the pages have turned in Chicago. Maybe you'll have a nice big snow storm in Chicago but it might be against you. Maybe the people will be unhappy with you that their streets won't be plowed. Think about it."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I...everyone has an idea of when the primary ought to be, ought not to be, and there is a reason for or against it for any particular date you may choose. I would like to simply point out that in the city of Chicago, there is a practice of...most leases on apartments have September 30 due dates, or April 30 due dates, and most of the poeple in Chicago who are renters who may find themselves moving at the expiration of the April 30 leases, are going to find themselves in the position of not being qualified to vote in a primary shortly after May 1. It's my opinion that is someone from their apartment on April 28 or 27 into a new residence, that if the primary is held on May 8, or 9, or at that point in time, they would be ineligible to vote. And I..."

Speaker Matijeich: "I'm sorry, proceed, go ahead."

Telcser: "I simply wanted to make that point to the Members of the House, that we could be disenfranchising a large number of Chicago residents, at least, who get caught with an April 30 lease, and they're moving."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, has asked for a verification. Have all voted?"



Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I couldn't disagree more with my learned colleague from...on this side of the aisle from Chicago relative to apartment leases and all those other kinds of considerations. If Illinois is going to get in the 20th century, whether it is 7 o'clock voting hours, or a later primary, I think May is not the only date, but I think it is certainly a move in the right direction, and I would encourage some more green lights favoring this Amendment on the Board. Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask at the appropriate time for a verification of the negative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, that's already been requested by Representative McBroom. Representative Katz would like to be verified as an affirmative. Alright...in the affirmative. The Clerk will proceed with the... Poll of the Absentees first."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees are Bluthardt, Dyer, Ewing, Hanahan, Hoxsey, Hudson, Kent, Kucharski, Schlickman, Stearney, Winchester, and Young."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed with the negative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Ackerman, Alexander, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Bower,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower."

Bower: "May I be verified as voting 'no'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. Leave for Representative Bower to be verified as a 'no'. Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Bradley, Bullock, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Collins, Cullerton, Davis, Dawson, DiPrima,



Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Flinn,
Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa..."

Speaker Matijevidch: "One moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney...record Stearney as 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Greiman, Hannig, Henry, Huff, Johnson, Emil Jones, Keane, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kulas, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Madigan, Matijevidch, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McCourt, McMaster, McPike, Meyer, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien,..."

Speaker Matijevidch: "One moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bianco; for what purpose do you seek attention?"

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

Speaker Matijevidch: "You're..."

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

Bianco: "Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Matijevidch: "Record Bianco as 'no'. Continue with the negative."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ronan, Ryan, Schuneman, Sharp, Simms, Slape, Stearney, C.M. Stiehl, Sumner, Swanstrom, Taylor, Terzich, Vitek, Waddell, Watson, White, Williams, J.J. Wolf, Woodyard, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevidch: "Questions of the...negative vote, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. What are we starting with?"

Speaker Matijevidch: "What's the count? 78-87. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty. Representative Getty."

Getty: "May I be verified please?"

Speaker Matijevidch: "Leave for Getty to be verified."

Mahar: "Mr. Watson."

Speaker Matijevidch: "What was that? I didn't hear it."

Mahar: "Mr. Watson."

Speaker Matijevidch: "Watson, Frank Watson."

Mahar: "He's in the back there."



Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative...Margulas, for what purpose do you rise?"

Margulas: "Margulas."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's a better. There you go. I'm sorry."

Margulas: "Mr. Speaker. How was I voted up there?"

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

Margulas: "Change me to 'no', please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Margulas to 'no' and Proceed."

Mahar: "Mr. O'Brien..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Wyvetter Younger from St. Clair wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Harris wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Do you give up, Bill. The request...Winchester 'no', and the request for a verification has been removed. The...wait a minute...the vote is 76 'ayes' and 91 'nays', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Bradley. It amends Senate Bill 562 on page 1 and line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, on Amendment #2."

Bradley: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 provides for... provides 2 things. The first, as we know the law today, in case of a vacancy in the Secretary of State's office, the Comptroller, the Treasurer, the Attorney General's office, if a vacancy occurred today, the Governor would make an appointment to fill that vacancy for 3½ years. This Amendment, part of it, would bring about the appointment of the Governor would hold office only until the next general election, to give the people the opportunity to participate in an election to fill the vacancy for the full...last 2 years of the term of office. I have had no opposition to that particular concept in this Amendment. The second part the Amendment goes quite a bit further. In the



event there...one of the dually elected office holders for some reason or another decides to run for another office, the Amendment addresses itself to that particular problem. If he decides to run in a...next general election, for instance, he would be asked to resign that office, and I want to make it very clear that that resignation would be effective following the commencement of the office for which he has filed. So what we're saying, if a person would file for the U.S. Senate seat, and he presently is in office in one of the offices I have mentioned, the resignation from that office would become effective..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You may as well mention his name. Go ahead."

Bradley: "Well, we have 2 Gentlemen it applies to, Mr. Scott and Mr. Dixon, that their resignation would become effective the day that they would be sworn in as a United States Senator. The resignation is irrevocable, thereby bringing about a...in creating a vacancy in the office, so that the office can be filled at the next general election. It seems to me to be a fair way. I've never heard of anybody opposing holding an election. And it does not force anybody to resign. Only they are asked to resign if they decide to take another office while they still have 2 years or 3 years left on the present term of the office that they presently hold. The Constitution seemed to be somewhat of a question in some people's minds, and I quote from the Constitution, it says regarding the appointee, 'The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies, or until the successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law.'. And the so called 'Constitutional experts' that I have talked with seem to think when we say 'As provided by law' that we provide the law in Illinois, the election laws, so if this does become a law, that there would be...bring about, if somebody



decided to run for office while he still has time on the present office he has just been elected to, it would bring about an election and allow the people to participate in that election. I don't see anything wrong with allowing the people to elect their executive officers when we have plenty of time, when we have time for petitions to be filed, to be circulated, filed, a primary to participate in, and be elected in the general election. And I ask for the support of the House on Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that, the Sponsor of the Bill from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank-you, Mr....thank-you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Go ahead, try it again, I think it's working. Move over then."

Steczko: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that if we were to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 562, contrary to what the Sponsor of the Amendment says, it would raise grave Constitutional questions. The Supreme Court of Illinois in 1939 in American Legion Post verses 'Barrett' said, and I quote, that 'The General Assembly may not take away from a Constitutional officer the power of duties given to him by the Constitution.' That provision, which was in our 1870 Constitution, was repeated in Article 5 of the current 1970 Illinois Constitution. By requiring an elected Constitutional officer to resign if he files nominating papers or if he is certified as a candidate for public office, there is no question that the General Assembly would be depriving that Constitutional officer of the Constitutional powers and duties on the effective date of that particular resignation. This vacancy language is a substantial departure from existing statutory and Constitutional language. And the Sponsor, I believe,



is injecting a new element. Seeking another public office is a basis for declaring a particular office vacant. The wisdom of the Illinois Supreme Court and the 'Barrett' Decision I believe is clear, when we consider that the opportunity for infringement by the General Assembly on executive power. Unless the conditions of resignation and vacancy are narrowly drawn, the door is open for the General Assembly to violate the principle of separation of powers and impose its thinking or policy on the executive offices of the State of Illinois. And I encourage a 'no' vote on... Amendment number 2 to Senate Bill 562."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins. ...One moment...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to get straightened out before we even start on this count. If this Amendment passes, how many votes does it take to pass this Amendment? We are dealing with a Constitutional officer and the appointment of a Constitutional officer, and it is a change in the Illinois State Constitution. How many votes will that take to pass this Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Only a simple Majority to adopt the Amendment. ...Save that if it's adopted for Third Reading."

Conti: "I want to make note that I am appealing the ruling of the Chair. I'll accept your ruling, but I want to make note so for further record that I am appealing the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright...it is..."

Conti: "That's your decision, isn't it?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The objection is..."

Conti: "That's your decision."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right..."

Conti: "For the record..."

Speaker Matijevich: "There is an objection, and that will be



included and journalized. Proceed...on the...oh,
Representative Collins from Cook."

Collins: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am somewhat surprised that this...that the Amendment would be offered from the other side of the aisle, and what is a blatant attack on the most popular elected office in the history of the State of Illinois, and naturally I'm referring to Alan Dixon, our Secretary of State, and you would think that such an attack would be mounted by Republicans, but here it is...it is offered by a Democrat, and a Democrat leader at that. It's surprising and shocking. The other individual who might be...who might be included in this attack would be a Republican, the Attorney General, who is running for the United States Senate, and of course, he is the second most popular elected official in the history of the State of Illinois, so all in-all, this is a rather surprising Amendment to be offered by a Legislative leader, but beyond that, the framers of the Constitution of 1970, and of course, the framers of the Constitution of 1870, in their wisdom, left this power...this appointed power in the hands of the executive to provide for orderly flow within the executive and to avoid the intrusion of the Legislature which is being attempted by this...by this Amendment today. Beyond that, we have to consider the inconvenience and expense of special elections which I know we all want to avoid, and again in the debates and in the Constitution of 1970, the framers of that Constitution, in their wisdom, did provide for taking the election of the state executive out of the presidential years and putting it in the off year election as to avoid the undo influence that national trends might have on our state elections, and, of course, this Amendment could put those elections right back into the presidential years. I think for these reasons and for a million of other reasons, we should out of hand reject this... what



I can best...refer to as the Speaker's Amendment. This is something the Republicans and Democrats should join in and overwhelmingly defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, would like to clarify his objection to the requirement of a simple Majority to this Amendment."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, yes. I think maybe we misunderstood each other. For the passage of this Amendment, it would take 89 votes, but after this Amendment is adopted,...if adopted...now, please pay attention so I don't have to ask the question again,...after the Amendment is adopted, how many votes would it take to pass this Bill if the Amendment is adopted?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, let's remove your objection then, because that inquiry is premature, and we will cross that bridge when we come to it. So, we'll remove the objection for the moment. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know, as a matter of courtesy, I should say that I reluctantly oppose my fellow leader, but I can't say that today. I'm not reluctant at all. I am also...should say that I'm...should have some reluctance about raising Constitutional questions because my experience tells me here that when we are considering something on the floor of the House, about the only thing we can be sure of, if it is Constitutional, is the judge's pay raise. We pretty well know that, but I do believe that this Amendment is unconstitutional. How can we, a legislative branch of government, pass a law that would remove a Constitutional officer from office before his 4 years are up, or until he has resigned to accept another elected office. Even if we were in our Constitutional right, it...this would be unfair to the Dixons, the Scotts, to the O'Neals, and whoever else might want to run for



U.S. Senator. It causes them all to resign upon filing for the U.S. Senator job, really any other job for that matter. Some of the best public officials we've had in this state have come from the ranks of those holding other offices, some statewide and some local. I think it would be very unfair, and one of the worst things about it is, I shouldn't even bring this up, but it's something that starts after the ball game because you change the rules. It's no different than what the U.S. Senate did when they extended the deadline date for the Equal Rights Amendment. Certainly this...I don't see how we could do anything of this sort. There is nothing wrong with the Governor appointing the vacancies. They do it all over the country, every place. But there is something wrong with forcing all people from seeking another office to force them out of their office, and I would suggest that we defeat this Amendment soundly."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this has been the type of an issue that I have been wanting to support for a long time, and unfortunately it's drafted wrong. I think he's simply taking off after Dixon and Scott. I've had the attitude for a long time that those people sitting in the Senate, meaning the Senate of the State of Illinois, have an opportunity that we don't have in the House. That's one that I don't think they should have any more than us, and I don't think we should have that kind of an opportunity over somebody else. If you look in the recent history, Demucio, Bruce, Pines, have all run for offices and were able to keep their seat and supposedly be Legislators while they are running for those other offices. I believe that any time a person files for another office they should be compelled to resign. I think it's only right and fair for the nonincumbent to be



opposing an incumbent and being on equal grounds. If I in this House decide that I want to run for another office, I have no right to take the money from the state and continue to do so. But this particular Amendment is addressed to 2 different...2 separate people. If the Bill could ever be drafted to say that is a person on the county board wants to run for the General Assembly or any other seat, that they resign their position, it's one of those that I could support. But since you are hitting on just 2 separate people, unfortunately I think this Bill is going to fail."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank-you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose this Amendment because I think it is going to present some very serious future problems of the people of this state. Throughout the history of our country, public officials have always had the right to seek higher office..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, the...one moment Representative Stiehl, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Yourell: "Yes, point of order, I think that to have somebody from the Secretary of State's office on the floor lobbying this Amendment at this time is absolutely wrong, and I would ask the Chair to please remove those people from the floor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well I believe he can have one aid on the floor...but he shouldn't be lobbying, he or she. Proceed Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. As I said before, throughout the history of this country, public officials have always had the right to seek higher office while serving their present term. And many of these officials, history will show, have served us very well. Now I think that if this Amendment passes, we are putting serious



limitations on the ability of some very able, capable, experienced men and women to seek higher office, and I ask for the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to this Amendment and it gets more intriguing the more debate we have. It sounds to me like this is probably the best upward mobility Amendment that we have ever seen on this House floor, and those who aspire a higher office perhaps might increase their chances if there are more vacancies among those who hold higher office. The argument also hits home that any time a Member of the Illinois House runs for another office, that Member of the Illinois House, unless he or she is running in a special election, for example in the Congressional election, risks his or her political career. I don't see why everyone shouldn't have to have equal risks when they seek equal opportunity for higher office. I think this Amendment is beginning to sound better and better. I understand that we need 10 Republican votes to pass this. At least that is the rumor, that the Democrats have enough votes on their side to get it passed if there are only 10 Republicans, and I would think there are at least 10 Republicans that don't want to think they have to stay in the House for the rest of their lives. I'm not sure all of us could stand it for the rest of our lives. In fact, I'm not sure all of you could stand it if all of us were in the House for the rest of our lives."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before I call on Representative Mugalian, I've been told that those who have not yet taken their photos, they are taking your photos in the hallway over on this side. Those of you who have not taken your photos. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."



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

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous question is put. Representative Bradley from McLean to close."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe the Amendment is not timely, and some people are taking a view that it was put in for certain particular people who choose to run for another office. If they choose to do that, this Amendment would affect them. The remarks that some people made that the people would be denied the expertise of some good office holders is exactly why you should adopt this Amendment. The people just realize that they could put the best people into office just last November. There's no question about that. The two Gentlemen that have announced for the U.S. Senate seat, in my opinion, are excellent Constitutional officers, both of them. Both elected by overwhelming majorities. The people spoke and they said, 'We want these people to serve us for four years', and they expected them to serve for four years. If the Gentlemen wish to serve for four years, this Amendment won't affect them at all. But if they do decide, or any other Constitutional officer would decide to leave office and to seek another office,... all we're doing with this Amendment is saying the people ought to have the opportunity to participate in the election. And you, all of us sitting on the floor of the House know what it means to participate in an election. I don't have to spell that out. So, I've been saying to you, the people realize they have elected excellent people to office. We're just saying let them stay there, or let them give up that office and let the people participate in an election...in the next general election. It doesn't bring about a special election. It's not going to be any more expensive. I feel

(continued)



...have rather mixed emotions about my friend, Phil Collins, who always gets up and speaks about something other than the Amendment and makes discouraging remarks about other Members of the House and tries to look underneath the leaves to see why we're really putting these...Amendment in. I know sometimes, Phil, you just look at the top and see the clear daylight that we are attempting to make it possible for the people to participate in elections. And I know that you approve of that. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to 562. The question is 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no', and to explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what we have here, of course, is clearly a Constitutional issue which deprives or relieves any officer, any Constitutional officer from the powers and duties afforded them by the Constitution. I see we have a number of red lights. There is no need for me to speak any more. I'll just conclude."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my question in explaining my vote,...are Members of the Legislature Constitutional officers?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I hope so."

Simms: "It's your interpretation, Mr. Speaker, that they are Constitutional officers?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I sure hope so. It is mine. The Gentleman from Cook, Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank-you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'no' because, well, I guess for a lot of reasons, most of which have already



been expressed, but if we were really going to make this thing applicable and fair to everybody, there are an awful lot of colleagues in the Senate who have 4 year terms, many of whom do an excellent job in the Senate and have run for other offices, Congress, other offices during their 4 year term. I don't see anything wrong with that. They are excellent Senators. They'd make excellent Congressmen or whatever other offices they've held, and I really think this is a bad concept to single out 2 officers of the State of Illinois to make this applicable to. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, to announce his conflict of interest."

Epton: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. You anticipated I, once again, have a conflict of interest. I'll vote my conscience."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marion...he's from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "I don't know how many of you listened to the Sponsor's explanation, but I don't think he explained it to my satisfaction. I do have a copy of the Amendment here. What this says is that if Alan Dixon, and Dave O'Neal, and Bill Scott would all file for the United States Senate, that effective January 1981, none of them would be state officers at that point. And I don't know if that is what he intended to do or not, but that is what the Bill does, and I don't know if he understood that or not. They would all stay in office till January '81. One would go to the United States Senate, the other two would go home."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Just one moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "I'd like to explain my 'no' vote, too. I have a conflict of interest, and I want to make sure that I am voting my conscience by voting 'no'."



Speaker Matijevich: "Atta boy, Elmer. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 38 voting 'aye', 116 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before we get to Floor Amendments, Representative Garmisa wanted to make some sort of announcement. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to ask leave of the House to change the Transportation Committee meeting from this Monday at 3:30 in room D1 to Wednesday, June 13, at 3:00 in room D1. I checked this out with the leadership of both sides of the aisle. They are in agreement. I would ask for leave and ask for the Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave that those Bills posted for Monday shall be heard on Wednesday in Transportation Committee, and the Bill will be suspended until that date. Leave for the Attendance Roll Call leave. And it shall be so done. Floor Amendment #3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Friedrich, amends Senate Bill 562 in the House on page 4 by deleting on line 25 immediately after 'the period the following' and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, on Amendment #3."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill without this Amendment provides that on your campaign literature, you have to name your Committee, the address of the Committee, the name and address of your chairman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Cook...from Cook, Representative Steczo says this is agreed in favor of Amendment #3...adoption say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. House Bill 568...that's Senate Bill rather."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 568, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Banking Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Is Senate Bill 562 now noncontroversial. Can we have leave to keep it on short debate? Leave, and Senate Bill 562, no, that Amendment wasn't adopted. Yeah, leave, and Senate Bill 562 is now on Short Debate. Proceed with the Amendment on 568."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 689."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 689, a Bill for an Act in relation to reimbursement for optometric services under certain insurance programs, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 724."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 724, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 735."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 735, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Brokers and Salesmen License Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 809."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 809, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Aeronautics Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevec: "One moment. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin, for what purpose do you rise?"

Breslin: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I wanted 735 held on second Reding please."

Speaker Maitjevich: "Alright, hold 735 on Second Reading. Return that to Second Reading and hold. 809...any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevec: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevec: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 892."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 892, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nonprofit Healthcare Service Plan Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1049 is out of the record. 1241, Senate Bill 1-2-4-1."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1241, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1259."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1259, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Amendments from the floor?"

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



Bill 1259 on page one, line 65, by deleting the word 'may' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, on Floor Amendment #1."

Getty: "I'd ask to withdraw Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #1, and it is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Getty, amends Senate Bill 1259 on page one by deleting lines 13, and 14, and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty on Amendment #2."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #2... we've had discussions with the department. I believe it was agreed to, and it would provide 2 reports rather than one. I vote for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Daniels indicates agreement."

All in favor of Amendment #2 say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1334. Leave Bill 1259 remain on Short Debate. Leave, and it shall so remain. 1334."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedures, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1... Representative Schlickman, amends Senate Bill 1334 on page one by deleting lines 8 thru 10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following. 'Any person appearing before the Grand Jury shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel who shall advise him of his rights, but shall not participate in any other way.'"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, is not here. I believe we will have..."

~~Representative Stearney from Cook, what purpose~~



Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, as Minority Spokesman of the Judiciary II Committee, it was my idea to put this Amendment on. It was merely Mr. Schlickman who attached his name to the Amendment. It was merely an Amendment...I ask for leave to proceed."

Speaker Matijeich: "Do we have leave that Representative Stearney can handle the Amendment? Leave. Proceed, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment was merely meant to clarify the language of the Bill, to put it in conformity with the existing language of the...chapter 38, so I would ask for a... that it be adopted."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "What does the Amendment do...a little more clarity?"

Stearney: "Well, if you read the Bill, you would find that it provides a council shall be provided to any person appearing before the Grand Jury. The purpose of the Amendment is to...put the language in conformity with existing language which provides for council, so...target defendants appearing before the Grand Jury. So it is merely a clean up Amendment, Mr. Leinenweber, and it doesn't..."

Leinenweber: "In other words...without this Bill, target defendants are the only ones entitled to have council present before the Grand Jury. Is that correct?"

Stearney: "No, no, it is already the law of the State of Illinois that target defendants shall have the right to have..."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I said that...target defendants do, but the Bill extends that to other people who appear, but what you're doing is just making the language track with the other Bill. Is that right?"



Stearney: "Yes, it does."

Leinenweber: "Thank-you."

Stearney: "That's all the Amendment does."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well thank-you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this Amendment does a little more than that. It strictly limits what the attorney can do before the Grand Jury. He can advise the person of his rights, but he cannot participate in any other way. It's not just a merely (sic) Amendment. There is some substantive language in here. I'd appreciate it if we'd hold it until Representative Schlickman came."

Stearney: "Wait, Mr... may I answer the Gentleman?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, just for the edification of the Members of the House, because I don't think Mr. Darrow has read the Bill. The Bill provides quote 'nothing in this Act shall prohibit the right of any person appearing before the Grand Jury to have his attorney present during Grand Jury procedures.' And now the Amendment reads quote 'Any person appearing before the Grand Jury shall have the right to be accompanied by council who shall advise him of his rights but shall not participate in any other way. The purpose of the Amendment is to put the Bill in conformity with existing language of the Criminal Code. It does nothing more. If you don't like the Bill you can vote against it on Third Reading, but the Amendment is meant to clarify and nothing more."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1334. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted.. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading, We will return back to the order of Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar to pick up a couple Bills of Members that have returned. Representative Neff on Senate Bill...first of all let's get one of our leaders, Representative Polk had one. Senate Bill 505. Read the Bill. 505."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 505, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, may we move that back to Second for the purpose of a couple of Amendments that have been filed?"

~~Speaker Matijeich: "Leave to return Senate Bill 505 to the~~
order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Leave, and the Bill is now in Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 505 on page one by deleting line 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following, and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 505."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago there were allegations, in fact charges, brought by the U.S. Attorney that this was a 'fetcher' Bill, and as a result of this Bill, a couple of people went to jail. Representative Hanahan had legal costs of upwards of \$100,000. And the Bill didn't pass. It seems to me that the Bill is a good Bill, and that the Bill should pass. What it does is require all leased vehicles to bear the words 'rental vehicle' on the title. Now, if you drive...when you drive to the Forum 30 for a reception, you'll see on 9th Street that Avis Car Rental is selling used Avis cars right out on the street. So obviously, a major supplier of leased vehicles does not object to people knowing that the vehicles are leased. Of more significance are the vehicles that have been



leased by Members of this General Assembly, one in particular who is now on the phone and probably won't figure out I'm talking about him, but when this Bill was... in Committee last year, Representative Emil Jones asked me or asked the witnesses whether they were talking about cars similar to the ones he leased. And the industry answered 'Yes', and Representative Jones replied 'Well, people certainly ought to know that it was leased. I didn't change the oil for 15,000miles.' Well, it's problems like that, it seems to me, that the consumers ought to know about, and unfortunately I forgot to introduce this Bill this year. It was introduced last year. It passed the House overwhelmingly and got lost in the Senate, because I suspect the Senators didn't know what was behind it. I think the Senate is now willing to except something like this, and I would ask for your support of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Skinner has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 505. No objection, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #2 is adopted. Do we have leave to retain Senate Bill 505 on the order of Short Debate Third? Leave. Senate Bill 265."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 265, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff on Senate Bill 265."

Neff: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask permission to hear Senate Bill 265 along with Senate Bill 507. They are almost the same Bills."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to hear Senate Bills 265 and 507 together. Leave. Read 507."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 507, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections fo the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 265 are the results of a Working Committee and the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission. This is a Motor Vehicle Laws Commission Bill, and we had a Committee that made a study of this which includes the Secretary of State's office, the Department of Transportation, the Illinois State Police, and several Representatives from different classes of the agriculture and chemical industry. In this legislation the proposal is that we're increasing the registration fees for exempt vehicles from \$8 to \$16...period. The reason behind this increase that the administrative and proceeding costs are exceeding the present \$8 fee. All Members of the Working Committee are in agreement with this Bill 265, and regards...pardon me, in regards to Senate Bill 507, which I said is similar, but it does address one other very serious problem associated with a floatation tire for fertilizer spreader. At the present time, the operators of these floatation vehicles are...in an operation dilemma, because they can use...loading these tires the way the regulations now are, they cannot pull these wagons...these fertilizer spreaders on the highways because of the width of the tires. Floatation tires are an exceptionally large tire made to carry heavy weight. And that is the only difference in House Bill...507 from 26...from 265. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on this and be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 265 and Senate Bill 507. There are no questions. This is Short Debate. The question is 'Shall these Bills pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk



will take the record. On this question there is 124 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 651, Lechowicz. Is he ready? Out of the record. And Hoxsey's not here yet, nor is McAuliffe,;: I don't see. Oh, here, Roger McAuliffe, are you ready on... I saw a Bill here with your name, I thought: I guess I must have been mistaken. Motion...the...Representative Ewell, from Cook, Representative Ray Ewell on motions."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, yesterday evening I made a motion on Senate Bill 622. I would like to amend that motion just slightly, with leave of the House, that is, and to make it a motion to reconsider and place on the order of Postponed Consideration by suspending the proper rules."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman is moving to suspend Rule 38 and to reconsider the vote...by which Senate Bill 622 lost and place that Bill on Postponed Consideration. On that the Gentleman...on that motion, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, now Mr. Speaker, he...we were talking about the issue last evening, correct...and you are requesting the motion does what?"

Ewell: "We considered and placed on the order of Postponed Consideration. All we wanted was 70 votes to leave it there. Stearney' just Postponed Consideration, that's all we wanted it to be."

Speaker Matijevich: "The upshot of this so that all the Membership knows is to reconsider the vote so that that Bill can be on Postponed Consideration. Does everybody understand that now? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Question for the Gentleman. This Bill lost yesterday. Am I right, Mr. Ewell?"

Ewell: "That is correct."



Stearney: "Now what...what assurance do the Members have who voted against this Bill yesterday, that when it comes back in some other form, it won't be in substantially the same form. In other words, have you prepared an Amendment as of yet?"

Ewell: "No, no, I'm going to watch it with you, and we're still going to help kill it, but you and I are going to work on it very hard. I'm not...there's no concern, but it wanted to go to Postponed Consideration..."

Stearney: "Well, I don't see..."

Ewell: "...In lieu of the Sponsor..."

Stearney: "...I don't see the rationale. You were one of the opponents..."

Ewell: "Of course I am, but..."

Stearney: "...And now you say you're going to continue to use every effort you can to kill the Bill..."

Ewell: "Mr. Getty would like it on-Postponed Consideration..."

Stearney: "Then what is the purpose of making the motion, then?"

Ewell: "Extending him the courtesy of putting it on Postponed Consideration like we do for a number of Bills. That's all. If you watch it, you'll hear me."

Stearney: "Have you seen the Amendments... proposed Amendments?"

Ewell: "What Amendments? I'm going to oppose it anyway."

Stearney: "Well, I see no reason then...to resurrect this matter, because everybody voted 'no' on it yesterday. I don't...and I haven't been shown an Amendment yet that would satisfy me, so I think as it is, as the Bill now stands, it is dead. I think it should stay that way, and rather than give it life again, breathing life into this Bill like Lazarus and then be confronted with a monstrosity again next week. I would urge that the Members continue and vote 'no' on this motion to reconsider."

Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."



Johnson: "Members have indicated to me that they don't think it's possible to amend this Bill into a form that would meet the objections of the people who voted 'no'. I tend to agree. I don't think we can devise an Amendment that is going to make this a livable Bill. This is one of the few Bills, probably the only Bill in my legislative career that I have life and death control over because Representative Getty has given me his word. I've never known him to break his word on anything, that if we didn't arrive at an agreed Bill that I thought was totally acceptable to those...at least those objections that I raised, he would not call the Bill for another vote. And with that in mind, and also with the minds of the objections the people have raised to me, I think we're probably in a posture to extend the courtesy to him of letting...letting him...have put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Matijeich: "Based on that, do you remove your objection yet, Representative Stearney, or not? No...alright then, Representative Ewell moves that..."

Ewell: "Suspend the appropriate rules..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Moves...suspend the appropriate rules to reconsider the vote...Rule 38. On that...those in favor vote 'aye'..."

Johnson: "And place on the order of Postponed Consideration..."

Speaker Matijeich: "...And place on the order of Postponed. Those in favor say...vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. You need 89 votes. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Point of inquiry, Mr...Speaker. How did Mr. Ewell vote? Was it 'present', or 'no'? We had a little problem with that yesterday on Elections Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "We take his word for it. He said he's on the..."

Friedrich: "Well, I know, but it is a matter of which prevailing side. You know it was rules yesterday if you



vote 'present', it's on the prevailing side. And it's kind of a new concept, and I just wondered how he voted on this one."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "The winds of time shift and change like the sand, so you have to be flexible in the Legislature."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 51 'nays', and no 'presents', and the motion prevails, and Senate Bill 622 shall be on the order of Postponed Consideration. Senate Bills Third Reading on priority of call. Just one moment, the Gentleman from Rock Island,

Representative Polk, for what purpose do you rise?"

Polk: "Well, the question has been brought...would it only take 89 or would it take 107 to do that, Sir.?"

Speaker Matijevich: "89...one moment..."

Polk: "...Still shakes his head yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you rise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, that was just a motion to reconsider to put it on Postponed Consideration. He still doesn't have enough votes to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, he suspended the whole ball of wax, and..."

Conti: "All in that one vote..."

Speaker Matijevich: "All in that one vote...and nobody has to divide..."

Conti: "Boy, we sure changed the rules around here."

Speaker Matijevich: "Glen Schneider looked like he wanted to divide, but he didn't ask for it, so...you did it all in one. The...Third Reading. Senate Bills Third. Order of priority call Senate Bill 292. I don't see... is Mary Lou Kent back there? I don't see her. Senate Bill 394."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 394, a Bill for an Act to amend the



Industrial Building Revenue Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf, on Senate Bill 394. Just one moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel. For what purpose do you rise?"

Piel: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, just a question of the Chair. We are going according to priority of call, and these appeals were called yesterday. Are we going to go to the top of the list everyday, or are we going to go according to priority of call?"

Speaker Matijeich: "All I can go by is the list that was given to me..."

Piel: "Yes, but if you'll notice on your list there is a space there after about the first 5 Bills. There is a space, and that's where we're starting as of today."

Speaker Matijeich: "Well, since there is only a couple to go by, let's do it this way. I think you're in order, but we'll do it this way. Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 394 is the companion Bill to Senate Bills 142 and 45 of which passed yesterday. This Bill simply amends the Industrial Building Revenue Bond Act, and it allows the industrial revenue bond interest rate to be increased to 10%. It has an additional provision which requires bonds issued at 10% to be sold at par. I would respectfully request your favorable support."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf, has moved for this passage of Senate Bill 394. Are there any questions? If not, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 394 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 voting 'aye', 2 'no'...2 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 394 having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 635, McBroom. Read the Bill. Is he here? He's not here, out of the record. Senate Bill 658, Abramson. Out of the record. Alright, Senate Bill 5, Marovitz. He's running to his seat. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill #5, a Bill for an Act creating a Hos..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hospices."

Clerk Leone: "...Hospices Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, on Senate Bill 5."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to bring Senate Bill 5 back to the order of Second Reading for an Amendment that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to return Senate Bill 5 to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Leave. Second Reading. Read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Marovitz, amends House (sic) Bill #5 on page 1 by deleting line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz on the Amendment."

Marovitz: "Thank-you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Amendment does is instead of having 4 public Members appointed by the Governor, it says we'll have 3 public Members appointed by the Governor on the Commission, and one from the Department of Public Health. This has been agreed by the Department of Public Health and the Sponsors, and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 5."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz has moved to adopt Amendment #1. On that, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."



Polk: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to one question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he will. Proceed."

Polk: "The...what is the criteria now being established by the Department of Public Health? I'm all for this hospices, all the way, but...the change. What is the criteria established by the Department? How will they determine who they will appoint? Is this consumer...?"

Marovitz: "No, that doesn't necessarily have to be a consumer. It would be somebody that they feel is involved and knowledgeable in this particular field and would make sure the intent of the legislation and of the Commission would be fulfilled."

Polk: "Then...there are no guidelines set up. There just... at the discretion of the director."

Marovitz: "Right...the discretion of the director."

Polk: "Alright, thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker...!"

Speaker Matijevich: "Third...Third Reading."

Marovitz: "I would ask leave of the House to suspend the appropriate rule so that Senate Bill 5 could be heard at this particular time. I've cleared this with both...Leadership on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the rules so that this Bill can be heard now on Third Reading. Does he have leave? No objection...use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I was just wondering why we're so quick to get to this Bill.?"



Speaker Matijevich: "I'm in no hurry..."

Leinenweber: "I put my light on to ask that question before I..."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's because it's the next one on the priority of call."

Leinenweber: "Well, why shouldn't it be handled like every other Bill? I was wondering whether this Gentleman had any particular reason why it had to be..."

Speaker Matijevich: "I...I don't know. I wanted to hold it, but he asked leave, so I had...I had to go ahead. Are you objecting...are you objecting? Alright, proceed, Representative Marovitz. There is no objection."

Marovitz: ~~"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 5."~~

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, there is an objection...oh, no he doesn't object. He wants to speak on the Bill when you get to it. Proceed, Representative Marovitz. Okay."

Marovitz: "Senate Bill 5...sets up a...the Hospices Study Commission consisting of 8 Legislators and 4 public Members. Two House Members appointed by the Speaker, two House Members appointed by the House Minority Leader, two Senate Members by the President, and two by the Senate Minority Leader, three public Members appointed by the Governor, one, the Department of Public Health. The Bill creates a Commission to study the feasibility of hospices for all individuals in Illinois, the present and future needs of hospices, hospices experienced in other states, and there is experience in other state, and the cost of construction and financing hospices. According to the Department of Public Health, this Commission will serve to educate the public as to what the hospice concept entails. The Illinois Department of Public Health has proposed rules and regulations before the Illinois House Facilities Planning Board on a hospice program, and these guidelines are a result of a study that was done by the department and pressure from the medical profession



and industry to implement some type of a hospice program. the...each hospice offers a program to provide medical and supportive care for terminally ill patients and their families, either directly, or on a consulting basis with the patients physician. The hospice offers an organized program for people that are going to die and are terminally ill. The whole family is considered a unit of care. Emphasis is placed on symptomatic control, preparation, and support prior to death. This is a reality. It's a concept that exists in other states. It has been talked about, and there are people who are intending to create hospices in the State of Illinois...

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz, I'm having all kinds of inquiries, even from the press. They want to know what is a hospices."

Marovitz: "Okay, a hospice is a facility for terminally ill people to prepare them and give them supportive care and treatment prior to death. This is a facility that exists, a concept that exists in other states. I can't say how many exist. It does exist in other states. Medically I am told that there are Boards and individuals ready to create hospices in the State of Illinois. I think we owe it to all the citizens of the State of Illinois to set up this Commission which, by the way, has its own repealer...in it. This Bill has its own repealer in it. It's repealed October 1, 1981, but we would set this Commission up to make sure that every citizen of the State of Illinois is protected from anyone intending to defraud the public, and that if a hospice was set up, it would be done so in the proper way with all proper protections, and I would ask for your support of this important new concept."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 5.

On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti.



Conti: "Is there a companion with this Appropriation Bill?
And if there is, how much is it?"

Marovitz: "Yes, there is an Appropriation Bill, Senate Bill 6 appropriates 50,000 dollars to fund the Study Commission. That Bill is in Eugene Barnes Commission, rather Committee, and will be in the...omnibus Appropriation Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I would...is this on the Short Debate Calendar, Mr..."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, you'd have to..."

Deuster: "So we can ask questions? I would ask this question. No one on the floor of the House, or in the Press Gallery, or even in the Chair seems to know what a hospice is. I pulled out the dictionary, and a hospice is defined here as a 'lodging for travelers, young persons, or the under privileged, especially when it is maintained by a religious order'. And with that definition in mind, Representative Marovitz, I then got a copy of the Bill to see...to assume rather that you had probably defined hospice in the Bill, but I don't find it in the Bill. Is there a definition of hospice. We're creating a Commission to study or to consider hospice, and it is not defined. What...what... what is..."

Marovitz: "Well, it is not defined in the Bill because hospices as originally created in England and which now appear in the United States are facilities, as I defined, for the terminally ill. That is what they are whether you need a definition or not in the legislation, I personally don't feel you need one. That is what a hospice is. You're asking me for a definition, and I'm giving you one."

Deuster: "Well, if I might speak briefly to the Bill, I think that the Sponsor certainly has something compassionate and meritorious in mind, but when we write laws and



make statutes, we don't rely on orally what somebody might say on the floor of the House. If a definition is needed, I think it ought to be in the Bill. In expressing my feeling, I must vote 'present' or 'no' on this in its present form. And I would suggest to the Sponsor that since it is a very important subject in which he is conscientiously interested, I think he would be well advised to take this out of the record and discuss with some Members the possibility of at least adding a provision to the Bill that would define hospice, which I think is in desperate need of definition. I would make that clear..."

Marovitz: "...I would ask whether legislative intent...has any meaning on this floor? Certainly..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. That was not a question, so you are out of order. Representative Pierce from Lake."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, all this Bill does is create...a Commission to study the need for hospices. Is that right, Sir? The definition will come in any legislation...that Commission presents to the Legislature. Now the Gentleman told you what he means by hospice, the Commission may have a slightly different definition. But believe me, any of you that have ever had a parent or relative that was terminally ill, will need...will know the need for a facility different perhaps than a hospital, which will bleed the family absolutely dry and different than a home environment where children and others are put...are put at a great hardship to provide the 24 hour nursing care that a terminally ill person might require. They may be no more medications, the type that the hospital needs to give. It may be able to be as a hospice in a less expensive, and a more humane environment. Now part of the duty of this Commission, I suppose, will be to present legislation that will



properly define what a hospice is and what it does. For us to define it in a statute creating the Commission, it should do the work...to do the work of the Commission. The Gentleman told you what he has in mind. I think it is a good concept as far as being worth study. I say this from personal experience, and I think we ought to support this Bill because all the Commission will go out, see what they're doing in England and other states and determine whether we need this concept and should have this concept here in Illinois to avoid the inhumaneness and coldness of a hospital as a place for a terminally ill person, and yet realizing the inability of the home environment to support such a person...as the family to support such a person at home, and therefore, I will vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. Anybody that did today's Sun Times crossword puzzle, and I refer to 25 across, will know that the definition of hospice is a rest home. Now, Members of the General Assembly, I certainly don't quarrel with the concept of hospice. I think it's been around for a while, whether you call them rest homes, or you call them hospices, or whatever, I don't quarrel that we probably need some or should have some. The only question I would have is whether or not we need a new additional Commission that's going to spend a lot of our money. Now they're coming in for a major 50,000 for this fiscal year. I think they'll be back probably next year, probably with two Bills, one to appropriate 100,000, 150,000 probably a lot for travel because it is a popular concept in Europe. Members of the Commission will probably want to go over there and take a look at what they have in England and Ireland,



and places like that, however, we have made a conscientious effort to try to trim some of these Commissions down that we already have, and I think this is an inappropriate time to create a new Commission. The Department of Public Health, I think, is capable of looking into this subject and suggesting perhaps to Members of the General Assembly that legislation might be necessary to say expand some of our financing agencies so that they could make governmental loans or something like that to private groups, or perhaps even to appropriate money for a hospice. I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the year to create a new Commission. Now...he has put in a 1981 cut off date, but I suggest...they won't get the job done by 1981, it will be 1983 or maybe 1985. It will be 50,000 this year, 100 next, 100%, 200, it'll be around for a long, long time. Probably as long as the Sponsor's around, probably, maybe even longer. Probably longer than I'll be here, but I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Darrow has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Thank-you...thank-you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which passed the Executive Committee of the Senate by 15 to nothing vote and the full Senate 46 to 4. It's a Bill that is totally supported by the Department of Public Health who feels this is needed, this kind of



a study, this kind of a Commission is needed. We have a small appropriation. There is a repealer built into this Commission which is very rare. I think it's ludicrous to say that we're going to be coming in for more money, or more of this, or more of that. We're coming in for \$50,000 with a Commission and a repealer about a subject that is near and dear to every one of us. We all know people, whether it's friends or relatives, that have been suffering from terminal illnesses, and we know the rigors and the heartbreak, what we, what family, what friends, and what the individuals themselves go through. This is a new concept in our country. It's a reality, let's not be blind to it, and if we want to protect our citizens and make sure that it is done properly, this is an important vote. I would ask everybody to think about it. It is important to Senator D'Arco. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 5. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 5 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Certainly before we vote for this Bill with its incredibly large appropriation, we ought to know whether junkets are planned across the Atlantic, and so far I've heard no one suggest that it isn't. I can't think of any way a Commission could spend \$50,000 without spending about 90% of it on travel and accommodations. Now it seems to me that this is a perfect example of, unless somebody can come up with a better reason than I've heard so far, of a Commission that...who's work could be done by a subcommittee of the Human Resources Committee on which Representative Marovitz speaks... the Sponsor served last term. I don't know whether he



serves on it this term, but this...it didn't even go to the right Committee; for Pete's sake, it went to the Executive Committee instead of the Human Resources Committee. Had it gone to the Human Resources Committee, the Committee might have decided a subcommittee could do it. Certainly the subject needs to be investigated, but I don't see how it is going to cost \$50,000 to do it, and if you are going to Great Britain, I might change my mind. I might vote for it if you'll take me."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know what the Republican analysis on this Bill indicates, but certainly those of you on the Democratic side who have any questions about the definition of a hospice as it is used in the context of this Bill can simply turn to your analysis and find the definition provided there by the Department of Public Health. We now have an Amendment on the Bill indicating that a Member from the Department of Public Health will be a part of this Commission. I think there will be absolutely no confusion about the definition of what their work is. It is an area in which the Department of Public Health has rightfully already taken enough concern to at least provide a definition for the kinds of services that could be provided, and I urge your support. This is a...matter of compassion for terminally ill people and their families..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman..."

Satterthwaite: "...With the support for a family unit so that both the treatment of the patient, and the psychology effect upon the family unit can be supported at the same time to give relief not only in a medical sense, but in that mental and psychological sense that befalls a family when they have a terminally ill member. And I urge your support so that we can proceed to find



ways of addressing that accute problem."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentelmen of the House, I rise in opposition of this legislation for one of the reasons Representative Leinenweber indicated is another Commission. Secondly and most importantly, I think those that are dying do not want to be around other individuals that are dying. I think they want to be around the living. The people that are going to get better, I think they want to have hope that they are going to live, that they are going to continue their life here on earth, and I think the worst thing that we should do is put someone that has a terminal case in with a group of other people that have terminal cases in order to demoralize them and lose any type of sense of responsibility or hope that they may have. I think this would be one of the worst things that the Legislature could do, and I think for these reasons that this legislation is untimely, and I think that there is enough experimentation to the university systems throughout our country that can provide the necessary information without the..."

Speaker Matijevich: ~~"The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote."~~

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first of all let me say that I think it's premature that this Bill has been called before the House for action. It has yet to be assigned and debated in the Appropriations II Committee of Representative Barnes. I think before acting on this Bill, at least we should know whether the Committee believes the appropriation is justified. I don't believe it is personally, but I think that Appropriations Committee ought to make that determination. And secondly, it appears to me that it is another Commission being formed



and somewhere along the line we ought to draw the line. We can't kill Commissions now existing, even though there had been repealers on them at the beginning of their course of life. It would seem to me that if we can't kill Commissions now existing, we oughtn't establish any more. This one is certainly not needed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leinenweber has indicated a request that if this Bill gets 89, he requests a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm fully aware of the fact that the Sponsor of this Bill is my esteemed Senator from my district, but I feel somewhat constrained to wonder as I consider the concept of hospice. Could we be but one step away from the concept of euthanasia. Reminiscence of the time from a movie called 'Soylent Green' where with the proper papers filled out and the proper signatures affixed, you could be rolled in and put to death to the melodic strands of Brahms or Beethoven. I wonder..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just an explanation that was indicated and which is correct, that the funding mechanism for this Bill is in the Appropriations II Committee, but I just want to make something clear here. One of the procedures that we follow in that Committee on all Commissions and...is that we wait upon the passage of the legislation which either or establishes that Commission, or extend the life of that Commission that that action be taken in either House before we take up that measure in the Appropriations Committee. So as I understand, the Sponsor of this Bill was correct. He



had been in Committee, had indicated to him in the Committee that the fund for this Commission would be offered for the omnibus Bill that comes out of our Commission. That is correct based upon the action that we will take..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "...Based upon the action that we will take here relative to this matter currently pending before us. I am supporting the measure. We...I would suggest that the Members of the House that feels strongly on this issue would support the measure. That determination of a funding is based upon what we do on the current measure before you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that one of the questions we have to consider...in this vote is whether or not we want to further...further implement this drive that our country seems to be in toward a cradle to the grave welfare state type operation. Now the question is 'Does government have any legitimate purpose, or any legitimate cause in almost every facet of our lives?'. I think the American people are beginning to resent the steady ever increasing intrusion of government in every facet of their lives from cradle to the grave. If we want to add and implement to the thrust of the welfare state and settle this responsibility and cau..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank-you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can't believe some of the things I am hearing. I...I don't think that there is anybody in this country that would resent providing care and treatment and assistance for people



who are terminally ill. And any attempt to link this with government intervention...I don't think people are thinking logically if they do that. How can you resent caring for a family and friends who are terminally ill? When one of the previous Speakers said this was one of the most demoralizing pieces of legislation, he obviously hasn't read the legislation, because this legislation would provide supportive care, psychological care, spiritual care, physical care for family, and friends, and the individual who's terminally ill. What could be more important, Ladies and Gentleman, for helping every citizen in the State of Illinois? Don't link this with government intervention. How about caring for people who will provide service to everybody in the state throughout their lifetime and now are unfortunately are doomed to death. How about caring for them? This is an important concept. It's \$50,000. We've got a repealer in it, and if everybody..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard of many valid reasons why I should be voting against this Bill today, and I have in the past never voted for a Bill before the appropriations, but I can... Two valid reasons are standing out in my mind as I am voting 'yes' on this Bill. In the last 6 months I have had 2 requests from families where the hospitals have sent the patients home. They would no longer take care of them, and the people at home were too old to take care of these people, and it created a tremendous hardship and a burden on the remaining family, because they were terminally ill, and the hospitals would not take care of them. I urge a vote for the hospices concept. I'm not too concerned about the Commission."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island,



Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, if I ever had a conflict of interest, I have it on this Bill, and I am still going to vote 'yes'. I think a couple of things should be brought out. The Gentleman from Rockford said people, elderly people, sick people, don't want to be with other sick people. How true it is, and that is exactly what hospice will do. The people from the...the Legislators from the House, anyway from the 36th District have all met with the visiting Nurse's Association, with hospital people, with those who are interested in our community, and they have convinced me anyway, that this is something that we should have. What they are going to do are take these people out of the hospitals, Tim. The people are going to be...that are seriously ill and want to go home. My father just passed away 2 months ago from cancer. He wanted to go home, and there was no place in town that anyone could take care of him. There was no 'VNA', there was no visiting nurses type thing. He had to stay in the hospital until he died, and he didn't want to. I was at the...I gave the eulogy at a funeral service just 6 months ago of a lady friend of mine who was 32 years old who died..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Are you through? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill, and I think that the Sponsor really should be commended for his action in this regard. For those of my fiscally conservative friends, let me say...not studied hospices, because if you have studied hospices, you would discover that treating a person in a hospice is really much cheaper than treating them in a hospital. I think that this is really a progressive step forward. What we would be able to do is we would be able to take the...the hospital



costs and really reduce them, and I think a Commission like this is really needed in the State of Illinois, and I think it is the humane thing to do. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm told that dimming of the lights is because of some lightning outside. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Leinenweber, the Gentleman from Cook, you spoke in debate, I hope you don't want to explain your vote."

Leinenweber: "I want to ask for a verification. That's all."

Speaker Matijevich: "I've already said that there was going to be a request. On this Bill there are 104 'ayes', 42 'nays', 8 'present', and the request for a verification by Representative Leinenweber. Poll the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Beatty, Bluthardt, Capuzi..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute. Did I hear Bluthardt say 'aye'...or Beatty voted 'aye'. Record Beatty 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi, Dyer, Epton, Ewing, Gaines, Hanahan, Henry, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Kane, Kent, Kozubowski, Kucharski, McBroom, Meyer, Peters, Ryan, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Stearney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, we start at 105, 42, and the Gentleman so persists. You persist, didn't you?"

He says...Kane 'aye', 106. Henry, is he wanted..., Henry 'aye', 107. So persist? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, I just was wondering whether or not I could be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to have Representative Barnes verified. ... Mulcahey, 'aye'. What's the count? Oh, 107. Alright, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I can only count 14 absences over there, so I



concede."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright, the request for a verification has been removed. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 42 'nays', 8 voting 'present', and this Bill Hou...Senate Bill 5 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Before we call the next Bill, I have been told again that all Members who haven't had their pictures taken this week should do so today so that these color pictures will be used at the State Fair in the General Assembly tent. The photographer is in the side corridor on the Republican side, and there are about 90 Members who have yet not taken their pictures. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The General Assembly tent?"

Speaker Matijeich: "We've got a tent all by ourselves, I guess."

Skinner: "I don't believe this. Is that coming out of a Committee Appropriations..."

Speaker Matijeich: "The next Bill, Senate Bill 106, Campbell. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill...Senate Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to tax gifts, legacies, inheritances, transfers appointments, and interest of certain cases. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: The Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Campbell, on Senate Bill 106."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill. It simply says that the counties can retain 10% of the inheritance tax in the future, and the substantive language has been changed. You know that they can no longer collect fees. They used to get 4% for handling it, and the Supreme Court held in 1977 that it was unconstitutional. The substantive language has been changed to make it



Constitutional, and I know of no opposition. I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Campbell has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 106. There is no debate. The... one moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "By way of it, I wonder of you'd explain how much money this is going to take from the state."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Campbell."

Ewell: "Campbell."

Speaker Matijeich: "Would you answer his question? Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Between 10 and 11 million dollars."

Speaker Matijeich: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 106 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. McClain, would you vote your seatmate, please. Vote my seatmate, too. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "No, not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, but a young lady here went over to get a Senate Calendar for somebody, and she lost track of where they were. Whomsoever wanted the Senate Calendar, here it is."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright, anybody who needs a Senate Calendar, Ebbesen has one. Have all voted? Have all voted? Ha...the Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Campbell, to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Well Mr. Speaekr and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as we all know, it is easier for the state to raise money than it is for the county. Not only that, but we have mandated over the years several cost programs for the various counties, and this is simply giving back to the counties what one time they collected. The county treasurers collected 4% for handling of the inheritance tax. And this isn't a fedistribution of wealth or anything like that, it is



simply giving back to those counties the money that... the assets that were accumulated in those counties. I think it is a fair Bill. I think it is a good Bill, and certainly the counties can use the money, and I's certainly appreciate getting enough votes up there to get this Bill passed. Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 106 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 111."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 111, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 111 would amend the Vehicle Code, and would permit red oscillating or rotating lights on emergency patrol vehicles operated in the Department of Transportation District 1 and District 8. These emergency patrol vehicles that are operated by the Department of Transportation are operated under emergency conditions whereas they are in direct line with the high speed lanes, with the expressway system in those 2 districts. There are 62 vehicles presently being used, and they have had in excess of 70 accidents approximately, now per year. This would allow them to have red lights instead of amber lights, and I would ask for your favorable consideration of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 111. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is with great reluctance that I rise to oppose Ted



Leverenz's Bill. We've worked so closely in the Vehicle Committee in the past. Yet, certain things are self-evident. First of all, we have no assurance the lack of a red light on a red vehicle which is help changing a tire would it prevent another car from hitting into that vehicle. I suspect that whether the lights were green, blue, yellow, or pink, both of those accidents would have occurred. But I do submit to this General Assembly that formerly and historically, we have felt that a red light indicates extreme danger. It is either an ambulance rushing to a scene, a fire truck on the way to a fire, some police agencies use them in pursuit. In Chicago we use the blue light, but we have conditioned ourselves to give relative importance to lights. Red light means extreme danger. It means a life is in danger. A green light means everything is alright. A yellow light means look out, there is something in the way, some obstruction that you should circumvent, be wary. A yellow light is adequate for such vehicles that get on the highways and assist us with our motor troubles. In closing in opposition to this Bill, may I indicate to you that the Department of Law Enforcement is firmly against this legislation. I suggest its defeat."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, did you... The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support this legislation. It was studied out... a complete study was made by the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission. I think this is from a safety standpoint. We need this type of legislation, and I would hope that we would all give this a green light."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. Let me point out a couple of things. The Department of Law Enforcement has



continually and not specifically pointed out this Bill. They're just opposed to anyone having lights apparently the same color that they use. I would submit to you, however, that the 70 accidents have been extremely severe, not only to the life and limb of the people that drive these trucks that stop them directly in the traffic lane. However, at least in District 1, workman's compensation cost and payments to these individuals who have been hit already are approaching \$100,000 a year. It is only a matter of time until we kill one. Red means stop. That is the rationale for this Bill, and I would appreciate your favorable consideration. It passed the Senate 48 to 0, came out of Committees unanimously."

Speaker Matijevich: "I see the Speaker's found another Senate Member over there. Senator Washington... They've been all visiting lately. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 111. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 111 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 52 'ayes', 46 'nays', 3 voting 'present', and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, we ask for a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll of the Absentees. Fifty-two and... I guess that would give it a few."

Leverenz: "There's 76 so..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you looking for 70 votes? Is that what you're looking..."

Leverenz: "Yes Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "Can we give him 18 votes to put it on Postponed and then...alright, Jaffe 'aye'..., can you see 18 out there, Jack? Let's give him another Roll Call. He wants to get over 70. And under 89, remember



that."

Leverenz: "We wouldn't mind 89."

Speaker Matijeich: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. It'll be... The question is 'Shall this Bill be postponed?'. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I just want to point out that the Senate doesn't even have this type of procedure, and you don't get this type of treatment over there when you have a Bill. So I don't know why we should give 70 votes just to keep this thing alive till the last day when it could get killed in the middle of the evening."

Speaker Matijeich: "Right, let's put 2 more up there. Alright, on this issue there's 74...6 votes. Does he have leave to place it on Postponed Consideration? Leave, and Senate Bill 111 shall be postponed...put on Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 165...wait, 159."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 159, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Commission...Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from R...Lake, Representative Deuster, on 159."

Deuster: "Senate Bill 159 was a...was handled in the Committee by Representative Capparelli, and if he is here, I will yield to him, but not seeing him, I'll proceed on to explain the Bill. Senate Bill 159 restores the law to what it used to be with respect to the appointment of Members of the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention to provide that they will be appointed by the Governor. And this Bill is a result of a court decision, actually, the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention is regarded as being an executive branch agency because it exists by executive order, and the court decision in the case that came against 'Lindburg' held that Members of the General Assembly could not appoint Members of an executive agency..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Deuster has moved for the



passage of Senate Bill 159. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 159 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none 'present', and Senate Bill 159 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 165, Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 165, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 165 is a Bill which addresses itself to the alteration or falsification of information on campaign finance reports which are obtained from the State Board of Elections or the County Clerk. And also to the publication of such false or altered information with intent to misrepresent. This portion provides for a Class B misdemeanor penalty for such offenses. It also provides for a Class B misdemeanor penalty for offenses involving the sale or use of information copied from campaign financing reports for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for business solicitation. In the last election there were a number of such offenses in my district, and I am sure that there were offenses in your district also. On this basis I would solicit your favorable support of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 165. There is no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 165 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those



opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 165 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 168, Pullen."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating a Board of Higher Education, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, on 168."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ~~Senate Bill 168 asks for the teaching of remedial~~ courses at university levels to be de-emphasized and to have remedial courses emphasized instead, in the community colleges. Right now we are spending several million dollars on teaching remedial courses at the public universities when actually...when the community colleges were set up, one of the reasons was to remediate students who had some lacking of skills and could benefit from remedial courses before going to public college. The State Board of Higher Education has already adopted a resolution concerning this, and this Bill will help them in implementing the policy in that regard. And I ask for favorable consideration of Senate Bill 168."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Pullen has moved for the passage of 16...Senate Bill 168. On that the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Glen Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. House (sic) Bill 168, I think, negates the chance for a lot of students to benefit from the broadness that a university offers as compared to that of a community college. And the reason I suggest that is that none of us, I believe, are ever so competent that we are skilled in all areas ~~in terms of literature or language, mathematics or~~



science. What this proposal intends to do is to say in the event that you might need remediation in one area, you cannot, even though you may be an exceptional student or a better than average student let's say in another area, what this would deny you is the chance to go to a major university, because they will not be able to offer you a program of remediation. Present university programs include remedial instruction without credit for areas that they feel you are not up to their ability or standards. Other opportunities include regular placement with any other student in the event that you have failed that class, you fail. And you cannot graduate, obviously, if you haven't reached the skill level that that university, or that instructor, or that department requires in all the areas. If the universities are indeed phasing this in, I feel it is unfortunate. If...however they are doing it, another reason why you should not support the Bill is that they are doing it on their own without directives from the Illinois General Assembly. So strike...me as being the kind of proposal that we can do without in as much as it is already going to be done if indeed the Sponsor has reported it properly. It strikes me as unfortunate that students will have to pick up the... rather community colleges will be picking up students possibly for only one class, where they may indeed need remediation before they can move on to another university level, so I think it is an opportune Bill. I think it is a bad Bill, and I would hope that we can defeat it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm not sure if I agree that it's a bad Bill because of the reason that the Representative from DuPage County stated or not. I rather think it is a bad Bill



because I don't think that junior colleges ought to be in the...junior colleges or universities ought to be in the business of providing remedial instruction. It would seem to me that the Bill would be a lot better if we'd mandate the local high schools provide it. I don't see why people in junior college...admitted to junior colleges or those who are admitted to universities should n't be able to have basic high school education, and if they don't have it now, we certainly ought to change the law to make them have it before they get in. Perhaps the Sponsor would agree to change it to high schools. Then I think I could vote for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Northern Illinois University has a program called the 'Chance' Program. It is a program directed for young...to young women and young men who can do college work, who have college potential, and who are a great basic natural resource of ours, but often who come from homes that are not oriented toward education, and often are missing some few basic skills.

And so while they enter the Chance Program...they are people who we say are perhaps culturally deprived, but nonetheless, have great college potential. These young men and women would be denied this entire program under this Bill. The 'Chance' Program at this school and at other schools in Illinois would be destroyed. And young men and women would not have an opportunity to move forward in our educational system. We would, instead, be forever labeling them because of some basic skill that they may or may not lack, but which they can re... obtain easily. Again, as Representative Schneider suggested, if the Board is doing this...considering it already, why do we have to tell them? Why do we



have to put our noses there? I think this is a bad Bill. I think it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that what this Bill really does, is it proves up the failure of the system as we have it right now. I think this is bad, and it ought to be defeated."

Speaekr Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand in opposition to this legislation to take Representative Greiman's statements one step further, I'd like to pointout that the 'Chance' Program operated at NIU has about an 80 to 90% completion rate of those students that come through the program as opposed to about a 40 to 45% completion rate of those students who get into the university basically under their academic skills from the high school level. It's a good program. It addresses those students who are not...let's say financially able, or have total complete previous experience in high school, and they need something additional, but at an 80 to 85% completion rate, I think it is a good program, should be continued, and this Bill should be defeated."

Speaekr Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I think it would be a good thing if every Member read the Bill. Senate Bill 168 is not going to destroy or harm anything. All Senate Bill 168 does is to provide that some guidelines will be developed and submitted for consideration later, that will shift the emphasis...just shift the emphasis. This is not going to add...end remedial education at the universities. It is just going to suggest that more



attention be given to remedial education at the community college level. Now, speaking from Lake County, I have CLC, the College of Lake County. The average poor person who has had a little trouble in school and needs to have his English or his mathematics pepped up a little bit, needs a little remedial work, quite often will go to the College of Lake County for a year or two and take some remedial courses, improve his record, his academic performance, then he'll go down to the University of Illinois. It makes far more sense to me to say that a great emphasis should be made at the community college level for those people who maybe are staying at home, or taking a couple of courses, saving up their money, and trying to improve their basic skills before they head off down to Champaign or one of the other Illinois state institutions at some distance. This is just a change in emphasis, a shift in emphasis. It doesn't destroy anybody's program. I think it is good legislation, and it represents the General Assembly sending a message to the Board of Higher Education suggesting the direction we think they ought to go in. And I would urge support for Senate Bill 168. Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Just briefly, you can't be all things to all people. You can't have every university in the state having all professional schools. The community college system is set up. It is state-wide. It is very appropriate as a place where remedial education can be given. That is the ideal place, not the University of Illinois. It is terribly expensive to have in every university, community colleges. This Bill does not prohibit the University of Illinois from engaging in remedial education. It just says that the principle emphasis ought to be in the



community colleges. That's the reason we have built them up that way, and so, because I think the Bill has been misinterpreted, and because I really think that the community colleges have a real message to give, a real program to give. They are ideally set up for this purpose. I don't really find anything inappropriate about the Bill. It is an appropriate message to give to the state educational system. Don't be all things to all men. Don't set up every facility to do every purpose. Have some specialization. Save taxpayers money. Use the universities for university education. Use junior colleges for broader education. ~~If, in fact, the high schools can provide~~ it, as Representative Skinner said, that is absolutely splendid. That's where it ought to be done. But if not, use the junior colleges, get your basic education, transfer from the junior college to the senior colleges. That is an intelligent way to set up higher education, and I find the Bill an appropriate response to a major problem in our state."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. To...to close, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, first let me assure the Members of the House that the 'Chance' Program that a couple of Members spoke about would not be effected by this because it is put in a different category by the Board of Higher Education from remedial. It is true that remedial programs at the university level are extremely expensive, both to the state, and to the student. It is true that the



emphasis at higher education at the university level should be on university learning, and at the community colleges...are established for the purpose..., among others, and structured in the best manner to provide remedial education for young people who are...more advanced than high school, but perhaps not quite ready to fully adopt the university way of learning. It was aproved on a very good Roll Call in the Committee on Higher Education, and I certainly solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 168. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 168 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Sharp, vote me 'aye'. Sharp, vote me 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is probably one of the most elitest pieces of legislation it had in this chamber this Session. I taught at a 4 year senior institution...supported by the state, and I think that is a decision that is best left to those institutions. I know that the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, they have a program similar to the 'Chance' Program that Representative Greiman mentioned, and I have worked with students in that program. And I think if this is a good way of giving everybody an equal shot at 4 year education and not trying to put them into a slot or peg them into a stereotype roll early in their higher education program...I think if this Bill passes, next year we will see a Bill that will actually mandate the remedial education at the junior college level and take it out of the universities all together, and I think that... that would be a bad step. Let's just stop it right here and defeat this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



changes need to be made in our remedial education program. We are indeed only cluttering up our state's statute book by adding successive paragraphs that duplicate things that are already being done without statutory authority. If this Bill passes, it has really no effect one way or another, and I am voting 'present'.

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative McGrew, to explain his vote."

McGrew: "Thank-you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm really a little bit amazed at the opposition to this Bill. Let me give you just a brief history, if I may. I established a categorical for grant in the Bill that I passed through this Legislature 3 years ago that applied for remedial education for junior colleges. It was the consensus of all of those people in higher education, all the experts both within and without, that the junior colleges are the place that can offer remedial programs the closest to home. If that's necessary, then they could then go on to the 4 year colleges upon completion of whatever the weaknesses may be. This Bill was heard before the Committee. Again we supported what was already on record, what is already in the categorical grants for junior colleges. All we are attempting to do is to cut out duplication and extra expenditures that frankly are not necessary. It's handled much better at a junior college level. We should be able to support this Bill..."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am wondering what kind of message we are sending to the Board of Higher Education if we do not pass this Bill about remedial education. Are we telling the Board that we feel that they should emphasis remedial programs at university level instead of junior college?"



Bullock, to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Thank-you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. I think it's rather ironic in light of the fact that the budget for the state universities and Board of Higher Education is rapidly approaching 8% of total state budget. I further think it's ironic, and I hate to disagree with the Sponsor of this Amendment, but if these programs for remedial education are de-emphasized and switched to community colleges, we are going to find that many of the people who need to possess upward mobility are going to be denied that opportunity to come into the mainstream of society. Certainly the programs have been proven helpful. They have been proven positive, and I dare say many of the Members of this General Assembly probably are products of that type of special attention. So I think that while the Sponsor has a good intention, she is perhaps missing the mark, because the program would save the state money in the long haul in making people productive and bringing them into the mainstream of society. And I don't think they should be wanting to reduce the appropriation to the university to start this program. And I would certainly urge Members on both sides of the aisle to cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is probably one of the most useless pieces of legislation that we've had before us in this term. If you look at your digest it indicates quite clearly that a resolution has already been adopted by the Joint Education Commission composed of the State Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. The study is already underway to make this transition. I think we can well leave it with-
in the hands of that Body to determine when and if



This will not effect those special programs which a previous speaker spoke about in terms of his concern about about upward mobility, but it will say that is we are going to have remedial education above the high school level, very expensive to do it at the university level both for the state and for the students, it should be done at the community college level where it can be done best and where it can be done with the least expense and prepare those students for a good university education."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 62 'nays', 7 voting 'present', and...the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Please poll the absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll of the absentees, and by the way, there is a request from Representative Greiman if this reaches 89 that he will verify. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty, Bluthardt, Breslin, Brummer,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi, Dyer, Ewing, Gaines, Hanahan, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Dave Jones, Kent, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Leverenz, McCourt, Meyer, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Stearney, and Vitek."

Speaker Matijevich: "On this question there are 85 votes, and the Lady from Cook asks leave to place it on Postponed Consideration. Does she have leave? And it shall be so placed on Postponed Consideration. The next Bill is Senate Bill 199, Marovitz. Oh, just one moment, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I need leave of the House to hear Senate Bill 1002 in Subcommittee on Monday. I cleared it with both



sides of the aisle. The Bill is technically a half day late on the posting. Both sides have agreed to this. So I would ask..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call so that...what Bill in what Committee?"

Marovitz: "Senate Bill 1002 in Judiciary I. It would be the special Subcommittee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave, and they shall use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose. Representative Pullen, you wanted a similar request. Representative Pullen from Cook."

Pullen: "I asked leave to have Senate Bill 1277 heard in Elementary and Secondary Education on Monday. I have checked with the Chairman and the Leaders on both sides."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call. Do you have the number, John? Secondary and elementary...you got the number? Leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call. Leave, and that Bill shall be post...heard in that...Elementary Committee. Alright, the next Bill is Senate Bill 199, Marovitz."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 199, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to require payment of interest by lessors of residential real property on security deposits made by leasees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under present Illinois law, owners of buildings with 25 units or more and who require a security deposit as a condition to obtaining a lease must pay interest on the security deposit. We originally had the interest at 4%. We increased it to 5% about a year or 2 ago. Many Illinois renters who presently live in buildings with less than 25 units



and who are required to give a security deposit feel that they are the victims of a grave injustice because they don't come under the provisions of our present laws and statutes and a result are deprived of any interest on their security deposit. Senate Bill 199, Sponsored by Senator Merlo in the Senate, amends this Act relating to the payment of interest on security deposits in residential buildings and lowers the number of units from 25 to 10 units state-wide, and I ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 199. On that, the Gentleman from Will County, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a bad idea that's run amok. A few years ago Senator Merlo, then Representative Merlo, came into the General Assembly and passed a Bill which applied only to Cook County and applied only to units, I believe, 25 or more. It might even have been higher at the time. It was a worthy effort to try to re-elect him. It worked time and time again. Unfortunately, people keep hacking away at that and bringing it downstate and now bringing it lower and lower. Last term, Representative Schlickman prevailed upon the House and the Senate against their better judgment to extend this downstate. So this Bill will not only apply to Senator Merlo and Representative Marovitz's district, but will apply to your district. And I'll tell you, at 25 units that wasn't too bad either because most of your small towns and out in the boon-docks...25 unit buildings aren't that frequent. And it means if a person has 25 units, he probably is pretty sophisticated and probably has the ability to carry out the red tape and paper associated with the task of maintaining these accounts and paying out this interest. Now they're bringing it down to 10, and I suggest to you,



and particularly talk to you people downstate, 10 units is newly not that big of enterprise. You're getting down to the less sophisticated people. You are going to put an awful lot of burden and extra work that probably...you're going to have to hire somebody to do this work. You're going to have to hire a bookkeeper, an extra bookkeeper. This is going to cost money. It is going to increase the cost of renting units. And what happens when you increase the cost of renting units? You increase the rent. So fine, we're extending this great idea to those tenants in 10 units who are probably going to end up increasing their rent by more than what they are going to end up increasing their rent by more than what they are going to get by way of interest. If this is consumer legislation, then God help the consumers, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Marovitz of Chicago needs this so bad, why can't they do this by home u...home rule units?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Marovitz..."

Conti: "Pass an ordinance if they can do it by home rule. Why does the rest of the state have to have it?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Marovitz to respond."

Marovitz: "Well, not only Chicago needs it, Representative Conti, but I think every citizen in the state needs this, and that's why it should be state-wide in application. I wonder if we're insinuating that our downstate citizens are less concerned and less interested with what is done with their money than our Cook County citizens. I think citizens all over the state are concerned with what happens with their money, and since the money that is paid down from the security deposit is their money, I think they'd like to know what is being done with their money and



have interest paid on it like banks, like Commonwealth Edison, like Illinois Bell, like People's Gas. I think they're entitled to interest on security deposits across the state, not just in Cook County, not just in the City of Chicago."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Represen...the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, in response to the last Gentleman's statements, we're concerned throughout the State of Illinois with what happens with our money and our interest deposits, but in Committee, we asked the Gentleman to define why we needed this Bill, why we had to reduce it to 10 when we already have it at 25. And he said that the people in Chicago have a great need for this, and that is where the primary need is. So if the people of Chicago have this great need, God bless you, Chicago. Do it yourself. You're always yelling to us about home rule. Use your own powers instead of coming to us and forcing this on the rest of the state. We don't want it in the other parts of the state. Leave it in your section. That is what you have home rule for, and do it with that. It's a bad Bill. It's a bad concept. This Gentleman will be back next year with reducing it to 1 unit, and now what are we doing? We're taking away the money from the people that are trying to keep our economy flowing."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I kind of object to people on the other side saying we downstate don't want this Bill. Maybe the apartment owners don't want it, but the people who are doing the rent...doing the renting want it. I think this is a good Bill. We ought to pass it. There is absolutely no reason why someone who has to make a deposit on an



apartment of anywhere from 300 to 500 dollars shouldn't get interest on that money, particularly I know in some downstate areas, particularly in university areas, it is awful difficult to even get the deposit back, much less any interest. And I think we ought to pass this Bill and make sure that the consumers and the renters who need this money get it."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well first of all, the whole concept is absolutely ridiculous, and I join in expressing resentment over the Gentleman from Chicago wanting to extend this idea the rest of the state. If you rent property and ask somebody to put \$100 down, or 200, or whatever it might be as a security deposit, and if they object and say, 'Oh, I want interest on that money', all the landlord has to do is say, 'Well, alright, if that's the way you feel about it, the deposit will be \$400'. It is foolish and ridiculous for the State of Illinois to inject its nose into this business. And I would say that if the Gentleman's going to persist in trying to creep this law in to cover everybody, then I think some of us are going to come in with an Amendment to say that the security deposit, additions to it, can be required for the depreciation in the property caused by the tenants, or just the general depreciation in the property. I don't know why the Sponsor of this Amendment doesn't work through the Chicago City Council under their home rule powers to solve this problem in Chicago. I'm going to vote 'no', and I'm going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call if it gets anywhere near 89. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Slape has moved the previous



question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the previous question...the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "Just to remind my colleague on the other side of the aisle, I am State Representative Marovitz, not Alderman Marovitz, and so I do things that the...in the General Assembly..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Nor Judge Marovitz."

Marovitz: "...That's right. Not in the City Council, and this is what we were duly elected for to help people in our districts, not in certain wards only, and throughout the State of Illinois. One of the...one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said this is taking money away from people who try to keep this state going. Well, I don't quite understand who's money it is we're taking. This is the...this is the individual who is renting. It is his money. It's not the landlords money. Anybody who tries to make you believe it's the landlords money is kidding you. This is the tenants money who's putting up security deposits. If he gets interest at banks, if he gets interest at Commonwealth Edison, and Illinois Bell, and People's Gas, why shouldn't he get interest on his own money that the landlords using? If he destroys that apartment, the landlord gets to keep that money. There is no question about that, but why shouldn't he get interest on his money if he hasn't done anything wrong? Senator Merlo doesn't need this particular piece of legislation to get re-elected. He's re-elected on his merit, on the basis of his voting record because he is a quality Legislator. This legislation applies to all people in the State of Illinois, and I certainly agree with Representative Kane that anybody who says we down-
~~state don't need this, just isn't in touch with their~~



colleagues. The consumer, citizens throughout the state who are renters and tenants throughout the State of Illinois would also like to...to be able to receive interest on their security deposits even if they don't live in big high rise complexes. Let's make this applicable, fairly, to everyone across the state who live in 10 units or more. It's a very good consumer piece of legislation. It's good for all the people in the State of Illinois. Every citizen is concerned about what is done with their money, not just the people in Cook County, or Chicago, and not just the people who live with 25 units or more. Everyone cares about it; and remember, the most important thing about this legislation is it's the tenants money. It's not the landlords money, and if he's using that money for whatever he's getting, if he gets a CD, he can certainly get more than 5% on that CD. Why should he get the benefits of that and not the individual whose money it is he's using, and that's the tenant. This is good legislation, and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Marovitz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 199. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 199 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no', and Representative Ewell from Cook to explain his vote. Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlmen, I'd like to explain my 'no' vote. You're having an extreme condominium problem in the City of Chicago simply because you're putting the landlords out of business. You never take a look at their problems. Now the landlords don't vote. There are more tenants than there are landlords, and it's popular to sponsor this type of legislation, but may I say to you the problem that you're having now is a direct result of this and other types of legislation. Everybody simply wants to get out of the



business because it's not profitable. Now when the landlords want out, it's the City Council and everybody else that wants to keep them in. This is not good legislation. You're not really doing any material thing for the tenant. It's a bad Bill, and by the vote, I'll cut off now. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote. One minute."

Robbins: "The tenant and...does not receive interest on all other security deposits he's put down. Why designate the man that is having a hard time making his interest and trying to provide what is badly needed. We are very short of rental housing all over downstate Illinois because the income that comes in does not keep up the building and pay a decent rate of interest. If you want to have a landlord, if you want to have a place for the man to live that can't live otherwise unless... let's just put them all in government housing and pay the tax on it and forget it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape to explain his vote."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I just wanted to clarify things. My name is spelled S-l-a-p-e incase public action decides to issue a press release on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 63 'ayes', 51 'nays', and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Poll the Absentees, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll the Absentees. He's looking for 7 votes. Is that it? ..."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Beatty, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Bluthardt, Breslin, Capparelli, Capuzi, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Ewing, Farley, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Harris, Hoxsey, Wave Jones, Emil Jones, Koane, Kempiners, Keat, Kosubowski,



Kucharski, Leverenz, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster, Meyer, Molloy, Murphy, Oblinger, Peters, Richmond, Robbins, Sandquist, Schisler,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Robbins 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Schlickman, Shoerberlein, Stanley, Stearney, Sumner, Terzich, Totten,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Totten 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Winchester, J.J. Wolf, Yourell, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "On this question there are 64 'ayes', 53 'nos', and Representative Birchler, for what purpose do you rise?"

Birchler: "How am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're not recorded."

Birchler: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Birchler 'aye'. Richmond 'aye'. Yourell 'aye'. Ackerman 'no'. On this question there are 67 'aye',...Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're not recorded."

Sumner: "Would you please record me as 'no'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No...Winchester 'no'. McMasters 'no'. On this Bill there are 67 'ayes', 50...how many 'nos'? 57 'nos', and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The...I think we tried hard enough, Bill. The next Bill is Senate Bill 256."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 256, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to regulate the practice of dental surgery and denistry in the State of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Senate Bill 256, who's handling this? Sumner? The Lady from Peoria, Representative Sumner. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you just take that out of the record for a moment? Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 291, Kent



Out of the record. Senate Bill 359, Gaines. Is that out? Out of the record. Senate Bill 407, out of the record. 420, Yourell." Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 420, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, on Senate Bill 420."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 420 provides the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation with the authority to adopt rules necessary to accomplish the purpose of the Acts under which they have been established. It requires the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation to adopt the necessary rules to carry out its powers and duties subject to the provisions of the Administrative Review Act. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 420."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 420. On that...no debate...the question therefore is 'Shall Senate Bill 420 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 1 'nay', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 420 is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 547, Getty. Is he here? Where is he? I don't see him. Oh, out of the record for a moment. Senate Bill 563, Yourell."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 563, a Bill for an Act to revise the Campaign Financial Disclosure Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell. No pictures in the gallery, we're sorry about that. Alright, we'll get it next."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House. Senate Bill 563 was discussed in great detail on Second Reading, when we adopted..., I think, Representative Collins Amendment #2. It clarifies the reporting dates and eliminates the overlaps in those reporting periods under the Campaign Financing Act when primary election dates are in close proximity... proximity. I move for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 563."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 563. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 563 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 voting 'aye', no 'nays', 2 'present', and Senate Bill 563 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We'll revert back to Senate Bill 547, Getty, 547. Read the Bill."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 547. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to practice and procedure in the courts of this state. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. For a moment. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Purposes of an announcement, an introduction, Mr. Speaker. We have with us, up in the balcony, a group from the Goodwin School. Teacher's John 'Guvans' is with them, and the district that they are from is represented by Representative Pechous, Matula, and Klosak. I wish they'd stand and be recognized."

Speaker Matijevich: "~~Welcome. Well, most of them are standing~~ anyway. There wasn't much room up there. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, on Senate Bill 547."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 547 would just make clear that upon the filing of a release or satisfaction and full judgment signed by the party and in whose favor the judgment was entered, or his attorney, the court should vacate the judgment and dismiss the cause of action. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 547. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Mike, what's the purpose of this Bill?"

Getty: "The purpose is to implement a practice which has already been started in many counties to permit the court to enter and va...a vacation of the judgment. In the absence of that, you have a contradictory situation where, for example, title companies will pick up the fact that there's a judgment and then have to go and search the records to see that there's been a release of that, so this just makes it clear that you can go into court and



just vacate the judgment so that there's no record showing against the person that could be picked up by a credit bureau, for example."

Leinenweber: "Well, as I understand the current practice, I get a...A gets a judgment against B, and B pays the judgment, or they settle their differences, whatever it is, so A gives B a satisfaction, and he goes over and files that with the Clerk of Court. Now, in...who's going to handle the paper work? Would this be B, the guy who has the judgment against him, and then have to go into court with a written document to present to the judge that... so the judge wouldn't enter it, would the judge do it on its own motion, or how is that supposed to be done?"

Getty: "It would just be filed with the court, and the court would automatically enter a vacation of the judgment."

Leinenweber: "That would be a...an additional document that..."

Getty: "No, it's...it's...No, no, no, no, no. All you're required to do is to file the...the release or satisfaction, which you would insist upon already. I'm sure you would insist upon it."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, well, that's what we do now, and then the satisfaction is placed of record and picked up by the title company."

Getty: "That's correct. Now, but what this would do is the court would enter a satis...instead of just a satisfaction it would vacate that judgment, so there'd be no judgement still standing against the individual. If he was concerned enough to go over and file, this would...would permit him to have the judgment vacated."

Leinenweber: "Well, what's the difference between a vacated judgment and a satisfied judgment? They both have the effect of removing any possible lien in their claim."

Getty: "That's right. You know it and I know it, but people who are looking at these things from the point of view of consumers see that there was a judgment there, and



when they see satisfaction of judgment, they may not realize the full import of that."

Leinenweber: "Is this another little guy 'Bill?'"

Getty: "That's right."

Leinenweber: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Getty, I think I'm going to support this Bill, but I...I have one question."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield."

Johnson: "If...part of the purpose of the Credit Union's or Credit Union's...the Credit Bureau's activities are to determine who are good and who are bad credit risks."

Seems to me that it would be a germane factor in their determination of that end to know that there's been a judgment rendered at the individual because of whatever reasons...had a judgment rendered against him, and this really vacates that, and I suppose to some extent, doesn't it really eliminate the...the ability of the Credit Bureau and then respect the potential future creditors to determine how good a credit risk this individual is. I realize there's all kinds of judgment. You know, somebody's not a deadbeat, because he has a judgment rendered against him in automobile accident. But, if someone has a judgment rendered against him in a...in a case involving nonpayment...repayment of a note or some other matter that would affect his credit ability for the future, this would seem, to some extent, to diminish the ability to ascertain that fact."

Getty: "Well, as a matter of fact, I don't think that it really would, because you would still have the record of the nonpayment, delinquent payment, the fact that the judgment was once entered, but now there would no longer be a judgment. It would be vacated. Further, it would.. it very often it's impossible to distinguish which



judgments have been satisfied and which judgments have not been satisfied, and that really leads to a problem. So, what this does is is wipe the slate clean."

Johnson: "Okay. But, speaking to the Bill then. Now you know, we have countervailing matters here, but I think on balance it's probably a good Bill. If, for no other reason, then it serves at least a...some small purpose of encouraging judgment debtors to pay off those judgments. This provides at least not much of an incentive, but some incentive to do that, and I suppose on balance it's a good Bill and ought to have a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. This is an excellent concept. You know, consumers really don't know how to clear up their credit record, and, basically, what this Bill does, it's really very simple. It just helps the consumers clear up their credit record. All that it provides is that upon the filing of a release or a satisfaction of judgment the court shall vacate the judgment. It's an excellent Bill, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 547 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are...The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', one 'nay', and three voting 'present', and Senate Bill 547, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I understand Ed McBroom now is ready with Senate Bill 635. 635. Read the Bill."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 635. A Bill for an Act to amend the Section of the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom on 635."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. ...yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill addresses the situation where banks are land-locked and wish to expand, and the position has to be directly across the street. It's supported by the IB... Illinois Bankers Association and 'AMB' both. I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McBroom from Kankakee has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 635. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 635 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 voting 'aye', no 'nays', and 8 voting 'present', and this Bill, Senate Bill 635, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 642. Bowman."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 642, a Bill for an Act in relation to acquisition and disposition of telecommunication duplicating electronic data processing equipment by state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, on Senate Bill 642."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. The provisions of this Bill were recommended by the Governor's cost control task force. It is supported by the Department of Administrative Services and the State Comptroller. Basically it provides that the state may enter into multi-year leasing arrangements for a term not to exceed 7 years for limited kinds of durable equipment such as...electronic data processing equipment, such as telecommunications devices and copying equipment. The need for this



legislation is...stems from two sources. One is that the nature of the technology in those industries that it is constantly changing and changing very rapidly so that a lease arrangement whereby we are not locked into buying something that eventually turns out to be obsolete and then we're stuck with a white elephant. The leasing arrangement is much more economical. The Department of Administrative Services estimates that this will save the state 2.3 million dollars a year... And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 642. There is no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 642 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132...33 'ayes', 2 'nays', and no 'present', and Senate Bill 642 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 675, Wikoff."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 675, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Parliamentarian come to the podium?"

Wikoff: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is very similar to House Bill 1885 which was Representative McPike's, which did pass the House on May 15. It corrects a rather archaic quirk in the present Illinois Liquor Law, which states that no alcoholic beverages can be sold within 1,500 feet of a state supported university. This does not apply to junior colleges, private colleges, grade schools, so on and so forth. The reasoning for this, during my time as Liquor Commissioner of Champaign, we were taken to court, and the court threw out that portion of the law saying it was unconstitutional because it was discriminatory, and I'm sure that any other court would do the same thing, but this removes that provision."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 675. On that, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yeah, just to reiterate, this is, I guess, nearly identical to House Bill 1885, and this...it seems to me only logical that if we have a 100 foot limitation for churches and elementary schools, that 1,500 feet is ridiculous..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 675 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 4 voting



present, and Senate Bill 675 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

Senate Bill 695, Representative Schisler."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 69... (malfunction)"

Speaker Matijeich: "...Fulton, Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 695 would amend the Homestead Property Act, and where it would include residential property that is occupied by the owner or owners thereof as is or their principle dwelling places. And then there was an Amendment where married persons maintain and reside in separate residents qualifying as homestead property under this Section, each resident shall receive 50% of the total reduction to equalize the assessed evaluation provided by this Section. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Schisler has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 695. There's no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 695 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 695 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. ...696, VonBoeckman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 701, Oblinger. Out of the record. And I understand Senate Bill 719 is...Ebbesen, you want to try it, or out? Out...Speaker, do you want to go with 719? No... out of the record. Senate Bill 971 is out of the records. Senate Bill 1040, Dawson."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1040, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Dawson, on Senate Bill 1040."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1040 amends Minimum Wage Law. It changes \$1.50 minimum hourly wages for learners to 70% of the standard minimum wage. This would allow an...employer to hire somebody for a six month period at a reduced wage rate so that we may...eliminate some of the people who do not have a trade. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dawson, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1040. If there is no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1040...that number sounds familiar...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten.'"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield."

Totten: "In effect, what this would do would be put people under the minimum wage law who are not under the minimum wage law right now."

Dawson: "Don, even if they...it would allow them to go underneath the minimum wage law for a period of six months."

Totten: "People classified as learners under this Bill are not covered under the minimum wage law right now. Is that right?"

Dawson: "They are covered, but at a lower level."

Totten: "What does this Bill do to the lower level?"

Dawson: "This makes it move up a little bit compared with the basic minimum wage."

Totten: "Alright, then let me speak to the Bill. I...in the Sponsor...in indicating what the Bill done, I think maybe have inadvertently mislead us, or maybe advertently, but by saying that it would inable more people to have jobs. Actually this age group and the learner classification that's having difficulty being



employed.. To raise the level as I understand it to 70% of the minimum wage would in effect disenfranchise people in this classification and youngsters from having jobs as the cost of employment would be too high. If that's the way the Bill is, then I would urgently request that we do not support Senate Bill 1040."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms. Simms"

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. This Bill did not get out of the Labor and Commerce Committee unanimously. There were votes that were waged against it. Basically what this does is it increases the minimum wage from learners from \$1.50 per hour to not less than 70% of the state minimum wage. Now if the Bill that is in the State Senate now should pass, that would be 70% of what the federal minimum wage is, because they will be identical Bills.. It also provides that a learner to be covered by these provisions must be at least 18 years of age. Very frankly, at a time when we're having..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Simms, someone tells me there's too much noise, they can't hear you. Is that it, Representative Getty?..."

Simms: "...At a..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Or does he want to take it out of the record? We want...he wants to take this Bill out of the record. Leave to take this Bill out of the record. Leave...alright..."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills Second Reading...Senate Bill 2... I'd like to introduce a former page here, my daughter sitting up there in the balcony. Colleen Redmond. Former page... Senate Bill 2...7, 7 pardon me."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 7, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."



Speaker Redmond: "Motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 23...wait a minute, wait a minute, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I did file an Amendment to Senate Bill 7."

Speaker Redmond: "Pull it back to Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Cullerton, amends House (sic) Bill 7 on page 1 by deleting lines 29 and 30 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Amendment that we adopted in Committee was filed in error. This is the Amendment that we intended to adopt. This Amendment allows the director to, by rule, exempt group life and group accident and health policy forms from the prior approval provisions provided in the original Bill. Amendment also provides...the intent of the original Bill was to protect consumers from any misleading language that may appear in a policy form. It was the feelings of the Insurance Committee that this type of protection was not needed for group policy because they are generally the products of collective bargaining agreements, and they are therefore well scrutinized and understood by all involved parties. There is no opposition to this Amendment. It was the intention of the Insurance Committee to adopt this Amendment, and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I think Representative Cullerton is correct. I'm wondering if staff advised whether we needed to table Amendment #1 before we adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."



Cullerton: "I believe that is covered in the Amendment #2. It repeals that part of Amendment #1 that we adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment 2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading 23."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 23, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to further effectuate the compact between states of Missouri and Illinois, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 88...Representative McClain, out of the record? Out if the record, request of Representative McClain. 114, Representative Davis."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 114, a Bill for an Act to add and amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 176, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Speaker, I was unaware that the Floor Amendments hadn't been filed. Would you hold this Bill on Second Reading, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Return 114 to the order of Second Reading."

Davis: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "176...out if the record? Out of the record, the request of the Sponsor. 312..."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 350."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 350, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code, Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 559."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 559, a Bill for an Act to enact
a new Credit Union Act and repeal present Acts. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendments # 1, 2, and 3 adopted
in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendments 1, 2,
and 3?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Dawson..."

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

Molloy: "The Amendment has not been distributed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, out of the record. 5-7-4."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 574, a Bill for an Act to amend a
Section of the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading
of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 758..."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 758, a Bill for an Act to amend
the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading 8-8-2"



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 882, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 9-3-7."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 937, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the expenses of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 937 on page 3 by inserting after line 20 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Is this motion... you better take this out of the record. I haven't seen this Amendment, and I'm responsible for it..."

Skinner: "It's a very simple Amendment. All it does is ask that House staff members be paid at the same dollar level that Senate staff members are paid if they are doing the same work. It's an Equal Rights Amendment. I understand the staff are very interested in it, even if the leadership isn't."

Speaker Redmond: "That Amendment was submitted and withdrawn in the Committee on account of substantive language to an appropriation Bill."

Skinner: "Yeah, but I'm not going to withdraw it. You're going to have to beat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair to rule whether this Amendment is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "I rule it is not germane to the appropriation Bill. Any further Amendment? Representative Skinner."



Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I think you owe some explanation to the House staff members who do at least as good a job as the Senate staff members do as any of us who have compared analysis can see, and as any of us have walked through the Senate office building...where the Senate had their...their...offices can see our secretaries work as hard as their secretaries do, if not more... I just..."

Speaker Redmond: "You just ask...you just tell them to come..."

Skinner: "...I think you owe them a public explanation which you could make right now on why you don't want to pay them as much as the Senate gets paid."

Speaker Redmond: "I have ruled that the Amendment is not germane. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 9-3-8."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 938, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1-0-6-8."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading.. 1-1-2-0."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act amending the Aviation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1-2-2-0."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1220, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1226."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act to provide for the transfer of Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the Grade Crossing Protection Maintenance Fund. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1348."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act relating to local, mutual, district, county, and township insurance companies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 amends Senate Bill 1348 on page 1 line 3 by deleting the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following. Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Cullerton. Representative Cullerton. Representative Emil Jones here? Better take it out of the record, I guess. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on the point of a personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point, Sir."

Ryan: "Yesterday, for the first time in 6 years since I have been a Member of this chamber, I issued a press release that was severely critical of another Member, and I want to assure each and every one of the Members on this chamber that I didn't take that course of action

without some considerable thought. Every Session.



we consider scores of issues where emotions run high and where the stakes are important. Each of us has experienced victory and defeat in those issues. And as people who understand the political process, we learn to roll with the punches. But yesterday something happened that cheapens and demeans this Body, and it calls into question the integrity of our electoral process. Every one of us in this room knows what the average citizen thinks of when he or she hears the word politician, and I think that most of us blanket...think that blanket characterizations are certainly unfair. But we can earn the respect of the people of this state only by conducting ourselves honorably and respectably. Yesterday, the Majority Party on the House Elections Committee used questionable means to dismiss a recount of the votes in the 49th Legislative District. That very action breeds disrespect for this Body and certainly creates suspicion on the part of the people of the 49th District. The issues involved here is not whether you believe that one Member of one party out to be seated or another, in this chamber with us today. The issue is not one for us to decide. It is one of the...it is the people of the 49th District that made that decision on December the 9th...the 7th, and to this point, they haven't heard. The discovery recount showed some serious errors were made in the ways that votes were tabulated. In 18 of the 275 precincts checked, the Republican Representative gained 92 votes, and he only lost the election by a half a vote per precinct. To deny a full recount in those circumstances implies to the general public that someone is afraid to have those ballot boxes opened up for a recount. No one person, or any group of people in Springfield should be able to keep those ballot boxes closed. The people of the 49th District have a right to know what those



boxes contained. We can talk about all the technicalities that we want to, but the fact remains that the most important issue here is the integrity of the system that has placed every one of us in our seats in this chamber. The cloud that hangs over that election must be removed, and this must be done not only for the people of the 49th District, Mr. Speaker, but for the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on the same point as Representative Ryan because I was there yesterday, and as a Member of that Committee, I was subjected to the most vulgar, brutal, arrogant violation of Members' rights that I have ever experienced in my 10 years in Springfield. In...in the Majority's haste to decide this election..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins...Representative Ryan rules on a point of personal privilege because he had issued the release, and he sought to explain it. I'd like to have you explain why you are seeking attention."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I was there...I was there. I was the one..."

Speaker Redmond: "I know, but Representative Ryan rose on a point of personal privilege, and we... What is your point?"

Collins: "My point is of personal privilege is that I was..."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you issue the press release?"

Collins: "Press releases have nothing to do with the way we were abused yesterday, Mr. S...Mr. Chairman. Mr. Speaker... If anybody..."

Speaker Redmond: "That isn't a point of personal privilege, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "If anybody is to explain, it should be the Majority and their good Parliamentarian that should explain their actions yesterday, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that that was Committee action, and that the full matter will come to the floor for the determination of the full Body."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, this was an irr...an illegal violation of the House rules yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "You'll have that point... You'll have that point when it comes to the floor."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you have to rule on this point. The point is can a Comm..."

Speaker Redmond: "It will be ruled on when it comes..."

Collins: "Oh no, Mr. Speaker, it has absolutely nothing to do with the report of this election contest. It has to do with whether the Majority can abuse the Minority's rights. It has to do whether the Majority can violate the rules and throw them out the window. It has to do whether the Majority can pull out and rob us rules of order. It has to do with the specific point as to whether a Committee of this House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, I raise the point of order. He has no personal privilege. He's out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what I said, but he doesn't want to take the ruling of the Chair."

Matijeich: "If he wants to talk about unfairness of election contests, then I'm going to get into it, because you know, I was here when you were the Majority Party and held some election contests. And I served on the election Committee. If you want to get onto that, we'll be here for a while, but you don't have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll recognize Representative Collins and Representative Telscer after we've adjourned. I'm trying to get everybody else to go home. Anyone wants to sit here and listen to them is welcome. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition to respond to



Representative Ryan, but if your preference is for a motion to adjourn..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have we adopted the Adjournment Resolution? We don't need one. Rep...it is for the purpose. I heard this before, Representative Collins, and I'll stay and listen to you, but a lot of people here want to go home. Representative Madigan. Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for...an announcement because we have right here with us today, a young man who I think has done an extremely fine job working in the Clerk's office working as an assistant to the Clerk over the past few days. I'm extremely pleased with the work and help that he has tried to do for all of us and that is Mr. 'Gale Rutheford' who is going back to school today. Today is his last day, and I just want to wish him well."

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

Leon: "When the proper time comes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this Body of the treatment I've received with Mr. Collins acting on a election recount in which I was involved in, and I'll reserve that until next week when we get on the floor discussing the antics and the deeds that were performed yesterday. Mr. Collins, I know, was very well aware of what happened in 1968. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino. Represen..."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a motion that all the Senate Bills that the appropriate rule be suspended for all Senate Bills to be posted in the Elections Committee next week."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Does he have leave? Does he have leave to...no. Okay, we won't have a... Representative Wikoff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative,..."

Wikoff: "I move to suspend Rule 18b to post Senate Bill 513 for hearing in Approp. 1 Committee on Monday. It has been agreed to by leaders on both sides, and it was an oversight."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there objection? Objecitons have been raised. I think we better quote that again. Are there any objections to Representative Wikoff's motion? I don't hear any. No objection. Representative Wikoff, I believe that you have unanimous consent to waive the posting rule. Representative Laurino: Anybody else? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a five Bills remaining in the Personnel and Pensions Committee, and I'd like to waive the appropriate posting rule so we could hear those Tuesday afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? There's no objection. I'll get back to you. Hearing no objection the posting rule is waived. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you've played your cute games up there long enough with your objections and non-objections. If Laurino wanted to tell us what the Bills were, we may have considered them. You know what the process is here, and I think you might spend enough time in that chair to know what you're supposed to do and not supposed to do. The same way with the last Gentleman that made that motion. We've had people here that have tried to be recognized legitimately, Mr. Speaker, and you're acting like the king, again, and you're not. These people are elected just like you are on this side of the aisle, and they are entitled to be heard in this chamber whether you like it or not. And I think



you owe it, not only to them, but to every other Member to let them be heard."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, you want to have Representative Laurino tell you the numbers of the Bills that he desires to have heard?"

Ryan: "You know that's always been the process here, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino..."

Ryan: "...Many times from that chair if both sides of the aisle have been cleared with us. You know what the procedure is. I don't care what you..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino. If you'll be quiet, he'll tell you the numbers of the Bills."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, they were the Bills that were posted for this week that have not had a hearing yet. I don't have the exact numbers in front of me. I can get them if he so desires, but they have already been posted. They just did not receive a hearing. I... would suspect that Mr. Ryan would not object to that, but if he'd like me to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well certainly I'd like to know what...what the Bills are he wants to talk about. That's always been the process. You know that and so do I, and I don't..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Fine, if you'll wait for about 5 or 10 minutes, I'll get the Bill numbers and reiterate them to him."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any other announcements? Any announcements? Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan. I'll get back to you, and I'm going to sit here and wait until you have your say, too. We'll let everybody else go home. You and I will stay here. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, we've heard comments today concerning the integrity of the legislative process and the trust



which the electorate has placed..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's on a point of personal privilege.

Proceed with your point of personal privilege."

Unknown: "Thank you, Mr. Conti."

Madigan: "We've heard comments today, Mr. Speaker, concerning...

I don't need a press agent to write my speeches."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, please be in order.

That's no way for 2 men of Southbend to talk. You're

supposed to love each other. Representative Madigan.

Proceed, Representative Madigan."

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

we've heard comments today concerning the integrity

of the legislative process and the trust which

the electorate has placed in our performance as

Members of this Body, and the trust that the

electorate has placed in the electoral system of

choosing those who will serve in this Body. I

suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the other Members

of the House, that those comments are well-founded.

But I think we should move a step beyond the remarks

which have already been recorded in the record today,

and move to a consideration of some of the particulars

involved in the election challenge which is the

subject of this discussion. An election challenge,

as we all know, is a dispute between two individuals.

one individual who at a certain point in time is not

a Member of this Body has alleged that another

individual who is a Member of the Body, should

not be a Member of the Body, and that the Elections

Committee of this House and in the full House should

decree that that one person should be removed and

the other should be appointed. And I reiterate all

of this because it explains that the election contest

involves the rights and the desires of those 2

individual Members. I'm sure that the Republican

Members are concerned with the rights of the Republican



Members, but the Democratic Members are concerned with the rights of the Democratic Members. And if the challenge is successful, then the Democratic Member will be removed. All of that places the Republican Member for the movement and the challenge under a responsibility to draft a petition which is proper under the laws of this state and under the rules of this House. It is certainly not fair for the movement, whether he or she be a Republican or a Democrat, to submit to this Body a petition which is not accurate and correct under the laws of our state and the rules of this Body, because to do that is to subject the respondent to unfair allegations and to an undue degree of harassment and uncertainty while he or she serves as a Member of this House. Yesterday, in the Elections Committee, a Majority of that Committee decided that the document before that Committee was improperly drafted and under the laws of this state, and the rules of this House should not be allowed to interfere with the rights of an incumbent Member of this House. That was the issue before the Committee. Some of you may disagree with that decision, and I think it only fair to restrict your remarks to that decision after the reasoning which went into that decision by the Committee. There is no need, as I have stated before during this Session, to engage in personality attacks, attacks upon the Chair, or attacks upon our system. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The pages...the attention of the pages, we found 2 greenbacks out in the corridor beyond the doors there, and thought it was, when delivering your order it may have slipped off the tray. So if anybody, any of the pages dropped a few dollars, why come up and...Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn claims that...Representative Telcser."



Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Majority Leader, who I know to be a very competent, capable attorney, has very ajointly side-stepped the issue which really is at hand regarding the election contest which we were discussing. All the respondent wanted to do was to get a recount. The precincts which were already looked into indicated that the Gentleman who was not ceded was gaining votes, and if the rest of the district were recounted, that Gentleman indeed would be declared the winner. And that is the issue, and that was the issue. Now the Majority Leader can stand before this Assembly and talk about some legal niceties, but I don't know what could be more important to the people of this great country than the right to elect their own public official and the right to expect that the votes will be counted fairly and honestly. That is all that we were asking. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the Majority Leader or the Majority Party or whoever, was afraid...was afraid to have the ballots in that district recounted because they felt that if that were done, Mr. Bartulis would be ceded from that district. And in that feeling of political fear, that Committee acted hastily and did what I have never seen in my years in this House done before. Among other things, the Members of that Committee took it upon themselves to suspend the rules of the House which were adopted by all the Members of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members, I ask you, is that a precedent? Can any Member who chairs a Committee arbitrarily if they choose, suspend the rules of the House which all of us have adopted by a Constitutional Majority. That is also at stake, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I say to each and every Member, the action of the elections Committee was a horrendous action because it struck



down the very heart of freedom. It struck down the confidence of the people to know that whoever they elect were elected honestly and fairly and that those votes were counted fairly. I can't understand why the Majority Leader does not want to have those ballots recounted. I can't understand what he is afraid of, and what's more, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are Members of the Majority Party who agree with me. I know how many Members on that side of the aisle would welcome a recount, would welcome the opportunity for the people of that district to have the Representative ceded who they elected. Now if Mr. Bartulis doesn't have enough votes, so be it. But if he does have enough votes, he should be ceded, and I don't know what you're afraid of so that we may go ahead and count those votes. That's the issue, not some legal mumbo jumbo. The issue is who won the election. And that is what we want to know."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that we don't have a Committee report on our desk, and I think this discussion is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti. I think you're right, but I'm powerless to call the voices of... Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm surprised at the Majority Leader saying that we should stick up for the Republican Members when there is a dispute with the Republican Membership, and that the Democrats should rightly so should stick up for the Democrats when they're in trouble. But I rise to speak on this occasion because I've been...
 41
 in my career, I've been a victim of this questionable



elections count several times. In my particular case, I went to bed one night...it was the election, and the first time in a good many years the City of Chicago had a Republican Senator from the 18th Legislative District. I went to bed 1,800 votes ahead. I woke...there were only 4 precincts missing and at 3 o'clock the next afternoon I lost 1,800 votes, and I lost the election. The next election...now this is serious, and I'd like to hear concern. I'm only bringing out these 2 points cause it could happen to you. The same election in the State of Illinois in the same legislative district where 3 candidates were running, 2 Democrats, an Independent, and a Republican. When they voted for that one candidate, they got 3 votes, accumulated voting system. When they voted for me, the machines were rigged well, and I got a vote and a half. And I lost that election by less than 200 votes. It could happen to me. It could happen to anyone on the floor. For that reason you should be concerned that this Body has a fair and equitable rule of determining the outcome of disputed elections. In the years I have served in the General Assembly, we had many close elections. We have Members sitting on this floor who have been elected by a vote and a half, 4 votes, 7 votes, 50 votes. Each of those elections were close enough that errors by a single election judge could have effected the outcome. However, in my years of watching politics, I have never seen an election where mistakes were as widespread in the 49th District cause I had occasion to go down and watch that election return the very next day after the election. First the totals for one candidate in one county were actually, accidentally doubled by a computer error. In another county it was discovered election judges had forgotten to count the straight party votes in several precincts. And still in another county, election



officials did not know how to count votes cast underneath the accumulated voting system. All of these instances cast appall on this entire election. In every discount...every discovery recount, the losing candidate was allowed to recount 18 precincts. In those 18 out of a total 275 in that district, he gained nearly 92 votes. Nearly 80 votes were in one single precinct. Even disregarding that abnormal gain, the candidate was gaining on a average of enough votes that spread throughout the precincts, he indeed would obtain enough votes to be declared the winner. The fact, I believe, demonstrates that this Body bears a tremendous burden. He must demonstrate to the people in the 49th District, and indeed to all of the people in the State of Illinois, that our electoral process is honest. The events in the Elections Committee yesterday certainly did not reassure anyone. House rules were violated and suspended at will. Three specific rules were violated. First there was no notice of hearing. Rule 77c requires written notice of a hearing to be delivered in person. This was not done, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether you're aware of it or not, but it was not done. Rule 62 a requires that written notice of a motion be filed for reconsidered on the next legislative day. This also has not been done, Mr. Speaker. Were you aware of that? The Committee actually suspended House rules. The first time in the history of my career in politics that I've seen that the Committee can actually suspend House rules. Finally, Rule 52 states that a present vote shall not be counted in determining the results of a Roll Call. How then, can a present vote be considered to be on the prevailing side as it was in this case? The tactics used to deny the people of the 49th District and the right to know who really won the election are deplorable. I'm ashamed to say I'm a Member of this



House. Those tactics are a disgrace to the House of Representatives, and they reflect the entire electoral process. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, the electoral process is the means by which you gained your seat in this Body. Do not demean that process, or you will recall into question the integrity of the entire Democratic system of the government of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I've been around this State Capitol a long time. Some people think too long, but I have never seen anything in my life that...like happened in that Elections Committee the other day. To go a little farther into the background, and they forgot to bring this up, about 3 weeks ago, the motion was put by the Democrats to dismiss the suit of Junie Bartulis. The motion failed. There was 10 to 10 with Ewell voting 'present'. The Parliamentarian ruled that voting 'present' was voting on the prevailing side. I've never heard of this in my life. And there is nothing in the rules, Robert's rules of order, or our rule. In fact, in our own rules it says if you vote 'present', you can't be counted for the purpose...for that purpose. It specifically says it. I urge you to read them. It says that. But then they voted to suspend the rules, and I have never seen a Committee of this House suspend the rules of the whole House. If you have, I'd like to hear the instance where it happened. The question here is whether or not Junie Bartulis was elected. At one point in the hearings back a few weeks ago, I asked both lwyers. I said, 'Is there any question but these were bonafide candidates, both candidates. They said they were. I said, 'Is there any question but what they live in their district?'. They said, 'No'.
'Is there any question but what the charges that Junie



Bartulis is filed? Are they legitimate?'. They said, 'No, that's right'. And I said, 'What is left, what is left, then possibly left to count the votes?'. Now this is a sheer movement of force, of power, and I'd expect that in Russia, but I don't expect it in the United States. We're a government of laws and rules. And when we quit abiding by that rule, God help America. And you're destroying America with this kind of tactic, and you're destroying the integrity of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in partial response to the previous speaker, the vote required in the Committee is a fixed number of votes, and a 'present' vote is a vote in the prevailing side if a motion fails to obtain the fixed number of votes. I would like to compliment the Republican Staff for the preparation of their speeches today, and I would like to compliment the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader from Chicago from adding a few new paragraphs to his usual form. And I'd like to read from an article which appeared in the Globe Democrat recently labeled 'Junie's Chance Remote to Regain Seat in House'. 'Chances are very remote that former Republican State Representative Bartulis' appeal of his election defeat last year will put him back into the Legislature according to a leader of his own party. 'It's doubtful', said Representative Bluthardt, 'Because Junie is too far behind to pick up enough votes.' Close quote. I move that we adjourn to 10 a.m. Monday morning."

Speaker Redmond: "After 10 minutes perfunctory, Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Before you move that adjournment motion, Representative Ryan wanted a list of the Senate Bills that have been posted in the Elections Committee for suspension of the rule to be heard next week. Does he still



desire to have those Bills reiterated?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that all of the election Bills that went from the House to the Senate are bottled up in Committee over there. Every one of the election Bills that went to the Senate. Do you know what's happened to those Bills, Representative?"

Laurino: "Yes, they have a Subcommittee at 4:30 Monday, and they are going to be acted upon correctly."

Ryan: "And what is your motion?"

Laurino: "The motion is to suspend the rules so that the Senate Bills that remain in Elections Committee can be heard. I will read them individually if you so desire. There are 3 that were not posted for last week, or this week, that are, should be heard next week."

Ryan: "I have no objections."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objections, the posting rule is waived. Representative Madigan has moved that the House, after 10 minutes perfunctory, that the House stand adjourned till 10 a.m. Monday morning. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the House now stand adjourned till 10 o'clock Monday."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee reports. Representative Farley, Chairman of the Committee on labor and commerce to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 7, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bill 320 and 433, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 17 and 1251.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, I'm going to stay. Come on back here and we'll open the microphone and let you talk. After the 10 minute perfunctory."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Do not pass as amended' Senate Bill 1264. Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on executive to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 7, 1979, reported the same back with



the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 76, 307 717, 746, 857, and 1411, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 1344, 'do not pass' Senate Bill 255, 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 278, 296, and 872, 'do pass Consent Calendar' Senate Bill 1190, 82, 404, 693, 710, 711, 713, 716, 723, 755, 795, 797, 862, and 1182, 'do pass Consent Calendar' Senate Bill 1190, 'do pass as amended Consent Calendar' Senate Bill 419, 700, and 712, 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' Senate Bill 215, 361, 654, 1204, and 1212, 'be adopted' House Resolution 202. Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on executive to which the following Bills were referred, action taken July 8, June 8, 1979,

reported the same back with the following recommendations:

'do pass' Consent Calendar Senate Bill 156, 1113, 'be adopted' House Resolution 236. Representative McClain, Chairman of the Committee on environment and energy and natural resources to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 8, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' Senate Bill 1084. Messages from the Senate. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 90, concurred in by the Senate June 8, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate By Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 841, concurred in by the Senate June 8, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage the Bill the following title to with House Bill #747 passed by the Senate



June 8, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House to pass these Bills, the following titles to wit House Bill 2487 together with the Senate Amendment #1, House Bill 357 together with Senate Amendment #1, House Bill 2487 together with...already read them... Anything else? We didn't adopt them... No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 08, 1979

PAGE 1

SB-0005	2ND READING	PAGE	53
	3RD READING	PAGE	54
SB-0007	2ND READING	PAGE	106
SB-0023	2ND READING	PAGE	108
SB-0026	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0071	3RD READING	PAGE	5
SB-0106	3RD READING	PAGE	69
SB-0108	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0110	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0111	3RD READING	PAGE	71
SB-0114	2ND READING	PAGE	108
SB-0136	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0159	3RD READING	PAGE	74
SB-0165	3RD READING	PAGE	75
SB-0168	3RD READING	PAGE	76
SB-0177	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0199	3RD READING	PAGE	86
SB-0210	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0214	3RD READING	PAGE	6
SB-0222	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0265	3RD READING	PAGE	46
SB-0289	3RD READING	PAGE	6
SB-0312	2ND READING	PAGE	108
SB-0344	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0346	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-0349	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0350	2ND READING	PAGE	109
SB-0388	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0394	3RD READING	PAGE	52
SB-0420	3RD READING	PAGE	95
SB-0421	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0422	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0467	3RD READING	PAGE	9
SB-0473	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0479	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0496	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0505	2ND READING	PAGE	45
SB-0507	3RD READING	PAGE	46
SB-0547	3RD READING	PAGE	97
SB-0550	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-0562	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0563	3RD READING	PAGE	95
SB-0568	2ND READING	PAGE	40

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 08, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-0574	2ND READING	PAGE	109
SB-0622	MOTIONS	PAGE	48
SB-0635	3RD READING	PAGE	101
SB-0642	3RD READING	PAGE	101
SB-0675	3RD READING	PAGE	103
SB-0685	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0689	2ND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0695	3RD READING	PAGE	104
SB-0724	2ND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0729	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0732	3RD READING	PAGE	10
SB-0735	2ND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0758	2ND READING	PAGE	109
SB-0809	2ND READING	PAGE	41
SB-0882	2ND READING	PAGE	110
SB-0892	2ND READING	PAGE	41
SB-0937	2ND READING	PAGE	110
SB-0938	2ND READING	PAGE	111
SB-1002	MOTIONS	PAGE	85
SB-1040	3RD READING	PAGE	104
SB-1049	2ND READING	PAGE	41
SB-1068	2ND READING	PAGE	111
SB-1096	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-1115	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-1120	2ND READING	PAGE	111
SB-1208	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-1218	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1220	2ND READING	PAGE	112
SB-1226	2ND READING	PAGE	112
SB-1228	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1241	2ND READING	PAGE	41
SB-1259	2ND READING	PAGE	41
SB-1260	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1270	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1277	MOTIONS	PAGE	86
SB-1309	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1334	2ND READING	PAGE	42
SB-1426	2ND READING	PAGE	3

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 08, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. POLK - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	126
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	126
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	127
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	128