

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

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order. Members please be
in their seats. Be lead in prayer today by the Reverend
Robert Schrack, Pastor of the Luther Memorial Evangelical
Lutheran Church of Springfield."

Reverend Schrack: "Let us pray. Eternal God, we come again to
the beginning of a new day. A day that gives every in-
dication of being very busy. A day where again we will
engage in the process of legislation. A day where our
best judgments will hopefully serve the interests of our
people in Illinois. As we prepare to take up the tasks
that lie before us, let us remember that our purpose is
that of service, and that we are servants here by virtue
of the common trust of thousands of people beyond these
walls. And, even though we are pressed by agendas and
calendars and the aspect of ever fleeting time, we pray
that we may not be overcome by the mechanics of our political
house, but may use this means equitably and justly, tempered
by love and concern, to serve our State. So, again, this
day we ask for minds to understand, eyes to see, lips to
speak, and wisdom to be at our best, because we understand
that we serve the best of Your creation, our fellow human
beings, and in this sense, we serve You. When this day is
finished, may we look back and reflect upon the accomplish-
ments knowing that we have been obedient to our duties and
have served the common good well. All of this we offer in
Your holy name. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman to lead us in the
Pledge of Allegiance."

Chapman: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States
of America and to the Republic, for which it stands; one
Nation under God, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice
for all."



Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your own switch only. Roll Call for attendance. Take the record. May I have your attention, please? We are honored with the presence of the Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky, Lieutenant Governor Stoval."

Stoval: "Thank you, Mr. President (sic). I made no promises to make any speeches. I wanted to enjoy this beautiful Senate and House Member, and I'm sure all of you are as proud as you can be of...of your Capitol. I hope that you have an opportunity to come to Kentucky and visit our people, because we think 130 people is an awful lot of people in our House, but it seems that you have 177, so I'm sure... I hope you all don't always sound and behave the way some of the people we have in the State of Kentucky, but we get the job done, and I'd like one of these days to come back and talk to you about the thing that I consider very serious, but since I would not impose on...because you're right. You know I think what I'm thinking of, and I hope that all of you will decide that the time will come that you want to be...all the people of Illinois be first-class citizens. Thank you so much and thank you, Mr. President (sic)."

Speaker Redmond: "I want to advise the Lieutenant Governor that the only reason that we can have 177 Members is because we're all so well-mannered and always behave ourselves. Would be difficult in any other state with any other Body. On page 13, Senate Bills, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 133."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 133. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Johnson, amends Senate Bill 133 on page 1 in line 2 and line 11 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Representative Johnson, on your Amendment #3. Four. Must be 4; isn't it? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yeah. This...this Amendment just strikes some language. I believe Representative Daniels is in agreement. It doesn't change the...all right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Why don't...why don't we just pull it out of the record and hold it then until Representative Daniels and I have a chance to talk..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Out of the record. 139."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 139. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 154. I think we've been taking this out of the record the last couple of days. Out of the record. 185."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 185. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 250."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 250. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 450. We took this one out, didn't we? Representative Katz, we'd better take it out. I'm pretty sure that's right. 636. Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. 667."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 667. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act and Cigarette Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 667..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Giorgi on the floor? Out of the record. 676."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 676. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Business Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Bullock on the floor? Out of the record. 764. Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 764. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner's Amendment. Is that ...?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No...NO Committee Amendments on 764."

Speaker Redmond: "Any...any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 667."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 667. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act and the Cigarette Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill."



Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I just wanted the record to show that I am here, and I...I've been requested to hold the Bill, so I'll hold it at Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I was holding it, but your seat mate told me to put it back in the record. I thought he was..."

Giorgi: "That's all right. I just wanted the record to show that I'm..."

Speaker Redmond: "do...working under instructions from you."

Giorgi: "I'm always present, but I'm holding the Bill up."

Speaker Redmond: "790. What...? Fiscal note ever been furnished on 767?"

Unknown: "...shadows knows."

Clerk O'Brien: "The fiscal note is not filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 790."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 790. 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 O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 676."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 676. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Business Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to withdraw that motion at this time and proceed with Amendment #2. I'd like leave of the Body to withdraw that motion."



Speaker Redmond: "...moves to table Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'. Oh, he withdraws the motion to table. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bullock, amends Senate Bill 676 on page 1 by inserting after line 16 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is Amendment #2. I've spoken to the Chairman of this Committee and the Minority Members of the Committee. I think...don't think there's any opposition to this Amendment. I would move adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Well, I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker. I have been involved in the process of amending this Bill, and I'm wondering why the Sponsor did not table Committee Amendment #1 when Amendment #2 was supposed to be a substitute for that, because Amendment #1 did not actually satisfy the concerns that were expressed in the Committee."

Bullock: "Representative Pullen, I spoke to Senator Geo-Karis, Chairman Chapman, and they both agreed that both Amendments would be in order and asked that I proceed with the Bill as I have."

Pullen: "Well, then we may have to oppose the Bill, because with Amendment #1 it does virtually nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on Amendment #2. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in...Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "...what it is. Will he explain it?"

Speaker Redmond: "I thought he had. Representative Bullock, on Amendment 2."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I felt that I had explained, but I certainly will for Representative Yourell's attention. This Amendment, in effect, would require that foreign corporation, that is out-of-state corporations,



have a physician on the board of any organization or corporation that hopes to engage in ambulatory surgical treatment centers. The Sponsor felt that it was required that a physician licensed to practice medicine, all of its branches, be on the board of such a facility. I move adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment 2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 676 as amended in the only sentence..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lein... Representative Leinenweber on the floor? ~~What's your pleasure, Representative Bullock?~~ Representative Leinenweber has an Amendment, and he's not on the floor."

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the Bill to Third and, perhaps, Representative Leinenweber and I can discuss it if like, and if it's agree with the Sponsor, the Senate Sponsor, I'll bring it back, but I'd like to move the Bill to Third."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Leinenweber,"

Speaker Redmond: "Same position. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Leinenweber had asked me to handle this Amendment #4. With leave of the House I will do this. It... Amendment #4... what it does is it changes the phrase, the termination of pregnancy, and just adds in the word, abortion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will rise in opposition to this Amendment. This Bill, quite simply, addresses a subject of guaranteeing the protection of... of health care for persons who



are treated in ambulatory serv...centers. I don't think any extraneous subject matter ought to be attached to it, and if there are subsequent Amendments to this effect, I would certainly have to take the Bill out of the record, and, perhaps, we could discuss it. But, I would oppose this Amendment specifically and ask other Members of the House to join with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Well, I...I would ask a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker, in... in adopting the Amendment or at least considering it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock, what's your pleasure?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you take the Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1...9...930. 930."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 930. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adopted in Committee or have been adopted previously."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Mahar, amends Senate Bill 930 on page 1 by deleting line 11 through 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 simply puts in proper form the requirement of an affidavit on the Bill, which when was drafted was not in proper form and now we have it. I would also ask leave that...there's a slight mistake in that on the first line of the Amendment it should read page 3 rather than page 1. I'd like to have that...ask leave to have that change made on its face."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to amend the Amendment on its face? Hearing no objection, leave is



granted...amended on its face, Mr. Clerk."

Mahar: "And I ask for adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1166. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my seat mate on this side, Representative Giorgi...I think he's in his office. Once in a while he makes the comment 'Let them eat cake.' Well, today, Representative Giorgi and I, we contributed and it's the tenth anniversary of my other seat mate, Mike McClain and Cathy McClain, and there's a cake in Representative Zeke Giorgi's office over here, and you're all welcome to eat... 'Let them eat cake' on Mike and Cathy McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "1166. Poor Cathy."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1166. 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 Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1200. Representative Beatty. Pardon me."

Beatty: "With regard to Senate Bill 1166, could we have the Clerk correct the House Sponsor? I am not the House Sponsor. It's William Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. We're going to be sure that it shows that Representative Kempiners is the Sponsor. 1200. 1200."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1200. A Bill for an Act creating



the Municipal Housing Finance Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1331. Nope. It's out of the record. 154 on page 13."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 154. A Bill for an Act creating the Criminal Victims' Escrow Account Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Katz, amends Senate Bill 154 on page 1 by deleting line 19 through 29 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "This...this was simply a Committee Amendment suggested by the Committee, and it's not controversial as far as I know."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. Was the intent of Amendment #3 to replace Amendment #2, which I think was adopted?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. Katz."

Katz: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I don't have my Amendment in front of me. Maybe we had better table Amendment #2 if I may have leave to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #2? Hearing no objection..."

Katz: "And then to move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is tabled. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment #3 is tabled. 450. Three was adopted, right."



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

Speaker Redmond: "450."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 450. A Bill for an Act to require state and local governmental entities to purchase or lease passenger automobiles complying with the minimum gas mileage standards. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Katz, amends Sente Bill 450 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, this is an Amendment that was insisted upon by the Committee to bring this Bill into compliance with a similar House Bill that had passed out. I would move the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 406."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 406. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 486."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 486. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you hold that Bill, please?"



Speaker Redmond: "Hold it. Request of the Sponsor. 487."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 487. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for expense of the Department of Local Government Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Younge, amends Senate Bill 487 by inserting after the last sentence in Section 2 the following...Section 2A...the sum of 1 million dollars or so much as may be necessary..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge on Amendment 7. Representative Younge in the chamber. Representative Younge. Representative McMasters."

McMasters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Sponsor of this Amendment is not here..."

Speaker Redmond: "She is here."

McMasters: "Oh, I'm sorry. Then may I...I think she should address the Amendment. Then I would like to, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say, Representative McMasters?"

McMasters: "Well, since this is an Amendment to a departmental appropriation, I would have to object to the Amendment until I have had the opportunity..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think we'd better take it out of the record..."

McMasters: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "...until you talk to Representative Younge."

McMasters: "And, really, I want to talk to the department before I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's all right. Talk to everybody. 513."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 513. A Bill for an Act to provide for the distributive expense of the State Comptroller."



Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 577."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 577. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Institute of Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #8 by Representative J. J. Wolf and Schraeder."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed. I don't know what that means. You take it out of the record? Take the Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. I would suggest that you talk to Representative Wolf, who has a motion to table your Amendment. 578. Out of the record. 581."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 581. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Business and Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Ackerman-Vinson-Ropp, amends Senate Bill 581 as amended by deleting Section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms.. Representative Ackerman on the Amendment #5. Proceed, Representative Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House. This Amendment appropriates the sum of 10,000 dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary to the Department of Business and Economic Development to study the feasibility and encourage the transformation of the Hiram Walker distillery in Peoria, Illinois to a facility for the production of alcohol from Illinois-grown grains for use in gasohol. For the expenditure of a very small amount of money we have a chance here to, possibly, reap great returns, and I would ask for your adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of the Amendment or a staff analysis. I'd like to take Senate Bill 581 out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Yeah. 94. Roll Call for attendance. Take the record. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 94."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 94. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to exemptions from liability of certain persons providing emergency medical care. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bianco."

Bianco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 94 would allow good Samaritans immunity to persons performing cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. It's commonly known as CPR emergency medical aid. This Bill would allow those persons trained in the generally recognized CPR standards to be exempt from civil liability while performing CPR. Our statutes currently exempt from civil liability nurses, dentists, police officers, firemen, physicians, and emergency medical technicians while in the performance of emergency aid. The City of Chicago has recently amended their municipal code to grant this immunity to those who perform CPR in that city. With this



Bill, we would broaden this exemption across the entire state. This is good legislation that is much needed, and in the interest of encouraging more individuals to take CPR training and more people to perform CPR in emergency situations, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall...Representative McCourt in opposition.'"

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Would the Gentleman please sit down, standing before the Chair and Representative McCourt?"

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if I'm in opposition, but I'd like a little clarification. Does this mean if a paramedic in the normal performance of a paramedic's duty, negligently administers the CPR technique and cause a person...cause the death of a person, that this person in...in exercising his...his normal professional functions, would be relieved of any liability?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bianco."

Bianco: "Yes, Representative McCourt, this Bill in its text explicitly outlines that it would have to be if it is... if it is willful and wanton..."

McCourt: "Well, Mr..."

Bianco: "...it would be...it would be..."

McCourt: "Mr Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I definitely oppose this legislation. This...this means that we are saying that certain people acting in their professional capacities may be negligent and no one can have any redress because of this negligence, and so for this reason I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "Well, I was...I was going to explain my 'aye' vote, but I see that's probably not necessary at this point. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 300."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 300. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Chicago Teachers' Retirement Fund Article of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "300. Oh, pardon me. Out of the record. 308."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 308. A Bill for an Act in relation to contribution among joint tortfeasors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill creates a right of contribution among joint tortfeasors, and it creates a two-year statute of limitations for contribution actions. Present law being five years. The Bill itself is a work product of the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois State Bar Association, and I believe has, in good form, passed heavily out of the Senate, and I would recommend your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think all of us non-lawyers ought to be very suspicious about this Bill. It looks like a very dirty Bill. I want to know what a tortfeasor is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "A tortfeasor is one who creates a tort."

Skinner: "Feases around torts?"

Daniels: "A tortfeasor is one who violates a civil law...who damages or injures another person."

Skinner: "Well, certainly we ought to do people...something to naughty people like that."

Daniels: "Yeah, it's a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman. Short Debate."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question if I might."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Representative Daniels, I see this Bill had a... a...certainly a very healthy past, and it doesn't seem to have much opposition, but I'm a little concerned about it, too as it might affect the cost of liability insurance, for example, in the State of Illinois. Doesn't...doesn't this Bill make it possible for law suits to be filed against people that are not presently being sued under



law, or at least they don't expand the number of people that might be adjudged guilty of negligence in court cases. It seems to me that it might do just that." Mr. Daniels: "No, I don't believe it would. What the contribution Section would mean that if somebody were found guilty of negligence, that they could be required to contribute towards the monetary recovery. Normally, these people are all joined..."

Schuneman: "I'm sorry. I can't...I can't hear you."

Daniels: "What the Bill does is it allows for contribution for monetary damages by people that are responsible for negligent action. Those people are normally joined in a law suit at the commencement of the law suit. However, under current law when a judgment is rendered, it's rendered against all of the people and not spread out in exact and precise amounts. What this Bill does is allow for the contribution between responsible parties as to varying degrees of the judgment action or how much they may owe. It's a codification of the Skinner versus Reed decision out of the Illinois Supreme Court, and it adds other provisions which we think will make it more beneficial for current law. But, it should not, in answer to your question, encourage or create any additional liability on any additional parties."

Schuneman: "You don't believe that this...that this Bill will be more expensive...will...will make law suits more expensive for the public than the present system?"

Daniels: "Absolutely not."

Schuneman: "As I understand our present system, if...if negligence is found, normally it is...one party or several parties are found to be negligent..."

Daniels: "If you..."

Schuneman: "...under our law now, and I really don't see..."

Daniels: "If you have three people that are negligent and responsible for damages, those three people...judgments



may be entered against in X number of dollars, say a thousand dollars, and in the case of a judgment the judgment would be entered against all of them. What this Bill allows to do is for a distribution between those three people as to the payment of the damages. It does not encourage or create additional liability. This is a contribution amongst people responsible for negligent actions or, in this case, joint tortfeasors. That's what the legal definition is. It does not and should not incur any additional cost to the public or any additional liability to parties that are not originally negligent and most likely joined in the law suit to begin with."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question? Does this Bill do anything else other than allow for the division of the liability?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "There are a number of things that the Bill does, but that is the major portion of the Bill and what the Bill is addressed to. It's...the Bill is primarily addressed to the Skinner versus Reed decision. It does create a two-year statute of limitations for contribution actions. That's the action for contribution between the joint tortfeasors, and it codifies the rights of joint tortfeasors as I said earlier."

Kane: "Well, what...what is the two-year limit on?"

Daniels: "On the contribution action. When that action can be brought."

Kane: "Is this a separate action from the original suit?"

Daniels: "Yes, if...if there is a dispute between the contribution, then there would be a separate action between the people that are responsible for the negligence or the damages or...or monetary amount."

Kane: "Well, this would be a two-year limit on the three



people who are liable...suing each other for...for how much each one is liable for?"

Daniels: "It would be a...it would be a two-year statute for the parties seeking contribution who claims that he made payment in excess of his prorated share."

Kane: "Okay. And what else then does the Bill do besides that?"

Daniels: "That is primarily what the Bill does. It...it, as I said, all evolves around the contribution action. For instance, there's a Section on right of recovery as limited to the amount paid beyond the prorata share of what the individual should pay, but it's all around the contribution action."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate. Representative Katz on Short Debate."

Katz: "I have the fear that this society of ours is finally going to end up with everybody tied up in court in litigation. I do believe that we are moving in the direction..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, we are on Short Debate, and now everybody voted for these rules. This is the Order of Business. I move to take this off Short Debate to make it legal anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Is he joined by nine other people? It's off Short Debate. Now, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there may be a relation between this Bill and that Bill yesterday when we created a new law school. I think that with all the litigation we're creating, we're going to need several new law schools. I'm not sure that having all that litigation helps the society, however. I do have the feeling that we've had a system of personal injury or tort law for a long, long time. It has survived. It has done pretty well, and I think that all of this tailoring and creating new remedies and new kinds of litigation is



going to do in not only the tort system but all of the society. It seems to me that this Bill, as well as some recent court decisions, are just going to create endless litigation on, on, and on, and, frankly, I protest that trend, and I'm going to vote 'no' on the Bill for that reason."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, if I might comment on the last Gentleman's statement. I think if he reviewed the Bill carefully and if he had come over and asked about the legislation, he would realize that this is codifying a Supreme Court decision. Representative Katz. Representative Katz. This is codifying a Supreme Court decision that was handed down in the Skinner versus Reed case. This makes it clearer as to the rights by and between the parties. It does not necessarily encourage any additional litigation, and I think if you reviewed the Bill carefully, you would realize that the Bill is going in the right direction and an effort to assist people when they claim that they are paying in excess of their prorata share. There...this is a direct result of the Skinner versus Reed U. S. Supreme Court decision...or Illinois Supreme Court."

Katz: "If I may respond since my name was mentioned in debate and that colloquy, Mr. Speaker. In my remarks, if the Gentleman noticed, I not only raised some objections with regard to the Bill; I was aware of the court decision. I said that I am not in favor of that trend in that decision. I think that in the long run, while it may appear to have some immediate...it is resulting in a legal system in which we are tied up continually in litigation. We are an over..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz..."

Katz: "...litigated society."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...would you kindly bring your remarks to a close? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."



Jaffer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. I think that Representative Daniels is really quite correct. Basically, what this Bill does is that it codifies that Skinner case creating the right of contribution, and in addition to that, it fills in some of the gaps that are not addressed by the Illinois Supreme Court in the...in the Skinner case. Let me say to you that this will not cost any more money to anybody in the world. I don't see how it can possibly do that. In addition to that, it will not create any new litigation. This Bill was endorsed by the Illinois Bar... State Bar Association, and it's a good Bill, and I don't see what everybody is really that excited about, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill is what's fair. When you have people that are responsible for monetary damages and there's more than one person and they have been negligent resulting in a judgment entered against more than one person, they are called joint tortfeasors. What this Bill says is that they should be responsible to pay their prorata share, and if this has not occurred, that the parties between themselves may have an action. Now, this is a result of the Skinner versus Reed decision handed down by the Illinois Supreme Court. It's our job to make sure that people are properly protected. That's what this Bill does. It's been very carefully worked over by the Chicago Bar, by the Illinois Bar. It's come out of the Senate very heavily, supported by the Judiciary I Committee of this House very



heavily, and I ask for your favorable support. It's a fair Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 308 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Griesheimer, you're on!"

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to reaffirm what Representative Daniels just said. Let me give you an example. If you have two people that are both at fault, one with insurance and one without insurance, and there's a total judgment entered of forty thousand dollars, right now the insurance company for the man who is insured, would end up paying the entire forty thousand, and the other guy would get off scot-free."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'ayes', 6 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Borchers: "I would like to rise, if you don't mind, on a point of personal inquiry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point, Sir?"

Borchers: "Well, we have on both sides of the aisles some very pretty girls as our Pages, and as such we cannot help but observe them. Now part of the beauty of the anatomy, of course, is a derriere, and I was curious, as a point of inquiry, whether we are permitted to use, in the same sense, the words of the President of the United States now in describing them, or is this particular reserved merely for the use of the Democratic side of the aisle?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can ask leave of the House. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, for what purpose



do you seek recognition?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement. In the Speaker's Gallery are Representative...are the Republican Steel Local of 1033...United Steel Workers of America who are five thousand Illinois employees strong lead by Frank 'Guzzo' represented by Balanoff, Dawson, and Collins. Up in the Speaker's Gallery."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 361."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 361. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the organization and maintenance for the University of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Domico: "Mr. Chair...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 361 permits the University of Illinois Board of Trustees to own and operate energy plants to serve university facilities. All...allows the Board to sell excess energies at rates determined by the ...by the Board. It exempts University of Illinois from being considered a public utility subject to an Act concerning public utilities. I would appreciate a favorable consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 361 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record: On this question there's 152 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 421."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 421. A Bill for an an Act to amend Sections of the Family Practice Residency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. Mr. Deuster, please sit down. Mr. Yourell."



Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 421 amends the Family Practice Residency Act. The Family Practice Residency Act is in its second year of operation. It was enacted in 1977 and encouraged Family Practice medical students to serve in areas of the state where there were shortages of physicians and other health care resources. Thirteen scholarships were awarded to first-year medical students in fiscal year 1979. An additional thirteen to fifteen are attend...intended for fiscal 1980. The Department of Public Health has already prescribed payback and service requirements by rule and regulation. Legislation...this legislation is necessary so as to clarify the state's authority and to invoke penalties since this has been questioned by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. The Illinois Department of Public Health came in and developed... proposed rules to the Joint Committee, and what we're asking is legislative and statutory authority for these rules. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 421."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 421 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On Short Debate. I'm not in opposition at all, but I just was wondering whether or not Representative Yourell could sort of say what the...the last portion of that. I caught it all but the last portion. Just the change that you're making. As you know, this was my baby last year. Just the change. Just the last portion that you mentioned."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "The Bill reduces the current payback penalty from triple the value to double the value of the scholarships awarded as those provided in the Illinois Department of



Health rules."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all..."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 554. Yes. The Gentleman...Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the Short Debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Conti: "Yesterday we had a verification of a Roll Call. You could hear a pin drop. Members were in their seats. Now, on Long Debate we have a time to look at our Digest. We have a time to reflect on what is being presented before the House, but on Short Debate before you turn the page, the vote is being asked for. I wonder if we can have some kind of decorum during the Short Debate program only?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I agree with your comments, Sir, with the...we should have the...that type of decorum throughout our entire legislative Session. I would hope that the Membership would kindly be in their own respective seats and kindly listen to the debate and consider the legislation. Senate Bill 554. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 554. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for fees of the sheriffs, recorders of deeds, and county clerks in counties of the third class. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 554 applies only to Cook County. It amends an Act to provide for the fees of the sheriff with a straight six hundred dollar fee instead of



a three percent commission on all sales of real estates and has scheduled the fees on sale of personal...personal estate made by virtue of any executioner or any judgment of court. Under current law sheriffs are paid a fee on all sales of property executed by a court order. The fees are computed on a percentage basis as I indicated of three percent of sales under two hundred dollars, and in sales over two hundred dollars three hundred...three percent of the first two hundred dollars and one and a half percent of the balance, but the maximum fee is four hundred... four hundred dollars. This Bill changes that fee from percentage to a straight charge. The Bill further provides that in no case shall the fee exceed the amount of sale. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 554 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Tim, would you hit my button, please? Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Borchers: "All I wanted to say is you'd better think what you're doing here. I'm not going...I'm not going to explain my vote, but you'd better think about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 3 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 558."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 558. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to return this Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asked leave to bring Senate Bill



558 from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment.
Does she have leave? Objections have been raised, ma'am.
The Lady wish to move?"

Hoxsey: "Who...where was the objection, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me."

Hoxsey: "Who objected?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Getty."

Hoxsey: "I would then make a motion to move it back to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves that we suspend the ap...
the Lady moves that the...that the House grant leave to
bring the Bill back to Second Reading. All in favor vote
'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. No. Have all voted who
wish? Hannig. Mr. Cullerton. Have all voted who wish?
The Clerk will take the record."

Unknown: "Turn Cullerton's mic off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 95 'ayes',
27 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, asked for
a verification. Verify the affirmative vote. The Lady
asks for a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees
first."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. Alexander. Balanoff. E. M.
Barnes. Birchler. Bradley. Braun. Brummer. Bullock.
Capparelli."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I've just been advised by the Minority
Leader that it's the intention to withdraw Amendment #1,
which is the Amendment which I did not want and, therefore,
if that is the program, I have no objections and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman withdraws his
request for a verification. The Lady has leave to bring
the Bill back to Second Reading. Put Senate Bill 558 on
Second Reading. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "The...I would refer to Mr. McBroom for the Amendment,
please."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to table Amendment #1."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McBroom, amends Senate Bill 558 on page 1 in line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment removes the precinct's ceiling of eight hundred voters and moves it to a ceiling of twelve hundred. I discussed it with Mr. Yourell, and it applies only to counties of two hundred thousand or less, Mr. Speaker. It does not affect Cook County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we're talking about keeping people politically active in our communities, then this Amendment ought to be defeated. It's very difficult now downstate where we don't have patronage to get people to work in the precincts. We want civic groups...citizens in all walks of life to participate in the political process. This Amendment would cut out those people who are now willing to knock on the doors and do all the hard work of the election, and I would ask defeat of this Amendment if you want the political process to be continued."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Sir and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In my judgment this is a very poor Amendment. This takes the process of the people...the people who are really interested in politics away from politics. It just enlarges the size of the precincts, and as speaking as a County Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Chairmen's



Association, I think this is one of the poorest Amendments that they could have for downstate precincts and enlarging them. Now there are 800 and some precinct committeemen have a very difficult time covering their precinct with 800 population and 1200 would be just completely out of the question. This is a very, very poor Amendment."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker...Representative McBroom, can you give me the background as to the reason for this request. Was it an election laws hearing that prompted this request or... You know what your doing. You're cutting out half of the precinct committeemen in downstate...the fifteen most populated counties. Is that your intention? What's the reason for the Bill? Or the Amendment?"

McBroom: ~~"Well, Mr. Giorgi, I will be delighted to respond to~~
 you. I can remember quite vividly...two...and two of the leaders of your political party, Alan Dixon and Senator Donnewald, whom I have known for many years and admire and respect, advocated voting machines and their speeches were, it will alt...Yes, it will cost the counties more money when we mandate them, but ultimately we'll not have to have so many precincts. Ultimately we'll not have to rent so many buildings. Ultimately we'll not have to hire so many judges. It'll be easier to get judges. Now it occurs to me that it's absolutely insane to continue to mandate counties to buy voting machines and at the... simultaneously decrease precincts, Mr. Giorgi, and that's the purpose. It's permissive. A county can still do whatever they choose to do. It does not affect counties... it does not affect Cook County, and I...I think it's an excellent Amendment. I, too, Representative Harris am a County Chairman, and I have...I have some feel for this also. I think it's an excellent Amendment."

Giorgi: "Okay. When does...when does...when does it become effective in the event this was passed and signed by the



Governor. When does it become effective?"

McBroom: "January 1, I assume, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Of 1980?"

McBroom: "1980."

Giorgi: "Have you done any statistics as to what you're going to do? The most populated counties...I think there are fifteen that qualify for two hundred thousand or over. How many...how many precincts do you eliminate? The logistics? Have you done a study on the logistics?"

McBroom: "I...what it would do in our county, which we're all vitally concerned with, would save us over a hundred thousand dollars. Our county clerk, who's held office for some twelve...fifteen years, feels that with voting machines and an adequate size building, Zeke, that it's no problem to vote fifteen hundred, and we're putting a lid of twelve hundred on it."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just to speak for a minute to the Bill. I think this is a case of...I'd like to support Representative McBroom's efforts to...to increase the limits of precincts, because in Winnebago and the most populated counties we do have this problem. We do have a problem housing the voting facilities. We do have a problem finding precinct committeemen. We do have a problem with the expenses of election. I think it's a very fine Bill, and I'd like to hear from someone from the Election Laws Commission that might have studied this problem and give us some more insight. Now, I'm going to support the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I disagree with Mr. Giorgi. This...actually this Amendment would have the effect of dissuading the...the people who have to walk to the polls. They were even going to vote, and I always thought the idea that we...that we had in our mind was to try to get everybody who had any right to vote at



all there to the polls to vote. You take the...especially in the poorer populated precincts that just half again this...makes the precinct size half again bigger and that gives these people that much further to walk, which has the effect of dissuading them to go vote. Also, in the time where we have a real good turnout for an election where you have again the precincts or cut the precincts by half I would say...when they go to the polls, if there's a big line, it also has the effect of turning people away, and I...I really think it's a bad Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When Senate Bill 558 came up for debate on Second Reading a day or two ago, there was Amendment #1 attached to the Bill and that had an open-ended figure that would allow counties un...under two hundred thousand to have precincts of two thousand twenty-five hundred...whatever they...they wanted, and I objected to that Amendment at the time if you recall and talked with Representative McBroom and Representative Ryan on the situation, and we thought, perhaps, a figure of twelve hundred as a ceiling would be more in keeping with what we think is a manageable precinct. I think this isn't all that bad, and I agreed to support the Amendment. Representative Pierce had the same Bill three or four years ago. I understand Representative Matijevich had the Bill. I...I'm going to support the Amendment, but I think that it will be declared unconstitutional simply because it does not provide uniformity as required in the 1970 Constitution. But, at...at any rate, we're not here to determine constitutionality as I've said on many occasions. We're here to vote on the legislative merits of...of a Bill and not on whether it's Constitutional or not, and so I rise in support of Amendment #2 to House Bill...or Senate Bill 558."

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



Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Oblinger: "Mr. McBroom, does this also apply to paper ballot counties?"

McBroom: "You mean paper ballot precincts."

Oblinger: "Well, counties that have paper ballots."

McBroom: "Yes, it applies to all counties two hundred thousand or less, Joseph...but it's permissive. It's permissive."

Oblinger: "I read the Bill, and it says, except...all right. It goes on. Shall at its regular meeting in June. It says, shall, in mine...divide its election precincts. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

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

Oblinger: "I don't know how many of the rest of you have been a county clerk, but I'm an ex-county clerk, and I would violently oppose this Amendment. Number one, we have a number of paper ballot precincts in counties still in this state. They would never get through with twelve hundred. It would be twelve o'clock the next day before they could get in with the ballots. Number two, when the polls close at six o'clock, we have a line around the block down the road. And, number three, in our precinct, which is eight miles by five miles, if you increase it so we have to have twelve hundred, we're going to have to be transporting people fifteen and twenty miles. As a county clerk, I would object to it and, as a Legislator, I certainly do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom, to close on Amendment #2."

McBroom: "Yes, I would simply close by saying, Josephine, that we've got a breakdown in communications. It is



permissive. I'd very much appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I still don't know why he excluded counties over two hundred thousand. The...the Lake County Board Supervisors...now they're called the Lake County Board is a Republican controlled Board, and they've asked for this Bill. The County Clerk of Lake County has asked for this Bill. I'm sure this Bill can be used at DuPage, Kane, Will, and the other...Winnebago and the other counties, and the other counties over two hundred thousand. It's permissive in this extent, and I think the Gentleman from Kankakee is correct. It's permissive to this extent in that it sets a maximum size of the precincts, and the county boards, if they want to, could have smaller precincts. It sets a maximum size, so I think the...the Lady from Sangamon might consider that. It sets a maximum size not...not a minimum size. However, it does not apply, in my opinion...unconstitutionally it discriminates against counties under two hundred thousand and, therefore, I intend to vote 'no' on this Amendment, so all counties are included in it."

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

Unknown: "God bless Mayor Byrne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sorry I didn't have an opportunity to ask the Sponsor this question, but it seems to me that it's absolutely the reverse of what we ought to be talking about on this House floor. It really is the areas of high concentration where it might be most feasible for us to have larger



precincts. In downstate Illinois, it seems to me for us to go to larger and larger size precincts, is totally impractical. If, in fact, the machines can be used by larger numbers of people, those need to be available to the high concentration districts, not the low concentration districts, and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote. Timer's on!"

Simms: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's more of a question. Does this also apply to those areas that are under a Board of Election Commissioners as well as those of the County Clerk? Maybe the Sponsor of the Bill could nod or..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McBroom. No, this is his Amendment."

McBroom: ~~"It doesn't apply to Winnebago County."~~

Simms: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In making my...explaining my vote upon this Amendment, the question arises of the words, shall do this, as far as the date of June. Yes, county boards must change precinct boundaries in June at their June meeting, but that does not say that they shall change the size of them from eight hundred to twelve hundred. The date of June for the change in precinct boundaries is mandatory. That's when a county board must do it, and I think anyone who had been a county clerk should know that, but that does not mandate that they change the size of the precinct. It mandates only the date when they must do it. The size is still at the discretion of the county board. That is not a mandate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 'ayes', 70 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, for



what purpose do you seek recognition? Mautino, please."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir. If this Amendment goes on, I'd like to verify the affirmative votes on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman wants to verify the affirmative votes. Mr. McBroom wants to poll the absentees. Mr. Van Duyne, for what purpose do you seek recognition? All right. Fine. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees. Alexander. Bluthardt. Bower. Bullock. DiPrima. Ebbesen. Ewell. Farley. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Getty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Record Mr. Hanahan as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Kucharski. O'Brien. Patrick. Polk. Pouncey. Schisler. Schneider. Stuffle. Taylor. Trotter. Younger. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified on this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Ewing. Mr. Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A little bird flew by and suggested that I change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record..."

Winchester: "From 'no' to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from...Mr. Winchester from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Piel. Excuse me. Mr. Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Maybe I want to verify that little bird that told him to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, there's a lot of birds in the air, I guess. Why don't we dump that Roll Call and let's have another one? Save a little time. Is everyone ready? The question is, 'Whether the House shall adopt Amendment #2?'



All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 'ayes', 70 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "I thought I hit my button, but I evidently didn't. Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Matijevich as 'aye'. Hanahan as 'no'. What's the count? On this question there are 77 'ayes', 71 'nays'...yes, Mr. Sandquist. Kindly record Mr. Sandquist as 'aye'. Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I see some green votes that aren't sitting in those seats, and I...I'd certainly..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks..."

Mautino: "...have to go ahead with the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...asks for a verification. Would the House kindly be in order? Everybody be in their own seats. All unauthorized personnel remove themselves, please. Mr. Piel, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. You're verified. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees. Alexander. Borchers. Bullock. Catania. Collins. Ebbesen. Ewell. Farley. Getty. Giorgi. Griésheimer. Henry. Huff. Keane. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Patrick. Polk. Pouncey. Schisler. Skinner. Taylor. Totten. Watson. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd...I'd like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Collins as 'aye'."



Borchers is 'aye'. The Clerk will proceed...Mrs. Younge, 'no'. Mr. Keane, 'no'. Mr. Farley, 'no'. Mr. Watson, 'no'. Mr. Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Yes. Kornowicz, 'no'. What's our count? Mr. Getty, what's your...what'd you..."

Unknown: "Could we the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm asking the Clerk what the count is now Sir. We're starting off with 80 'ayes', 75 'nos'. Verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. Record Mr. Ewell as 'no'. Proceed with the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kulas? No. Wait. Marco, come here for a second. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman can't see. Would the Membership kindly be in their own respective chairs and would you...when your name is called, would you kindly respond in the normal manner? Would the unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? Would you...would the Membership kindly be in their own chairs? Mr. Leinenweber. Oh, okay. He's there. Mr. Vinson, would you kindly break up the caucus? Mr. Collins, would you kindly break up the caucus? Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Campbell. Capuzi. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Dave Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Laurino. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Matijevich. Matu..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Totten as 'aye'."



Clerk O'Brien: "Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Neff. Peters. Piel. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Simms. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. Waddell. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. And Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the affirmative vote? Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Klosak? The Gentleman's there."

Mautino: "Mr. Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino? Mr. Laurino. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Garmisa. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Mr. Steele."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...who? Steele's here."

Mautino: "Mr. Gaines."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Gaines. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Mr. Meyer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Meyer. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "There he is."

Mautino: "Bower."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...what purpose do you seek recognition? Vote him 'aye'. Bower, 'aye'."

Mautino: "Mr. Schuneman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schuneman. He's there."



Mautino: "Mr. Ewing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing. Do you...He asked to be leaved to be verified, Sir. Ewing did."

Mautino: "Mr. Davis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack Davis. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Mautino: "Mr. Kelly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kelly. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record, and put Mr. Davis back on the record."

Mautino: "Mr. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Laurino back on the record. Wolf?"

Mr. Wolf. He's right here. All right, now which one? Jake or Sam?"

Mautino: "Jake."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jake. Jake's right here."

Mautino: "Mr. Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Mautino: "Mr. Telcser."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Telcser? He's here. Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Taylor, please."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Taylor: "Would you please record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Taylor as 'aye'. Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Record me as 'aye', Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Bullock as 'aye'."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly change Mr. Laurino to 'no'? Mr. Henry, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Henry: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Henry: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record him as 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? The Gentleman from...on this question there are 81 'ayes', 77 'nos', and the motion prevails, and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "I would like...Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this put back on Short Debate if possible."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's possible. The Lady asks leave to put the Bill back on Third Reading, Short Debate. Any objections? Objections have been raised. The Bill will appear on the Calendar...Third Reading, Full Debate. Senate Bill 565."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 565. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retail Installment Sales Acts and Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Just wanted to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Conti: "I wanted this off of Short Debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Take Senate Bill 651 out of the record. Senate Bill 735. Mrs. Breslin, Senate Bill 735."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 735. A Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers and Salesmen License Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin."



Breslin: "Senate Bill 735 amends Section 8 of the Real Estate Brokers and Sales...Salesmen License Act concerning the Real Estate Recovery Fund. This Bill provides that only persons agrieved by a real estate broker, a broker salesman, or a sales acting in that capacity or apparently acting in that capacity may recover funds from the special funds set up. Since its effective date in 1974, the Real Estate Recovery Fund has been funded by fees assessed against real estate agents at the time of their original license application. I believe that because the real estate licensees themselves support the fund, it's reasonable to limit the fund's availability to only those wronged by persons acting in their capacity as a real estate broker, a broker salesman, or a salesman. This Bill passed out of the Senate unanimously and passed out of the House Committee unanimously. There was no opposition recorded, and I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 735 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Hey, Billy. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Jim, are you ready on 300? Senate Bill 300. Out of the record. Senate Bill 739."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 739. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Gaines on the floor? Mr. Gaines. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 768. Mr. O'Brien."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 768."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 811."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 811. A Bill for an Act to amend



the Judges Retirement System Article of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Beatty: "I've asked...asked leave of the House to bring this back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring it back to Second. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Second Reading."

Beatty: "The Pensions Committee allowed this Bill out only if I would agree to table Senate Bills...Senate Amendments 1 and 2, so the Amendment...the House Amendment #1 does just that. It tables Senate Amendment 1 and 2, which the Senate...House Pensions Committee does not agree with. I ask...ask leave of the House to adopt House Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments on the Bill? Chalkie? 811."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 811 on page 1..."

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

Beatty: "I ask adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. He...he explained the Amendment."

Beatty: "The Amendment strikes Senate Amendments 1 and 2, which I agreed to do for the House Pensions Committee, because Amendments 1 and 2 were not agreed to by the Pension Laws Committee, and both the Republican side and Democratic side wanted these two provisions withdrawn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill put...placed on Third Reading, Short Debate. Hearing no objections, the Bill will remain on Short



Debate. Senate Bill 871. Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 886. Mr. VonBoeckman. Mr. VonBoeckman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 892. Mr. Daniels. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 892. A Bill for an Act to amend the Non-Profit Health Care Service Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 892 amends the Non-Profit Health Care Service Plan Act. In the provision of the Act amending the Health Care Service corporations, there was a provision that deleted everything relating to an exemption of corporate officers and agents in regards to medical malpractice. This caused some of our companies, HMOs, to have to procure medical malpractice insurance at an annual premium of some five hundred thousand dollars. To our knowledge no action has ever been brought under this provision, and we're asking that this provision of the Act be deleted. To my knowledge there is no opposition to this Bill. It came out of the Senate quite handily and cleared House Insurance Committee without any opposition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition to Senate Bill 892? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 892 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 909. Mr. Totten. 909."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 909. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House. Senate Bill 909 is part of a series of Bills. It's very similar to a Bill that the Speaker right there in the Chair passed out of this House. What it does is provides that expenditures of federal funds by state agencies be prohibited unless appropriated by law. It allows us to appropriate all state funds. The following courts are...are exempt: the circuit courts, units to local governments, State Scholarship Commission, local boards of elections, state colleges and universities, community colleges, the Illinois Industrial Development Authority, the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Illinois Health Facilities Authority, the Illinois Industrial Pollution Control Financing Authority, the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, the Illinois Education Facilities Authority. These were excluded to clear up some problems that we had last year with bonding authority. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 909 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 932. Mr. Bowman."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 932. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends only Article 34 of the School Code, which is the Article governing the City of Chicago. It does not affect downstate. It does three primary things. It brings the interest rate on bonding in conformance with other Sections of the revised statutes. It provides that



they may sell their general obligation bonds at any time during the fiscal year. Right now they have a problem, because their fiscal year spread over two tax years, and this would permit them to more flexibility and marketing their bonds during their...their fiscal year. Lastly, it provides, through an Amendment adopted in Committee, a provision whereby they can continue to levy tax anticipation warrants in view of the crisis...impending crisis involving the Corporate Personal Property Tax replacement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, wants to ask a question."

Borchers: "In relation to this part of the Bill...wait a minute...I...my glasses are not adjusted...requires the ~~County Clerk to extend taxes at the rate sufficient to~~ produce a full amount of taxes levied for the school purposes. In a way does that allow the County Clerk to ...to extend the taxes without consent of the County Board or the Cook County Board up to whatever the maximum amount would be allowable by law?"

Bowman: "Wait...wait a minute. Would you please repeat the question? I couldn't quite hear the whole thing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly repeat the question, Sir?"

Borchers: "I would like to know if there's a maximum allowed ...by...under law for the...for tax levies for no matter what it may be. It sounds to me as if this allows the County Clerk, perhaps, to extend it without consent of the administrative body of Cook County, perhaps, to the maximum amount if he thinks that they need additional money. I think that...if that is so, I think it should be reserved to the County Board of Cook County."

Bowman: "No, they...they are not the...the...this is...this is the school board, and they are not under the County Board. Representative Borchers, you were on the Committee



that heard this Bill, and I believe you voted for it in Committee."

Borchers: "Well, I may have heard the Bill at a time, but the question just came to my mind as I sat here now."

Bowman: "Oh, okay."

Borchers: "I just wanted to be sure the proper authority is able to levy...to raise the taxes to bring in whatever it is the school board wants. I thought the school board in Chicago was supported by the Mayor of Chicago, and, therefore, perhaps it should be the...the school board that...then can raise the taxes instead of the County Clerk..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It...it can raise the taxes in Chicago."

Bowman: "Yes...yes, in the City of Chicago, the...the City... City Council is actually the...the taxing Body, and they...the taxes that are raised...that is necessary to meet whatever the school board needs are..."

Borchers: "But this is not..."

Bowman: "...and the City Collector is the one that handles that..."

Borchers: "I just want to make sure..."

Bowman: "...city fund."

Borchers: "...that this is not the power of the County Clerk to do this and to..."

Bowman: "No."

Borchers: "Okay. That is all I want to know."

Bowman: "It is not."

Borchers: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 932 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'ayes', no 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 933. Oh."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 933. A Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. At the request of the Senate Sponsor I'd like to table this Bill and ask unanimous permission to table the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks the unanimous permission to table Senate Bill 933. Hearing no objections, Senate Bill 933 is tabled. Senate Bill 886."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 886. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 886 is a product of the Working Committee of the Motor Vehicles Law Commission, which had Representatives from the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Illinois State Police, the Illinois Office of Education, the Illinois School Transportation Association, the Secretary of State's office, the Majority and Minority staff in both Houses. It passed the...this Bill passed the Senate 53-1. It came out of the Motor Vehicles Law Committee 12-2...twelve to nothing, and I ask your... respectfully, your favorable support on this measure. I know of no opposition to this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 886 pass?' The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, are you in opposition?"

Robbins: "I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. What's your question, Sir?"

Robbins: "Does this include a bus that would pick up children on Sunday morning to transfer them to and from Sunday school?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. VonBoeckman, does that include a bus that transports kids to and...Sunday school?"



VonBoeckman: "Well, it in...the bus driver doesn't have to have a qualified bus driving permit."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 886 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 6 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 952. Oh, congratulations on your anniversary, Jim. Mr. VonBoeckman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 38 years ago at twelve noon my wife, that's sitting beside me became Mrs. VonBoeckman, and we have had a pretty good 38 years, although she deserves a medal being married to me, and I just want everybody to know. we're going to have cake back in Zeke Giorgi's office. If you want to stop by and have a piece, you're welcome to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Happy anniversary and many, many more good years together. Senate Bill 952, please."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill...Senate Bill 952. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 952 increases from sixteen hundred and fifty dollars to eighteen hundred dollars the maximum award a student may get from the State Scholarship Commission for full-time enrollment and increases from eight hundred and twenty-five to nine hundred dollars the maximum award for part-time enrollment. This formula or these figures have the approval of the Board of Higher Education, the State Scholarship Commission, and the about 4 million dollars that it would cost is improve...is included in the Scholarship Commission Appropriation Bill, and I urge the



passage of Senate Bill 952."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in...in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 952 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'ayes', 5 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 956."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 956. A Bill for an Act to exempt from certain occupation and use tax transactions involving sale or transfer of certain tangible personal property to an interstate carrier for hire. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bullock: "~~Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of~~ the House. Senate Bill 956 is a Bill that takes into consideration recent court decisions, and the Bill came to the House last year and received unanimous approval. It exempts from those taxes of sale of personal property to interstate carriers for hire who take possession of properties in Illinois and transported out of Illinois and for use outside of Illinois. It deals with...dealt with the popularity issue. The Bill passed the Committee overwhelmingly 16-3, and it passed the Senate with a vote of 51-nothing, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "By granting this...I really have questions. By granting this exemption, how much does that cost Illinois?"

Bullock: "Oh, it's been estimated at something less than 300,000 dollars."

Greiman: "And well, why are we...why are we doing that? What's the purpose of us granting another exemption to out of state people?"

Bullock: "Well, it's really not out of state people. It



requires only the railroad industry, Representative Greiman. The exemption would apply to carriers whether they cooperate with interstate...interstate carriers and moving their property...purchased goods through Illinois."

Greiman: "I...I don't...I may be dense, but I don't really understand why we...why we are doing this...why we give any exemptions. We...we seem to be a Legislature that's really involved in granting exemptions to people who are ...we cry about taxpayers and we ask about taxpayers and we...I hear all about how we're bleeding them and then suddenly the railroads come in, and the out of state guys come, and...and everybody has an ax to grind, and the farm guy...farm machinery people...we didn't give them an exemption from sales tax, and there were people who really cared a lot about that on this floor. I'm not sure I know why we give these big shippers exemptions, and...and I just think on...we ought to draw the line and be caring about people who live in our state and...and not give out these exemptions quite so freely. I'm going to vote 'no' just because I don't understand the exemption still."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Durand, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I know it's...Short Debate, but I'd like to answer Representative Greiman, because I handled this Bill last year. To put everyone's fears to rest, Representative Greiman, basically what it does is, for example, in southern Illinois we have a...a company down there that manufactures the four by four railroad ties. Now when the railroad themselves pick up the ties in the State of Illinois, they'll take...say take them to Indiana, they pay Illinois tax, so what they do basically is buy the railroad ties in Indiana and bring them into Illinois, because there's no way that you can separate railroad ties for use on the transportation system."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman."

Mautino: "There are some incidents of the transaction in the



state. Now there are ways that we have to apportion within the state. For example, if part of a transaction's in Illinois and part of it's out of Illinois, we can apportion that. We can tax some part of it, and we have a system of requiring that. What you're saying is, a part of it's in Illinois...a part of it's in Indiana, but let's forgive the whole Illinois thing. I think we should develop either...devise a system or keep the system we have for allocating between the...the states."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 956 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman...the Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Just a point of information. I have an Amendment to this Bill on my desk. Can you inform me... have any Amendments been adopted in the House on the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bullock, your response is 'no'."

Bullock: "No Amendments have been adopted."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, the Sponsor said it would cost something like 300,000 dollars. I...my analysis is it'll be close to half a million dollars. Now this Bill is similar to Senate Bill 1705 which we passed in the last General Assembly. It...in fact, it was passed by both Houses and then it was vetoed by the Governor, and the prime objection to Senate Bill 1705, in part, was the...due to the fact that the Bill was vague in what type of interstate carriers would qualify for exemptions...planes, buses, trucks, trains, but Senate Bill 956 clearly limits the exemption of railroads only, and I think we'd better take a second look at this Bill."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to respond to



to Minority Leader's question. Representative Conti, it does reply only to the railroad and railroad ties. The figure that you have, 500,000 dollars, was given by the Economic and Fiscal Commission, and they had received it in prior years from the Railroad Association. ConRail, I think, was the one that provided them those figures. The figure that we've used is somewhere between three hundred and five hundred thousand dollars, and it applies only to railroad ties, and it deals with the transporting of those ties through the State of Illinois, and the Bill did come out of the Senate 51-0 and out of House Committee 16-3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Pierce, please."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I can see the question that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, has, and this kind of Bill should be questioned. But the reason why the Bill is all right in my opinion and why it passed the Revenue Committee so strongly was these ties are ordered by ConRail. They go all over from an Illinois manufacturer or Indiana manufacturer. ConRail, itself, doesn't know where the ties will be delivered and used. They're delivered around the country. It could be Vermont. It could be California. Until those ties are...are actually sent out, ConRail isn't sure where those ties will be used on its railroad system. Now, because of that, all the ties manufactured in Illinois have been subject to the sales tax. Indiana, on the other hand, where they have...where there's a competitive tie-producing fact..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. Timer's on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman from Skokie thinks this is a raid on the treasury, wait till he sees what ComEd's about to try to pull off."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is indeed a good Bill. What we would exempt under this is not something we ought to be taxing. This is not an exemption in the form of an incentive. This is simply the recognition that we should not be taxing these sales, because they are for out-of-state, and we're going to encourage more business rev...more business in the state and more revenue for the state by passing this Bill than if we continue to tax this thing. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? You...you're... it's still open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 ayes, 48 nays, 14 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 975."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 975. A Bill for an Act creating the Attorney General's Environmental Protection Trust Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 975 basically creates the Attorney General...Attorney General's Environmental Trust Fund. It would amend the Attorney General Act to allow the Attorney General to accept, receive, and administer grants, gifts, or loans. It might be avai...made available for purposes of environmental protection. This was amended to...in...in the Senate, but all such funds would be appropriated by the General Assembly. It passed the Senate with a big majority, and also came out of our Committee 11-nothing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise reluctant-



ly in opposition to this. I think that it sets up a very bad precedent of giving a Constitutional officer a trust fund. Now, I think the purpose is very laudable. I think that, as a supporter of environmental protection, I'm in favor of everything that this is intended to do, but I have a sincere problem with the concept of giving any Constitutional officer such a trust fund. I would respectfully suggest that there not be sufficient votes to pass this Bill...that we withhold those votes and ask the Sponsor to consider bringing this back to Second and amending the Bill to set up a Commission that would disperse and take care of this...this trust fund for the same purposes intended. What I'm saying is, the idea is good. It's just, I think, a very serious Constitutional problem giving to any Constitutional officer a trust fund, and, for that reason, I'm going to withhold my vote and vote 'present', and I would ask my colleagues to do likewise and hope that there will be an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff, to close."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and...and Ladies and Gentlemen. If...this...this the first I've ever had heard any indication from Representative Getty that he had a concern or...or wanted an Amendment. If he is willing to do so, I'd be happy to take it out of the record and try to work with him on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 990. Mr. McGrew."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 990. A Bill for an Act to amend the Section of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is basically a non-substantive change piece of legislation. It was introduced as a result of the Auditor General's report criticiz-



ing the the ambiguit...ambiguity in the present law concerning the Illinois State Scholarship Commission and the way they handle funds both coming in to them from the federal government as well as student loan repayment, and it simply suggests that we now...all the money that's left over at the end of the year shall go to the general fund instead of the...we have a duplicate mandate right now saying that it must go both to the Comptroller and to the general fund."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 990 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. ~~This Bill having received the Constitutional~~ Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 991."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 991. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, this amends the Student Loan Purchase Program. It expands the condition under which the Illinois Designated Account Purchase Program may purchase delinquent or defaulted loans from their lenders. It does add a couple of conditions that are currently not in the law. It says that, for example, the borrower's lender, in other words, if...if you have a small lending institution or a bank, for that matter, that is no longer in service or has declared bankruptcy, then the Illinois State Scholarship Commission could take over the loan themselves. That is a new inclusion in the law, and it would be only under those kinds of conditions where the...the lender has declared bankruptcy. Other than that, it's clean-up language, and I ask for its adoption."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 991 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 994. Mr. Daniels. Daniels."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 994. A Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. Daniels. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 994. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 994 amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act and provides penalties for failure of either spouse to pay child support payments as ordered by the court. In essence, what it does is it sets forth clearly the authority that the judge has in cases of failure to pay child support. The Bill has no opposition to my knowledge. It came out of Committee very favorably."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 994 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', 1 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1011. Mr. Richmond."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1011. A Bill for an Act in relation to horticultural and fruit marketing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."



Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1011 would amend the Apple and Peach Marketing Act by reducing the number of producers required to petition for a referendum on a marketing program. What it would...basically does is lower from 200 to 100 the number of petition signers requested in order to direct the Director of Agriculture to propose a marketing program for this particular portion of our agricultural community. This is at the request and with ...also supported by the Farm Bureau, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "It...I do have a question or two to ask the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Richmond, is this similar to some of the check-off Bills we've had in the past?"

Richmond: "Yes, it is. It's quite similar. This was the first one that...that was put on the...in the statutes, but it's never been useable because of the 200 requirement and that's more than...than there are fruitgrowers in the state."

Leinenweber: "Well, is the effect of the...of the...I guess it's a law and you're trying to make it easier for the check-off system to operate. Is that what you're trying to do?"

Richmond: "Yes. Make it...make it workable."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate...'"

Leinenweber: "Well, I was going to comment that this law, I guess, isn't a...I don't think, a particularly good law, any better than the check-off proposals that we considered previously. It's an attempt by sort of a private group to force all farmers, I think within a particular occupation and area, under a check...or a compulsory check-off



system, which the...the goals might be good and laudatory, but I wonder whether or not we should give private individuals the power to compel everybody similarly situated to come under such a program."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1011 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. 'Aye'. Cullerton, vote me 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 13 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1025."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1025. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to counties in the Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Senate Bill 1025 actually has nothing to do with the drinking age or liquor. For those of you using the Digest, Amendment #1 strikes everything after the enacting clause. Rather, this Bill would simply allow counties, by referendum, to issue bonds to renovate a county courthouse. The present statute allows counties by referendum to issue bonds to build a new courthouse. However, there is no provision in the existing law for counties to issue bonds for major renovations. Since many old courthouses, including...including many old county jails, need major remodeling, I believe this change in the law is appropriate. This Bill passed the Senate 58-nothing. It passed Counties and Townships 13-nothing, and I know of no opposition. I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1025 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, as I read this Bill, it appears that this is a power to raise



taxes without a referendum. I think we should look at this one pretty closely."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig. Hannig, please. Please...you're on."

Hannig: "This Bill provides that by a front door referendum this can be done, but there is a front door referendum provision in order to raise this tax."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'ayes', 11 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1049. Mr. Walsh."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1049. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Housing Act...Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1049 amends the Housing Authorities Act and would permit county housing authorities to operate housing referral services for the poor. It defines poor and is introduced at the recommendation of the DuPage County Board. I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Only a question if I'd have leave. I...I'm interested...what is the definition of poor? I've always wondered what the definition of poor is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Walsh."

Matijevich: "Oh, Elmer Conti said, 'Look at me.'"

Walsh: "I can think of an example, SBI. The definition though is the same definition as used in the Circuit Breaker, and the definition in the Amendment refers to that definition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1049



pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', 2 'nos', 2...3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1085. Mr. White. Take it out of the record. Mr. White, take the Bill out of the record. 1089. Jake Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1089. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1089 changes the provision relating to the indemnity fund, which we established, I think, in the last Session, I believe. It provides that owners of property containing four units or less to be indemnified by any loss resulting from the issuance of a tax deed to the purchaser if, in the opinion of the court, the tax deed...the owner is equitably entitled to just compensation. It increases the fee that a delinquent tax sale purchaser must pay to the County Treasurer from three dollars to ten dollars for each piece of property purchased, and that money, of course, goes into the indemnity fund. I would ask for your favorable vote. I believe this passed from the Senate 54-4. Representative Farley is the House Cosponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in...in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1089 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. 'Aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'ayes', 1 'nay', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1107."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1107. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Water Well and Pump Installation Contrac-



tor's Licensing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Donovan: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1107 amends the Water Well and Pump Installation Contractor's Licensing Act. The Bill will exempt persons, a firm, or a corporation engaged in installation of driven point wells from being licensed. It also reduces the age from 21 to 18 and adds a requirement that the individual take an examination for the license, and if it expires within and is allowed to elapse within three years, that they be required to take another examination...pass another examination...examination. This Bill was introduced or asked to be introduced by the Department of Public Health, and it has their backing and is to help administrate the Act of the Water Well Licensing Act. I ask for your support for Senate Bill 1107."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1107 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'ayes', 13 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1110."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1110. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Currie: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1110 clarifies the Public Aid Code so that payments made by the Department of Public Aid to dependent children living in foster homes will be reimbursed by the federal government. I ask your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1110 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1128. Mrs. Macdonald."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1128. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1128 amends the Section on vehicle codes regarding commuter vans. The reason for the Bill, of course, is to pool car riders to and from their businesses to save on fuel. The Bill defines a commuter van as a motor vehicle which is designed for transportation of twelve to sixteen passengers, who in the transportation is incidental to any other purposes that the driver is not engaged in the transportation of passengers as a business. It is probably owned or leased for the purpose by a company or an employee or an organization operated for a not for profit reason, and it is used for the purpose, of course, of employing the employees to the company as an effort of public transportation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1128 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1134. Mr. Pierce."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1134. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



Senate Bill 1134 was requested by the Illinois Association of Sanitary Districts and is supported as well by the EPA. It authorizes sanitary districts and local government units throughout the state to inspect industrial treatment of industrial concerns that are hooked up to the sanitary system to make sure that their pretreatment in is...is in accordance with the standards of the Federal Clean Water Act of 1977, Section 307. I understand the Metropolitan Sanitary District presently has this authority and many, many downstate districts do it, but they would like the statutory authority to make sure they can comply with Section 307 of the Federal Clean Water Act by monitoring the pretreatment of industry...industries that are tied up to their sanitary systems to make sure that PCB's and other type of chemicals are not being discharged into the waterways. The Bill passed the Senate unanimously without a dissenting vote, and I urge the adoption of Senate Bill 1134."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1134 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', 3 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privileges."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise because of action taken in this House on yesterday afternoon... late part of the evening and, in my anger, I filed a motion to take all of those Bills off of the Consent Calendar and put them onto the regular Calendar. But, since I had a chance overnight to think about my action, and I'm not



the type of person that just wants to be an obstructionist, although I do not like what happened yesterday. I want leave of the...this House to have those Bills placed back on the regular...on day Calendar on the Consent Calendar. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I idolize a...a great man in my lifetime...a great politician. It was Congressman Bill Dawson. He was a man back in the early part of my life who did what he had to do in order to get his House in order. When the Republican Party did not do the things that they should have done, he went over to the Democratic Party. He became a great leader. I don't have any intentions of doing anything as drastic as that today, but I'm not above doing that, because the way black people have been treated in this state by some of my friends on my side of the aisle, I'm very disappointed. But, Congressman Dawson said to me years ago...he said, 'Jim, don't get mad. Get smart.' That I have intended to do, and I will try to remain cool and calm under these extreme pressures that I've been under in the past few days. Because we are not. The bright people in the State of Illinois is not, and you here in this General Assembly, who have been here for any length of time, knows that we are not getting our fair share. Governor Thompson is not doing the right thing in terms of black employment in this state, nor do he intend to do anything. Members in this House are not doing anything in terms of trying to help better this nation that we live in, and I hear you every morning say the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. You don't mean it. You don't mean protection for all, because if you did, you would act responsibly and do the things that you should do in this House...Speaker and Members, I ask for leave to place those Bills that I have taken... filed a motion to take from the Calendar on the Consent Calendar and placed back onto the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws his objection to



the Bills that were on the Consent Calendar. He asked leave to put those Bills back on the Consent Calendar in the same manner as they were. The Gentleman asked leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted. On page 4 appears Senate Bill 1137."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1137. A Bill for an Act to exempt the proceeds from certain mandatory service charges from taxation under state and local occupation and use tax Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Just so the Membership is aware of the fact that we will have to now print a supplemental Calendar with the Consent Bills. There was a question whether we can go to Consent Bills now, but we can't. Just get a Supplemental Calendar out, okay? The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1137 amends the sales tax to reverse a rule of the Department of Revenue which provides that the tax must be collected on a service or a gratuity charge if the charge is mandatory, as in the...is the case with most banquets and other large groups. The point is this gratuity is given to the employee and what is being charged on it is not the sales tax on the food but on the service. Now, we have double taxation on that, because the employee must pay income tax on that money, so what we're doing here is simply reversing the rule that has been used in charging sales tax on the gratuity charge. I would ask your favorable support on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "You're right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...I find myself today, I guess, as the guardian of the State Treasury...A unique role for me, certainly. But, everybody has got some little injustice in a tax system. It's hell to pay taxes. It's



a pain in the butt to pay taxes. I don't like to pay taxes either, and they're all unfair. They're all levied on us, and we don't like them, and everybody...constituent of mine writes me and says this tax is no good, make a little exemption here, that tax is no good, make a little exemption. So, what we do is we pass little exemptions. We had one before as I've spoken. A little exemption for the little old railroads. Now, we got one where we have to divide up and man...and...and...and have where there's a service charge put on, which is really just the cost of how they do it. It just...they just add the cost into the...that service charge is really part of the cost is what it is, and that's why the sales tax is chargeable on it. So, the...but it's just a little exemption, and they're all just little exemptions, and the one we had a few weeks ago about out-of-state stuff...that was a little exemption. They're all little exemptions, but this one is not a good exemption. We ought to not allow this to go through. We ought to stand fast for the taxpayers of Illinois for whom I hear so much bleeding. Well, I'm bleeding today for those taxpayers, and I think we ought to give them a break, and we ought to not give exemptions...special exemptions, and I ask that we vote down this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to close."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is as I said it was. We are righting what I consider a wrong here in double taxation. The gratuity charge goes to the employee. The employee pays their income tax on that income. Now, the sales tax should only be charged on the food and not on the service. I would ask a favorable Roll."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1137 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The



Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes', 28 'nos', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1142."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1142. A Bill for an Act to add Sections and to repeal Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1142 is a clean-up Bill that makes technical Amendments to the Guardianship Bill we passed last year. What it does...it's a result of work between the Chicago Bar Association, Judge 'Waller Dahl' of the Probate Court in Cook County, Chicago Council of Lawyers, the Illinois Association of Retarded Citizens, and the Development and Disabilities Law Project. I know of no opposition to the Bill. The Senate Sponsors are Senator Daley and Senator Schaefer, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1142 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1167."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1167. A Bill for an Act to amend the Blood Labeling Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Donovan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1167 amends the Blood Labeling Act and strictly prohibits the nonreplacement fees that has been used in this state for some time. It is comparable to House Bill 1908 that I handled. A nonreplacement fee means a fee charged a recipient who fails to replace in time the



blood used and is required to pay a fee on a voluntary donated blood. We believe this is wrong, and this is the reason for the Bill. Standing in support of the Bill is the American Red Cross, the Americ...the Illinois State Medical Society, the state AFL-CIO. I believe the time has arrived that we pass a Bill of this kind, and I ask your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any debate? Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1167 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Dawson. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', 3 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. "Senate Bill 1204."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1204. A Bill for an Act to permit the Governor to freeze prices during disaster. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1204 adds Section 8A to the Emergency Service and Disaster Operation Act. This permits the Governor to freeze prices and services in the event of a disaster or emergency. I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1204 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr....thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I haven't had a chance to look over this Bill, but it seems to be an extraordinary power that we would give to the Chief Executive of this state to freeze pri...freeze prices no matter at what time, and I don't know who defines the disaster in the Bill, but to have the Governor freeze prices would be a disaster by itself. And, I don't



know how many of you want to give the present incumbent the power to freeze prices, but it would also mean the power to freeze wages, and that will take away a lot of union power, also. And, I think the Bill has some really catastrophic possibilities, and I think it really doesn't deserve our support."

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

Vitek: "In answer to Mr. Totten, the Governor has this power now under Chapter 127, Section 1108. He has the power, but it gives him only thirty days. Now, in Chicago we had a disaster area, and as you all did...suffer downstate. This extends it beyond the thirty days and gives the Governor to recall that on his discretion...limited it before. He was only given thirty days. Now...when it's ...emergency ~~or~~ it's power that he has it gives him power at his own distinction to call off the emergency, and I'd ask for a favorable report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 40 'no' ...'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Vitek, has asked a poll of the absentees. After we get 107 you can get a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you change me from 'present' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Taylor as 'aye'. Mr. Bullock. Wait, let's get the Roll Call first. Are you ready, Jack? Kindly record Mr. Taylor as 'aye', Mr. Bullock as 'aye', Mr. Leverenz as 'aye', Mr. Brummer as 'aye'. Yes, Sir. Wait a minute. Wait a minute...one second. Mrs. Alexander as 'aye', Mr. Pouncey as 'aye', Mr. Patrick as 'aye'. Did you get Leverenz and Brummer? Mr. Katz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Katz: "No, I was just going to explain my vote on..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's too late. Oh, Mr. McMaster"



wants to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Oh. From 'aye' to 'no'. No, Ropp. You don't want to do that, Ropp. Kindly record Mr. Farley as 'aye'. What? Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Would you change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Ropp from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Bowman as 'aye'. Mr. Margalus. Mr. Margalus, please. Margalus. Oh, Matula. I thought...Mr. Matula as 'aye'. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, if it reaches 89 I'd like to verify it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Jones as 'aye'. On this question there are 90 'ayes' and 41 'nos', and Mr. Simms wants a verification. And Mr. Leon wants to be verified. Kindly record him as verified. Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to change my 'aye' vote to a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Neff from 'aye' to 'no'.

That's 89...Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Change my 'aye' vote to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terrible mistake. Change it from 'aye' to 'no'. Oh, I'm sorry. We still have 89 according to Jack. It's coming down very shortly. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Please change my 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not recognized for that. No. Kindly change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Preston, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Preston: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Preston as 'aye'. Kind... the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. What's our count now? Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Walsh as 'no'. What's our count, Jack? The Gentleman has 89 'ayes' and 45 'nos'. Do you persist in the verification, Sir? Mr. Simms wants a verification. The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Would the Membership kindly be in their own chairs? Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I looked at the language, and I looked at the Section in the first paragraph. It looks like this is a very slight modification of the Governor's present power. I think an 'aye' vote will not do anything that probably the Governor cannot do today, so I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman, Mr. Schneider, votes 'aye'. Mr. Van Duyne. Change Mr. Van Duyne from 'no' to 'aye'. Wait a minute. Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. Mr. Harris as 'aye'. Mr. Mugalian as 'aye'. Mrs. Willer as 'aye'. One moment, please. Mrs. Catania as 'no'. Mr. McBroom as 'aye'. Mr. Waddell as 'no'. Mr. Johnson as 'no'. Mr. Jones as 'no'."

Jones: "Aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Aye? No? Mrs. Oblinger as 'no'. It'll take a while for the Clerk to get the new scorecard. Would Mr. Jaffe come up to the Speaker's rostrum? Mr. Jaffe. Want to take a new Roll Call? We're doing so well on this one, Harry, I hate to do it to you. Oh, he's getting a little bit grayer. Mr. Simms, do you still... Mrs. Hoxsey."



Hoxsey: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Hoxsey as 'aye'. Did you get that, Jack? Hoxsey as 'aye'. Thank you. I don't know yet. What's our count? Now we have 92 'ayes', 49 'nos', and you still persist, Sir? Oh, okay. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Keane as 'aye'. Jim Keane."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Garmisa. Gettyl. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa. Garmisa, please."

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to be verified on the Calendar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asked leave to be verified. Yes, you may. You're verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoxsey. Huskey. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijeovich. Matula."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Jaffe as 'aye'. He's right here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. E. G. Steele. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyn. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the affirmative vote? Mr. Simms."



Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. E. M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "E. M. Barnes. Gene Barnes. Mr. Barnes on the floor?"

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Simms: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Where's he at? Mr. Bianco. There he is.

He's back there. He's back there in a corner, Mr. Simms.

Mr. Bianco, he doesn't believe me."

Simms: "Okay. I...no, I believe you, Tad."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Fine. There he is."

Simms: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Boucek?"

Simms: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek. Polish phrase. Boucek."

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek. Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli. Representative Capparelli.

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded? How's the

Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan in the chamber? The Gentle-

man in the chamber? Mr. Hanahan? Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Huskey? Mr. Huskey on the floor? He's

on his way to Hawaii? No. How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Huskey. Remove him off the Roll Call."

Simms: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi requests leave to be verified."

Simms: "Anything for our distinguished Assistant Minority Leader. Representative Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Margalus. He was just there. Mr. Margalus. There he is. In the back of the chamber. Mr. Neff, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to switch my vote back to 'aye' from 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Neff as 'aye'."

Simms: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back there."

Simms: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Danny O'Brien. He's in his chair."

Simms: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Piel. I think he peeled off."

Simms: "Yeah, I think so, too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's...Mr. Piel in the chamber? Mr. Piel. He's presently indisposed I've been told. How's the Gentleman been recorded? Mr. Piel."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Schlickman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schlickman."

Simms: "He's not...I don't see him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schlickman. Well, there's so many people standing over there. Would you kindly step aside? Oh, Mr. Walsh. You want to change your vote? Mr. Schlickman on the floor? Kindly remove Mr. Schlickman."

Simms: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pechous. Robert Pechous from Cicero, County of Cook. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How's



the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Steele."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which one?"

Simms: "E. G."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative E. G. Steele. Mr. Steele
in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stuffle. Representative Larry Stuffle.
How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terzich. Representative Terzich in the
chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jesse White in the chamber?
Mr. White. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Laurino in the chamber. Laurino.
How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Emil Jones. How's the
Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."



Simms: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Greiman. Mr. Greiman on the floor? Take Mr. Greiman off the record. Put Mr. Terzich on the record. Put Laurino on the record. You're back on the record, Bob. Put Mr. Jones on the record. Emil Jones. Put Mr. John Dunn back on the record."

Simms: "We...we never took him off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh. Put Mr. Pechous back on the record."

Simms: "That's all we have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Was Mr. Domico taken off the record? Oh. Would you put Mr. Beatty back on?"

Simms: "We never took him off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh. Where's Capparelli? Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, last night when we were trying to get Members on a Bill that I was trying to get discharged; the House...the Speaker was..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me... Mr. Beatty wants to be recorded as 'aye'. All right. Record Mr. Beatty as 'aye'. Put Mr. Greiman back on. Put Mr. Capparelli back on. McAuliffe is 'aye'. Mr. Mahar is 'aye'. Mr. Sandquist is 'aye'. Oh, yeah. What...Have you got Mr. McAuliffe as 'aye', Mr. Clerk? All right. And Sandquist as 'aye'? And Mahar as 'aye'. Kindly record Mrs. Currie as 'aye'. That's 91 'ayes'. How many 'nos'? Forty-eight 'nos'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Vitek, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vitek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This was my first Bill, and I thank those that come over and switched with me. I won't forget you, and I won't forget those that voted 'aye' and then switched to 'no', but I don't carry any hard feelings, if they expressed their expression, and that's the way I feel. And, I thank each and every one of you for your vote."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Just don't take any nitro... anymore of those nitrogen glycerin tablets, will you? Just stay well. Senate Bill 1212."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1212. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1212 amends the Capital Development Board Section on cargo handling facilities for the regional port districts in the state. It permits the Capital Development Board to make grants for such purposes and deletes specific language regarding repayments of loans. In other states throughout the United States such as Wisconsin and Indiana, they have made outright grants between 28 and 24 million dollars for their port district."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1212 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. No. Yes, it is. No, it's on. Yeah. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Schraeder. Mr. Schraeder, please."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, is this...that the Sponsor...would like to ask him a question. Is this the Bill that was supposed to have an Amendment on it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson."

Schraeder: "To make it a..."

Dawson: "No, this Bill is not supposed to have any Amendment, I hope."

Schraeder: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'ayes', 7 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1219."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1219. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill...or Senate Bill 1219 is a Bill that came through the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission and was worked out by a Committee of the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the trucking industry, and, also, with the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, I...this makes some small changes in the present law... Amendments to the present law. For example, it redefines what a lease is. It clarifies the public meeting notices that they need only appear in state newspapers. This has given the Commerce Commission a lot of problems of finding local weekly newspapers to put these in, so they will only have to put them in what we call the state newspapers. It clarifies a bill of lading that must be carried by common carriers. It redefines contract carrying. It makes other...some tall...small technical changes which the Commerce Commission is very agreeable on as well as the truckers and the teamster union, and I would appreciate a favorable vote and would be glad to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1219 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'ayes'...6 'ayes', 2 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1237. Mr. Katz. Out of the record. 1241. Mr. Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1241. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1241 excludes from the state privilege tax on foreign and alien insurance companies any premium for deferred compensation plans for state and local government or school district employees. The tax is imposed at the rate of 2 percent of net taxable premium income. The tax is now imposed only on foreign and alien companies...insurance companies that commercially are domiciled in another state or in a foreign company. Any amounts paid by the state to companies under this Act as premiums for the deferred compensation program for state employees would not be taxable in Illinois. The same would be true and is true of any other insurance program involved in the deferred compensation program for public employees. I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill. There has been no opposition to this legislation: ~~It passed out of Insurance Committee by a~~ 13-nothing vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1241 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Yeah, Mr. Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What?"

Greiman: "Is this...are we continuing this afternoon our exemption of people who live outside the state from Illinois taxes? Is that what this does?"

Marovitz: "No, that's not what this does. These people live in the state."

Greiman: "Well, why are we exempting the...the tax...it's the insurance company gets exemption in this case, right?"

Marovitz: "Well, the insurance company pays and charges back to the employee at 2 per...at a rate of 2 percent."

Greiman: "You mean there's a tax on our premiums that we pay?"

Marovitz: "No, there's a tax on nonresident insurance company



employees who are involved in a deferred compensation plan with nonresident insurance companies."

Greiman: "I see. So, today...okay, let me just want to kind of summarize. We had a Bill that...that exempted railroads. We had a Bill that exempted private fancy clubs...country clubs, and we now we got a Bill for foreign insurance companies. I just want to make sure we get them...everybody. I don't want anybody not to be exempted today."

Marovitz: "We don't discriminate in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I stand corrected. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 'ayes', 18 'nos', 31 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Request a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, my light is on 'present'. I wanted to be recorded as 'aye', and I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, you can be recorded as 'aye', but I think it's untimely to explain your vote. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Slape as 'aye'. Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Likewise, Mr. Speaker. 'Aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Mr. Henry as 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, will you change my vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Mr. Boucek from 'no' to 'aye'. I'm sorry. From 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Please record me as voting 'present', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Kempiners as 'present'. Mrs. Pullen."



Pullen: "Please change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'aye'. Mrs.

Pullen. Miss Pullen. Take it easy. Take it easy. Sam Wolf as 'aye'. Carol Braun. Kindly record the Lady as 'aye'. Mrs. Alexander as 'aye'. Mrs. Dyer as 'aye'. Mr. Simms as 'no'. Mrs. Jane Barnes as 'aye'. Klosak as 'aye'. Let's have a new Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1241 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Record me as 'no', please. Have all voted who wish? No, I want to be...no. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones, to explain his vote. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We passed out two similar Bills dealing with this same subject matter. This Bill was heard in the Insurance Committee, and what the State of Illinois does as a retaliatory tax is they charge a 2 percent premium on...on those particular policies. This is a very good Bill, because this cost is passed on to the consumers, and it will be a savings. We voted out Representative Deuster's Bill the same as Representative Schuneman's Bill dealing with the same subject matter with an overwhelming vote, and I...I solicit some more 'aye' votes on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 28 'nos', 25 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1259."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1259. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unclaimed Disposition of Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1259 amends the Unclaimed Disposition of Property Act making information required in the abandoned



property report to be substituted to the discretion of the Director of the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions. This Bill is an answer to an embezzlement that occurred in the amount of 1.5 million dollars. This Bill is supported by the Department of Financial Institutions, and I know of no opposition to the Bill. I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, on a question."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I...I don't know if I'm in opposition. I just would like to inquire of the Gentleman and ask a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Jaffe: "Well, what is the procedure now with unclaimed property? I don't know...you know."

Daniels: "This does not affect the procedure at all. What this does is...is affect the reports that are issued. The current procedure on the reports has that the Director will give the name, address, and all holders of over 25 dollars or life insurance policies, the nature, the identifying number, and the date that the property became payable or demandable or returnable, and those lists... from that list they had the embezzlement that occurred in the amount of 1.5 million dollars."

Jaffe: "Well, now I...well, that...that answer doesn't really satisfy me."

Daniels: "Well, your question..."

Jaffe: "I...I think that...well...well let me...let me just say to you, I think what you're doing is you're saying that at the present time he must, you know, make disclosure and now it's going to be at his discretion. Is that...is that what you're really saying?"

Daniels: "Only as to what's contained in the list, and the reason..."

Jaffe: "What list are we talking about?"



Daniels: "The one I just mentioned to you."

Jaffe: "Well, wh...what list is that?"

Daniels: "List of abandoned property."

Jaffe: "Well, why...why should he not be required to make that...that public? I don't know why it should be at his discretion. I...you haven't explained that to me. I don't know if I'm against this, Lee. I just would like an explanation. I don't think you're giving it to me."

Daniels: "Right. Okay. This, as I stated, was the response to the embezzlement by one of the investigators of the Department of Financial Institutions. What is required now under current law is that a list must be given, the report filed listing all the un...all the abandoned property. That..."

Jaffe: "And, who...who does that list... who is that list given to?"

Daniels: "The list is available to the public."

Jaffe: "Okay, if that is it's available to the public, you know, and...and you're saying that that should not be available to the public now, except at the discretion of the Director, I don't know how that hooks up..."

Daniels: "Okay. The people..."

Jaffe: "...with an investigator..."

Daniels: "All right."

Jaffe: "...in the...in the Department of Financial Institutions. You know, who would have that information anyway, so I think you're talking apples and oranges here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Dan...Mr. Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "No, I...I'm...he's...he's got some questions here that I'm trying to answer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, did he answer your question yet, Aaron?"

Daniels: "No, we're trying...we're in the middle of it right now."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly...kindly respond to the Gentleman's inquiries, please."

Daniels: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe."

Daniels: "Every person holding funds or other property, presumed abandoned under this Act, shall report to the Director with respect to the property. The report shall be verified, and the Director may require information in that report. The current law says that he shall require information set forth in the report. All we're doing is saying that it's his discretion. He may require that."

Jaffe: "In other words what you're saying is that you're giving the...the Director more power than what he has at the present time. Now he...he shall, but we're saying now the Department...the Director of the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions may. That's really what the..."

Daniels: "Still...that's correct, but he still has to issue the report. The question is what the report has in it."

Jaffe: "And that's left to his discretion, so...so really what we're doing is we're closing up public disclosure."

Daniels: "No, because they are still...well, I guess if you want to take to that extent, you could say, 'yes'."

Jaffe: "Yeah, well..."

Daniels: "However, the report..."

Jaffe: "...I...I...I think that, you know, I don't really have any great feelings about this Bill, but I think that anything that...that takes away public disclosure I would just have to oppose on...on that basis, and..."

Daniels: "Well, let me...let me explain to you what you're suggesting. You're suggesting that we leave it the same way it's...it is right now. The report still has to be issued. We're not changing that at all. All this..."

Jaffe: "Then who is it issued then, if it's not issued to the public? I...I think that we're not..."



Daniels: "The report is issued to the public, Representative. You're not listening."

Jaffe: "But you say that it...it may be issued."

Daniels: "No, no. The report is not changing. It's what's in the report."

Jaffe: "Well, what good is the report if they don't have the...the...?"

Daniels: "Representative Getty put on an Amendment that said the information shall be obtained in one or more reports as required by the director. The information is verified, but it's the contents of the report that we're changing, and we're not disclosing all of the contents because of the embezzlement problem. Now the Bill has been reviewed by the Department of Financial Institutions by staffs on both sides, by your side of the aisle, our side of the aisle, and this Gentleman right in front of you explaining it to you most emphatically of why you should support the Bill. I'm sure when he's done you'll support it. I move for a favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1259 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 142 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Jack, you want to make your announcement?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 1265. Mr. VonBoeckman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1265. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Braun, your speak light is on. Mrs. Braun. Carol. Okay. Okay. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, Senate Bill 1265 is a product of the Motor Vehicles Law Commission and agreed by the Illinois State Police, the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association, the Associated Dental Contractors, Illinois Trucking Association, Midwest Truckers Association, and the Secretary of State all support this Bill. What this Bill would really do is increase monies in the road fund. It passed the Senate 40-nothing and in the House Committee 11-nothing. I ask your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff."

Balanoff: "May I ask a question?"

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

Balanoff: "Mr. VonBoeckman, does this permit certain trucks to be overweight?"

VonBoeckman: "Yeah...yes. It does it now, and on the permit Section. It...it is allowed now under the permit Section, but you have to apply for a permit."

Balanoff: "And does this Bill also reduce the fine on overweight trucks?"

VonBoeckman: "Yes, it does. That's for the ones that don't get the permit. I mean, this is the one that gets the permits, because what happens...an individual can load his truck and go to a scale, and if he stopped before he gets to that scale, he then...I mean, he's subject to a high fine, and this is the reason why we lowered that fine. However, we did not change the fine schedule for those who do not get permits."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you completed, Mrs. Balanoff. All right. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1265 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would solicit more green votes,



and I would try to go back through this just a little bit for clarification in that it would increase penalties for overlength trucks, overwidth, and overheight trucks. We had a number of proposals in Committee to do that. This is the one that was the best. This authorizes, also, the issuance of permits by telephone, which is more advantageous to the Department and to the truckers and better control. It substantially increases the fees for the permits. This is the Bill that brings a great deal of money to the road fund that we need. It increases the fees for engineering inspection and for field inspections. It increases the fees for the state police escorts substantially, so that we are now getting the money that we expend to provide that service. It allows for the Department to establish credit accounts, and we can ease collection efforts. I appreciate your green votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a hundred and...100 'ayes', 39 'nos', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1284."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1284. A Bill for an Act in relation to interest rate ceilings. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House. This is one of a series of Bills which amends the allowable interest rate that revenue bonds can be issued by various units of...of government. This specifically authorizes county, township, or hospital districts to issue revenue bonds at a rate not to exceed 9% interest. The current maximum rate allowable is 7%. The public hospitals are finding that they cannot sell the revenue bonds at that rate, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is,



'Shall Senate Bill 1284 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1334.
Mr. Kulas."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1334. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1334 amends the Code of Criminal Procedure to provide that any person appearing before a grand jury may have his attorney present during the grand jury proceedings. This Bill would allow any witness before a grand jury to be accompanied by counsel regardless of whether or not the witness has been charged or whether or not the state is seeking a Bill of indictment against the witness. This is a peoples' Bill, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1334 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'ayes', 3 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1336."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1336. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Cigarette Tax Act and the Cigarette Use Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1336 is a Bill which would increase the penalty for divulging confidential information relative to the Cigarette



Tax and Use Tax from a class B to a class A misdemeanor. This is a confidential source. It can be disclosed only with proper judicial order. This has been recommended by the Auditor General, and I would solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opposition? The question is...what happened with the machine? Let's go. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1336 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 1 'nay', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. There has been a number of inquiries in to the Chair as far as what's the schedule for the day. As you probably now realize, we will not have a lunch break. Hopefully...hope you'll work right through and get through hopefully around 7 or 8 o'clock. Is there a party tonight? Maybe 6:30. What's the point of order? Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 1 of Supplemental Calendar #1. Senate Bill 72. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 156. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating Judicial Advisory Councils."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Jack. I believe you read Senate Bill 72. It's 82. Did you read Senate Bill 82?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 82."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Oh. Senate Bill 82. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 156. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections to amend an Act creating the Judicial Advisory Council. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 417. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 419. A Bill for



an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 693. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Bond County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill...page 2 of Supplemental Calendar #1...Senate Bill 700. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Transportation to release the state's interest in part of abandoned highway in Bond County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 710. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Vermilion County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 711. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 712. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 713. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 716. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Bureau County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 723. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Morgan County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 755. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of the Department of Administrative Services to grant an easement to the City of Geneva. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 795. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 797. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in DeWitt County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 862. A Bill for an Act to repeal and re-enact the Illinois Industrial Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1113. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to investigation and prevention of fires. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1182. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1190. A Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners,



for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kempiners: "A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point, Sir."

Kempiners: "If...if I have a Bill that is on today's Consent Calendar that I would possibly like to hold for one day, would it remain on the Consent Calendar, or would it have to go to Short Debate?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We can take one out."

Kempiners: "You can take it out?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Clerk we can."

Kempiners: "And...and put it back on the Consent Calendar, Second...Third Reading, Second Day tomorrow?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Kempiners: "Okay, I would request that you hold Senate Bill 82 for one day on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine, that's your Bill. Remove 82 from the Consent Calendar list, Jack, at the request of the Sponsor, and I'll put it back for tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 82 is removed from Consent Calendar for this day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This day. The question is, 'Shall the Bills that have been read by the Clerk pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'ayes', 1 'nay', 24 recorded as 'present'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, page 1 of the Supplemental Calendar #1. Senate Bill 442. A Bill for an Act making technical corrections in the law relating to municipal and county service occupation taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 518. A Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Drug Abuse Act. Second



Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 536. A Bill for an Act to amend the Local Library Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Senate Bill 708. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 847. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1041. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1342. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Priority of Call... which day...appears Senate Bill 971. Mr. Taylor, in the chamber? Third Readings. 971. Mr. Taylor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 9..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're on the Priority of Call, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 971... A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr...take the Bill out of the record temporarily. Senate Bill 1040."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1040. A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1040 amends the Minimum...Minimum Wage Law. It changes the dollar fifty minimum hourly wage for learners to 70% of the standard minimum wage. At the present time, it would raise the current minimum wage to a dollar sixty-one cents compared to the dollar fifty cents. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill...Senate Bill 1040 probably ought to be called the Teen-age Unemployment Act of 1979, because that's exactly what it's going to do."



There was a provision put in the Bill. Probably there shouldn't be any minimum wage at all for learners or for young people, because they're the type of people that need jobs to make enough money so they can continue schooling, so they can do a lot of other things, but unfortunately they don't possess the skills. They don't have the background in order to qualify for top paying jobs, so a lot of people would have work for these young people and these people who are trying to learn skills if economically they could work them into their program. But, if we're going to continue to raise this, and what we're doing here is taking a flat rate, which was a dollar and a half, and we're tying it to the minimum wage which is going up and up and up, and so the wages for these learners are going to go up and up and up, and the ability of these people to get jobs is going to go down, down, down. Now in some areas of this state, and I've heard Members of this House get up and tell the awesome level of unemployment of young people in their districts. But, if you want to add to that, if you want to double it, if you want to keep increasing that, then vote for this Bill. If you have any sense at all, though, and if you have any compassion for the young..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

Leinenweber: "...you'll vote a resounding 'no' on Senate Bill 1040."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson, why are you seeking recognition?"

Dawson: "This...this piece of legislation only applies to people over 18 years of age. It does not apply to students. It does not apply to anybody underneath the age of 18."

Leinenweber: "I wasn't aware that I asked a question, but I am...I'm aware of students that over 18 years of age, and I think if you'll check in many of the areas, you'll find



the unemployment level of those over 18 and say under 21 or under 25 or even over that age..."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in opposition, as Representative Leinenweber has, to the passage of Senate Bill 1040. There are many reasons why I oppose this Bill. For one thing, legislation has passed the Illinois House. It's now in the Illinois Senate, which would increase the minimum wage in the State of Illinois to conform with the federal standards. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are now at a time in our country when the Democratic administration in Washington, D. C. is taking this country into a recession and possibly a depression. Now, if you want to throw people out of jobs, throw people out of marginal jobs. This is the type of legislation to support, but if you believe in the free enterprise system, if you believe in the economy of the State of Illinois, and to bring in new jobs, and to keep the people that are working on the payrolls of the State of Illinois, you will vote against this oppressive legislation. This is inflationary. This is legislation that is going to throw marginal people out of their employment and place many, many people on the unemployment rolls of the state, and for these reasons I vote 'no' on this legislation, and I would urge any conscientious Member of the Legislature to search his conscience or her conscience and vote against this type of legislation which will only serve to destroy what we have in the State of Illinois, and that's trying to keep business and industry here and people that are marginal employees in positions of...the...of work product in the free enterprise system..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook..."

Simms: "...and for this reason I would urge a 'no' vote."

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



Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. I think anybody who hears the opponents of the Bill really has to laugh. We're talking about 11 cents an hour, and, you know, that comes down to four dollars and forty cents, you know, for...for an entire week. We're talking about a wage of \$64 total. About \$65 a week. I would like to know who could possibly live on \$65 a week? Even if you're a learner or not a learner...if you're 18 years or older in this society. I mean, my God, what are we talking about? We're talking about 11 cents an hour. We're talking about a weekly wage of...of under \$65 a week. I think anybody who gets up and talks against a Bill like that ought to be ashamed of himself..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shame!"

Jaffe: "...and I vote...I would vote...vote 'yes' on this particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "~~Shame~~ Eleven cents now, is that what it was? Eleven cents. That's not even one's what then? The Gentleman...the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yeah, to reduce that figure a little further, I think we're talking about two dollars and fifty cents an hour, and over a 40-week period...40-hour week, it's something like 65. It's slightly less than we, in the Legislature, make. But, further than that, these are people who are trying to learn new skills to keep themselves off the unemployment market. They are usually very, very low income people, and it's such a minimal amount to argue about. It just seems like a farce. It's just... I'm...I can't imagine us arguing about 11 cents an hour."

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

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

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



Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As we have said before, it's 11 cent an hour raise, and I think it's a great honor that we have our great Representative, Representative Hanahan, here to give us a little support on this, and I'd like to ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1040 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're talking about people who can't afford a lobbyist, and we're talking about people that do not have the ability to send, at high prices, lawyers to Springfield to ask the Legislature to support their needed increase in a wage level. We're talking about people at the bottom of the economic scale...the bottom of the ladder. The reason why the Bill originally, in 1971, included that provision of \$1.50 an hour per learners was because at that time we thought it was adequate, and we amended it one time since then. But, because of the constant inflation that was created through the Nixon and Ford economy that we're just now feeling the impact of, I could just suggest that today's market, that it would be exploitation to pay less than a meager 70% of the minimum wage to learners working in this state. Let's...let's not kid ourselves. We're talking about people that will either be earning something in order to learn or be on the unemployment rolls, and that these same people that bleed and...and beat their chests about how the unemployment rate of this state is going sky high. Those same people will be back here saying that we should keep these people off of unemployment at the same time. I don't know what the answer is to...to appeal to their better judgment, but if they had a Christian bone in their body, they would understand that you can't keep beating people down to the bottom of the heap. And having...



having talked to the Pope a couple weeks ago, I could assure you that he's in favor of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Well, in my denomination we don't go through the Pope. We go direct, and I didn't get that work."

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

Friedrich: "If..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...to ex...oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were through, Sir." Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "If this was a Bill to raise it to a dollar, sixty-one cents, I think we might be voting for it. It isn't that at all, but if you think you're doing the young people a favor, you're not, because there will be fewer jobs for the very people you're talking about. You're really legisTating them out of jobs, that's what you're doing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted for a minimum wage law Bill last year, and I have a Christian bone in my body, and I felt that we're talking about a nominal fee. But, shortly after I voted for that Bill, about three weeks later another Bill was introduced by Representative Taylor here to subsidize the difference between the minimum wage law that was passed, so that the young people in this state could have jobs. So, today I'm voting 'no' on this Bill, because I'm fearful that next week there will be a Bill here to subsidize the difference between the...the rates that we're increasing today, so that the young people can go to work."

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

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I have proudly voted 'yes' for this Bill. It's a good Bill. It's an important Bill, and I would



encourage everyone to put more green votes up there than we have already. It should pass out of this House unanimously if we are really concerned about the plight of working people in this state. However, Mr. Speaker, I have a Committee commitment, and I would like to be verified should a request for verification be made on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "Speaker and fellow Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I just want to point out that the Illinois camel is now going again at full speed, and this is the last one of the straws that is breaking and will break the back of the Illinois camel, but keep right on going. As soon as we get it to go broke and have trouble, the sooner it'll be cured."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robbin: "Maybe I don't understand the Bill. It...I thought it says 70% of the minimum wage rate. Now if a man is training to be an electrician, wouldn't...the young man, wouldn't he get 70% of the prevailing wage rate for electricians?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, not to explain my vote. On a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of personal privilege. What's your point, Sir?"

Jaffe: "Yeah, I would just like to tell Representative Hanahan that this is a good Bill even if you don't have a Christian bone in your body."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters. That's what happens when you see the Pope."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John."



Peters: "...and Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Hall."

Peters: "...of the House...Representative Jaffe and Hanahan to remind all of you that we are all semi-spiritually at any rate, and, in remembering what a Gentleman who just visited Poland, did say is that every man was entitled to the dignity of his labor regardless of the political or social system that he worked under. And, remembering that after Representative Friedrich's comments, I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Polish phrase. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'ayes', 54 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And just so...for the record, I said (Polish phrase) to Pete Peters, so it could be translated properly in the native tongue of the Pope. It means God bless you. Senate Bill 7."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 7. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Presently no life or accident and health policy forms may be used unless it has been filed with and approved by the Director of Insurance. But, if the Director does not disapprove of the policy form within 60 days, the form shall be considered approved. This Bill provides that no policy writer or application blank may be issued or delivered in Illinois unless its form and content had been filed, reviewed, and formally approved by the Director of Insurance. It provides that the Director must take action on a policy within 60 days after it's filed unless the Director extends this period for an additional 30 days by written notice prior to the expira-



tion of the original period. The Amendment, which we did adopt on the floor, allows the Director to exempt group policies. I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 7 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye'...138 'ayes', 3 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 971."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 971."

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

Taylor: "Would you throw Senate Bill 971 out of the record, please?"

~~Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record, please. Senate Bill 23."~~

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 23. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to further the affluent and certain compacts between the State of Missouri and Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 23 provides legislation to change the types of facilities that the Bi-State Development Agency is empowered to operate and maintain and also permits that agency to contract for the operation of facilities other than public agencies. It also provides for raising the interest rate under revenue bonds from 8 to 10 percent. Now, specifically, this Bill would provide for authority for the Bi-State Agency to build a solid waste to energy project and to enter the resource recovery field. The State of Missouri has already passed an identical Bill through their Legislature, and I would ask for your favorable support of this legislation."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 23 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Dawson. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill...I'm sorry. Senate Bill 88."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 88. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State's Attorneys Appellate Service Commission Act, and the State Appellate Defender Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. McClain on the floor? McClain? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 114. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 176."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 176. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 176 is a Bill which would, philosophically, accomplish two things. It is a Bill with the intent of permitting on a permissive basis our...our taxing bodies to utilize the services of persons who are required, under Section 61-4 of the Public Aid Act, to register and accept bonafide offers of employment. Such taxing bodies would, at that time from a roster provided from...by the Department of Public Aid, be able to select people under certain criteria set down and vote the statute, and under rules and regulations promulgated by the Department to enable these people to become acquainted with skills to work for taxing bodies. With the specific guidelines that nobody who is presently employed by a taxing body would be displaced, so no jobs would be lost, but people who are on the general assistance roll...not, and I emphasis, not people who are receiving other types of aid. For example,



to the disabled, the blind, and so forth. But, to those people on general assistance would be able to go to work for taxing bodies and would receive the minimum wage, would be credited against the amounts that they receive on public aid, and for any time over that that a taxing body would wish them to work, they would receive additional compensation in addition to mileage to and from the work. I think that this is a very forward looking Bill, and a very excellent concept. It does two things at one time. It gives the taxpayer some true tax relief in permitting him to get full credit for his tax dollar, and, at the same time, it gives the person on general assistance the ability to learn minimum skills, to develop those skills, and help...hopefully to become a person who can earn on their own in the future. I would ask for the support of this Assembly in this very forward looking and constructive Bill."

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

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I rise as the joint Sponsor of this proposal, having sponsored House Bill 409 in the House here earlier in the Session. What we're talking about here is putting the 86,000 people state-wide, who are in the general assistance category, to work for their benefit, for our benefit, and for the benefit of all the taxpayers. Those people approximately state-wide take in about 15 million dollars per month without returning to the taxpayer one iota of service. I submit to you this will benefit the public and those Members themselves who are on general assistance. The Bill that I had put in and that Representative Getty, also, had helped on earlier was based on an example from Bordentown, New Jersey, a town which had had a welfare... workfare instead of welfare concept. Because of that concept was so very successful in that town, having reduced welfare in that town from 25 general assistance



welfare from 25 down to 1 person and the cost from 8,000 dollars per month down to 500 dollars per month, the State of New Jersey has now adopted a workfare instead of welfare program. I submit to you that we here in Illinois can have the same result if we enact this program, and so I proudly join Representative Getty as the joint Sponsor on this proposal and ask for all your support. Thank you."

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

Willer: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Willer: "Do you agree with the figure just given that there are 86,000 able-bodied people on general assistance in Illinois who could be put to work?"

Getty: "I would defer to Representative Hallock on that."

Willer: "Well, what would you think? I mean, of the people on general assistance...you believe...what percentage then do you believe this would cover? All or half or what...?"

Getty: "No, it...no, I'd like to make it clear that the only people that this would affect is those people who are presently under our existing Illinois laws required under Section 6-1-...point 4, to register and accept bonafide offers of employment. It would not affect those people, for example, receiving assistance because of blindness..."

Willer: "Oh, I realize that."

Getty: "...because of disability, and so forth. It only affects those limited people, and I do not know the number. I think possibly Representative Hallock would. I don't."

Willer: "Well, if they are injured on the job, how would they be covered?"

Getty: "If a person were injured on the job, they would be covered under workmen's compensation, in my opinion, the same as anyone else would be covered. That and any other fringe expenses is something that would be born by the



individual municipality or taxing body, and it's something that they take into consideration when they make the decision to utilize the services of these people. They are to be paid the minimum wage."

Willer: "Well, if...if most municipalities have free hospitalization of their employees, at least in my area, would they also receive any other fringe benefits?"

Getty: "It...that is not mandated under law. If it were mandated under law, the municipality or the taxing body, yes. If it was not mandated, it would not be."

Willer: "Well, I'd like to speak to the Bill."

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

Willer: "We don't know really how many people this will affect. I mean, I do not quarrel with the idea. I think, perhaps, though, if it passes, we're going to go back to home and say, 'Well, now we've taken care of people on general assistance. They won't be loafing anymore. We're going to put them to work.' I suspect the percentage of people on general assistance who are physically able and going to work will be very small, and it's not going to be any great saving to the taxpayer. Psychologically, you may... I mean, I don't quarrel with your idea, I guess, as long as they're covered by unemploy...I mean, workmen's compensation if they're injured. I just hope we aren't fooling the voters at all and...and saying we're doing something great when it may turn out to be very negligible."

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

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this is a forward looking Bill. I would again direct your attention to safeguards which are set forth in Senate Bill



176 as it is before you. Further, to the fact that it would be operated under rules and regulations that would be, of course, set down by the Department of Public Aid to offer ample protection, and for those of you who would be concerned about displacement of any existing employees, there would be none. The Act specifically prohibits anyone who is a...a present employee from being terminated. However, it would provide needed assistance to taxing bodies, giving the taxpayer a very substantial bit of tax relief, and giving dignity to a person on general assistance, permitting him to not only gain work skills, but to actually get into a working system, to move ahead, and to make a contribution to society, as I am sure all of us want to do. I think this is the type of Bill that serves both ends. It serves our taxpayers, and, at the same time, it serves the recipients, and I am confident that under the permissive nature of this, since no taxing body would have to utilize it, it's absolutely permissive that no taxing body who...who was not interested would be forced to do it. I am sure that it is a Bill that will be fairly and equitably used for all of our citizens, and I'd ask for your wholehearted support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 176 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Schneider: "My 'no' vote, by the way, is directed at a couple of concepts. One is very simply the notion that we are reintroducing peonage into the process. That is slavery's been banned for years, and what you reintroduce here is a person at a minimum wage level at a position he doesn't want to work at, because he may or may not be skilled at it, and even if he is...even if the job requires high skill and that person has it, he's still getting a minimum wage. Secondly, it has the possibility for increasing cost of



local government. Representative Getty has indicated the workmen's comp provisions already would be covered. We, also, undercut the intention of the welfare program, if that's what we're going to call it. We deny the person the opportunity to seek employment that he or she feels is consistent with his skills. I think it's a lousy legislation. Obviously it's going to pass, but I think we ought to give a good look at it and re-evaluate. Obviously it's gone."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Carrying on with Representative Schneider's thoughts in the matter. We also actually cut down the amount of usable money that this person has. A person who is at the bottom, really the bottom of...of the economic scale because out of that comes, of course, income taxes. So, that it's not a trading for like for like, because when you...his...his benefits obviously they're receiving on welfare are not taxed. His...this...this income he gets will be taxed, so that if he's at the bottom level, he will find it even more difficult to make ends meet. As well as the in...as the increase to local government, by unemployment comp, by workmen's comp, by all the benefits of employment, the question whether he gets vacations, all...which he may be entitled to, the question of whether he could even get tenure if he had it for long enough. All of these are...are questions. How is he discharged...is the...is the impact in the civil service situation. Those things are not addressed in this."

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

Timer's on."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sorry I didn't have the chance to ask a question of the Sponsor in debate, but I'd like to know how the unemployment insurance program would be impacted. Suppose the person went off general assistance. They



would lose that job. Would they be eligible for unemployment insurance and the unit of local government, the township, would have to pay higher unemployment compensation rates, because people are leaving their general assistance program? I think that's absolutely insane, and I'm sorry we didn't get a chance to discuss that in ...in debate, but it seems to me that's an important consideration, and increases the uncertainties of this program, and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 9 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 312."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 312. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. Excuse me, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "Just as soon as he starts...when he's done, I want to ask him some questions. I'm not trying to get ahead of you. Go ahead."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, okay, fine. Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 312 was introduced by Senator Netsch and Rep... and Senator Grotberg at the request of the Commission on Children. What Senate Bill 312 does is amend the Section of the Juvenile Court Act relating to the impounding of juvenile records. Presently, under the present law juvenile records are impounded but by general order of court or special order, they may be inspected by the news media, and interested persons, and others. What Senate Bill 312 does is to provide that after the expiration of three years or whenever the minor becomes of



age, that the records would be sealed. It does not provide that they be destroyed but just sealed, and this means that they could not be inspected by the news media or by persons by general order of court, but you would require a special order, and they could be inspected by a court order by, for example, a victim or someone who had an interest in finding out who the juvenile was. The purpose of this law is to, after a reasonable period of time, to further safeguard the juvenile records and to make sure that the juvenile who had not gotten in any trouble for three years or come of age, would not be harrassed by news media people or others inspecting the records unless they came in and got a court order and identified themselves as interested persons. As I say, this is recommended by the Commission on Children, and I feel that the Bill still allows for a person who needs to know about the juvenile records to find out in a proper manner. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Johnson: "Well, Representative Deuster, I'm not speaking either for or against this Bill, but I have one...one concern. With the attachment of the Senate Amendment on this Bill, it appears to me that the only situations for an individual who is, for example, the victim of a juvenile crime or a juvenile delinquent act. The only situations where they can get...obtain the records for use in a civil action is in the event of a rape, murder, deviate sexual assault, armed violence, or armed robbery. What about the situation where someone has his car damaged or...or some lesser tort. A battery, for example. Even an aggravated battery, because that's not covered here, where they receive substantial personal injury, but it's not an armed robbery, or I mean not an armed robbery. It...it doesn't fall into the categories of...covered under the Senate Amendment. It seems to me that we're cutting off the ability of a



potential plaintiff in a...in a tort action from having those records available to him, which is, as I remember, one of the purposes of a Bill that you introduced last... of this term in the House. Do you respond to that?"

Deuster: "Well, that's right. I'd be happy to respond. What the Senate did, they added an Amendment saying that the juvenile records would not be sealed...would not be sealed if the minor was a adjudicated delinquent on the basis some ...of some facts which, if he was committed as an adult, would constitute murder, rape, deviate sexual assault, armed violence, and other aggravated and serious crimes. That Senate Amendment, as I understand it Representative Johnson, only applies to Section 2 of the Bill, which is the sealing Section, and that...and that it does not cut off the right of a victim such as you have described as a ...where a juvenile had smashed an automobile and caused some property damage or personal injury of another kind. It is my understanding that they would be able to go in and get a court order and find out the identity of the juvenile offender."

Johnson: "Thank you."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Epton: "As I understand the question posed to you by our colleague, I'm somewhat fearful that your answer probably isn't as accurate as it might be. Today, thanks to some of your previous legislation, the parents of some of these delinquents are liable for the damages he spoke of. Under the Bill, not the synopsis, but under the Bill, as I read it, he would...it would be necessary to get a court order. Today it isn't necessary to do that, even though you must show the...the court or the arresting officer the necessity. If I read the Bill correctly, it seems to me he foreclosed



that avenue short of additional litigation. If you have a five hundred dollar claim, I doubt very much whether litigation is worthwhile."

Deuster: "That...I'm not sure if that was a question or an observation."

Epton: "Well...well, my question really is, aren't you defeating your own purpose by your previous Bills which made the parents liable just as our colleague inquired earlier?"

Deuster: "Well, it was not the will of the House to enact my proposal to open up the juvenile records entirely for the victims of crime. The law that I sponsored and was passed into law during the prior Session said that a victim of juvenile crime would have a right to see the police records or the court records. Unfortunately, the law left in the qualification that where the juvenile was a delinquent. I didn't like that, but that's the way it was. This...this Bill still provides...this Senate Bill 312 provides that the record shall remain sealed unless the court finds that the unsealing the record will not adversely affect any other parties, so I think it's possible for a court order. The point you make is...are well-taken that it would seem to restrict the area that I suggested in the last Session, Representative Epton."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, is recognized."

Huskey: "...Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Huskey: "Repre...Representative Deuster, you and I are...are Cosponsors of an apparent responsibility law. Now, if this...if this Bill passes, wouldn't it negate the responsibility law, the Bill that you and I sponsored? More or less?"

Deuster: "Would it what? I'm not sure I heard..."



Huskey: "Would it negate the...the law that we just passed?

And, it's in...it's in the Senate on Third Reading now."

Deuster: "I don't think it would negate it. Where the...where you didn't know who the juvenile was, it would require that there be a court order. If...if the...if your assertion of rights under the juvenile...Parental Responsibility Act took place after three years after the...the event."

Huskey: "Well, let me ask you one more question. Don't you feel that if there is enough laws protecting the juvenile's identity now without a...without adding more to it, that this sort of thing that would just make it probably a little more confusing over the existing statutes?"

Deuster: "The Commission on Children has recommended this Bill, and their philosophy is that sometimes job opportunities and educational opportunities are denied to juveniles because of a past record, and that the Commission on Children feels that once three years has expired or that the juvenile has become an adult, that we should take action to restrict access to those prior records as...as a way of helping the juvenile face the future rather than be tied down to their past record."

Huskey: "Well, one more question, and I'll...I'll leave you alone. Don't you think that the...right now don't you have to get a court order to reveal the record of a juvenile?"

Deuster: "Under present law there may be either a general or a special order of court. It's my understanding that in Cook County there's a general order, so that you don't have to go in on...in on an individual basis one by one and get a court order. But, under present law if there's either a general order of court or a special order of court, it's possible for victims and others...interested persons to find the identity of the juvenile."

Huskey: "Well, really is there that much need for this Bill?"



Do you really feel that there is that much need for this Bill?"

Deuster: "Well, Representative Huskey, I'm presenting this Bill to the House and its recommendation on the Commission of Children, and they've studied this very carefully. Representative Hallstrom is a joint Sponsor with me of the Bill here in the House, and I just explained to you the philosophy of the Commission on Children. It...it's designed to respond to a need to help young people who have gotten into some trouble and who might be burdened with a respect to seeking jobs, or seeking educational opportunities, or joining labor unions, or apprentice programs to not be harrassed by a record that's over three years old."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom, is recognized."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to share with you. I was a Member of the Illinois Commission on Children for 15 years. I can assure you that it's not the way of the Commission to allow young people, who should not get away with things or hurt anyone else, for that to happen. This legislation has been carefully looked over. There is no way I...I could sum the concerns of Representative Deuster and some of the others. The fact that a youngster would have had to be free of any kind of juvenile problem for three years in order for this act to take place, I think is very important, and I would like to second everything that Representative Deuster said. I really do hope that you will vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski, is recognized."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Don, I've watched your laudatory work in the House



here for a number of years, and if this isn't a hundred and eighty degree turn from what you're doing, it's a hundred and ten degree turn from what you're doing. Do you really want this legislation?"

Deuster: "Well, I don't know if that's a fair question. I would say this, that under the present law, Representative Kosinski, it's possible for the news media to go in and search around and look into juvenile records. I don't think the news media has much business doing that. This would end that, and this would provide that after three years, except for serious crimes in which you're greatly interested, this doesn't affect serious crimes at all... after three years these records would be sealed. Presently, they're impounded. The difference between impounding and sealing is not an awful lot. The principal difference, as I look at it, is that after three years, an individual who wanted to find out the juvenile information concerning the juvenile's misconduct, would have to go in and get a court order. Whereas now it will be possible for there to be a general court order to apply to all similar situated persons. It's a question of degree."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Christensen...or Kankakee, rather. Representative Christensen's recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook...Lake, rather, Representative Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "This has been adequately discussed, and I'd urge your favorable vote for Senate Bill 312. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House...Senate Bill 312 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 voting 'aye' and 11 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 350. Senate Bill 350."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 350. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Klosak. Is Representative Klosak back there? I don't see him. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 490."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 490. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Arts Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Illinois Arts Council Bill, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there's an...or Mr. Speaker. There's an obvious attempt to muzzle me here, but I want to be heard on this horrendous Bill. You know, when I came here in 1967, this agency was first proposed, and the appropriation was \$25,000, and it was \$25,000 of wasted money then, and now we're up...it was introduced at two million nine hundred thousand, which was the same as last year, but I understand there was a curve ball thrown from the...from the County of Kankakee to add another five hundred thousand dollars to this wasteful project. Now, we're talking about saving the taxpayers money. We're talking about and closing ceilings on spending and taxation, and here we continue to flitter money away. You know, there...there's even a...there's even an item in this budget this year to go around the state and teach people how to raise money for the...for the arts. This thing is mushrooming to where we have every town, hamlet,



and township in the State of Illinois is having their own Arts Council, and what are they doing with money in the name of art? They're throwing it away. I wish I could use stronger language, Mr. Speaker, but I wouldn't do that on the floor of this House. But, this money is being wasted...wasted in the...in the name of art. What is art? There's dance studios in every one of our...in every one of our communities getting money to create new forms of dances. Now, I don't know how many forms of dances there can be, but everytime I open my mail, and everytime you open your mail, you're...you're getting a letter from the Arts Council saying that...that money has been put into your district for new dances. Well, I think that we can do more and better things with our money than dancing, and...and dancing as we throw it away-- They're painting underground garages. My...my Lord, Mr. Speaker, I don't know when this is going to end, and as I say at the start of this Session, the Governor of this State permitted that there would be no more than two million nine hundred thousand dollars into the Arts Council, and here just in the last week we see another five hundred thousand dollars added for something. I don't know what. I just wish that Representative Braun would come over here and dance with me. I haven't gotten any of this money. My Lord, what a picture of grace. Maybe I'm wrong at that, but Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member to turn this...this insidious agency down...this terrible waste, and in spite of the good sponsorship of this Bill, I ask everybody to vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The...the Chair would like to congratulate Representative Col...Collins on his pantomime of that tape he just had for us here. Representative Ryan, the Gentleman from Kankakee."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."



All those in favor say 'aye'. The...those opposed say 'no'. The 'nos' have it, so the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, is recognized."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Collins put it very aptly. This is the biggest rip-off in the history of the State of Illinois. They spend their money...our money not their money painting viaducts in the City of Chicago with pictures of eagles, and leopards, and snakes, and every other kind of thing. It's an absolute ridiculous waste of the taxpayers' money, especially in the year following proposition 13 when everybody's trying to cut down on...on taxes. I couldn't echo it better than Representative Collins did. I was down at Lake Michigan by the planetarium where they had a dance theater there. They had a bunch of people on top of a flatbed truck...a trailer truck with no sides on it. They were all dancing around in crazy costumes and hollering and screaming like a bunch of banshees. It is an absolutely ridiculous waste of the taxpayers' money to, year after year, fund this absolute form of garbage. I mean, every two or three weeks I get a letter in the mail telling me that they granted fifty dollars to this couple, or a hundred dollars to this couple, and interpretive dancing, and painting on the walls, and painting viaducts. It's just crazy, and we can't afford to keep on wasting the taxpayers' money like this. In spite of the good sponsorship, I must vigorously oppose this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn is recognized."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to observe that when I first came here, the Arts Council budget used to squeak through the General Assembly, but with each passing year Representative Collins' speeches have become better and better and the margin of passages become greater and greater, so I



just hope we continue that fine tradition that Representative Collins is lending his talents to with regard to this budget."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, is recognized."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with Representative Ryan and move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...all those in favor of moving the previous question vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. It takes two-thirds of those voting. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, I would hope...wish that they would hold off for a little bit...while, because we were sent downstairs to get up some of those nice new RTA posters. I thought Mr. McAuliffe would like to read them to the Members of the House. They are terrific this year. If you thought they were good last year, well you ain't seen nothing yet."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this qu...there are 109 voting 'aye' and 31 voting 'no', and the previous question's moved. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Oh, is this previous question? I...I just thought we were explaining votes."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes. No, we're...the Sponsor now is recognized, Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it pleases me that the Gentlemen on this side pay as much attention as they do to the Illinois Arts Council. I still contend that the state financially support, reflect the Democratic perspective, that entitles all the people in the State of Illinois to culture. There was a time, you know, when the only thought that the arts and the culture were for the rich, and if the Arts Council does nothing else, it enables the Chicago Symphony, as I said



yesterday, to travel throughout the State of Illinois and bring music and culture to everybody...downstate, southern Illinois, and everybody, and I really think this is one of the better projects that I addressed myself to, and I would ask for a very favorable Roll Call. And, I am going to ask, since Representative Collins says he doesn't know what art is, that the Illinois Arts Council address themselves specifically to Representative Collins in the next year. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 490 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Totten is recognized to explain his vote.

One minute. The timer's on."

Totten: "Oh, don't turn the timer on. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if there was ever an appropriation Bill that there was justification for noting... voting 'no' for, this was it. First of all, it is now some seven hundred thousand dollars over the Governor's original proposal. There were two Amendments in. Secondly, some of the work of this agency is rather suspect. I don't know how many of you ride the RTA and have seen these posters, but this is one of the reasons why the RTA hasn't got much ridership, because people are reading these things and becoming very confused, don't know where they're going, or ending up in...here's one that's been selected for me. This is really beautiful art. Let me read it to you. It's an aerosol can spraying, I don't know what. Sir James, southside. Sugar rat, the sweet-lipped one, says he will love her like no other. Genuine forever and she. He is insane, so gang love is true love, and I, no jousting brother, a loud mouth is crazy and bad aim. This is poetry. I play the game straight. Dont' go looking for trouble. Not capping nor the heart's high veil. No, sir. I say just party in peace to all people that walk by or ride. Here's another selection of arts.



It's a picture of a fire hydrant in Chicago in the snow. I don't know how they got the fire hydrant in the snow-storm, but there it is. It says waiting for a bus. Come the feathered snow. I remember fire hydrant summer, hot sidewalks, and children smells. Come spring. Fall flickers in my brain like leaves with the wind and old newspapers on the street. Now, this..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers..."

Totten: "Wait a minute, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "...to explain his vote, and the timer is on, and the clock is on. It'll shut off."

Borchers: "Did you say my name? Oh, well, you did."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, I did."

Borchers: "I just want to point when I first came here, some 10...11 years ago, this started at fifty thousand dollars. Now it's nearly three million. Think about it. Fifty thousand. Three million. I was opposed then, and I'm opposed now, and I want to tell you one other thing. Ten years ago when all the riots were all going on, they actually paid this...these people of our state paid for a ...for a...in Chicago for Black Panthers putting on a show that asked for the overthrow of the federal government by force, and I think it's ridiculous. It's time to quit it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, to explain her vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I...I rise both on a point of personal privilege and to explain my vote. I...I have been accused of dancing on the Republican side of the aisle, but I would say to Representative Collins that I will dance with him in...in the front of this...this House should this Bill receive the recommended number of votes, and it looks like it will. But, seriously folks, the Arts Council plays a very important role and makes a very important contribution in improving the quality of our



lives. Young people particularly learn through the arts, and I think we should encourage the activities of the Arts Council and give this appropriation a rounding... resounding vote of approval."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Schneider: "I was just going to point out, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps Representative Totten would benefit from a grant from the Illinois Arts Council on reading of poetry. He seems to have lost...lose a little bit in the reading. Maybe if you could read the revenue code, it would be more to your rhythm and rhyme. Obviously you're not into reading of poetry."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, the Sponsor, Representative Braun, One minute to explain her vote."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, unfortunately, I hate to tell the fellows that the project on the poems was so successful in the bus that another group is taking it over, so next year when I come back with this appropriation, they're going to have to find something else. And, just to point out, it was one of the most successful that they have done on the buses. Thank you for all of your support. I appreciate it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. Wolf...J. J. Wolf, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We left out one of the good ones over there Mr. Totten didn't get to, and it's a short one. I'd like to read this one. This is entitled, you must change your life, and it has a picture of a squirrel on there. It says of all the things one might be a squirrel lopes by busy at being himself in a tut nut... tough nutless world. Cats, at his young reign, slanting in his nest, night falling, winter not provided for, no



questions to ask of himself or anyone. The only question I have to ask is how do you expect to increase ridership on the CTA with these?"

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, since we're on poetry, I don't have a poem that was printed by the RTA, but I do recall one that I saw on the side of the bus. And...and, it wasn't bad. It went something like this, little pigeon in the sky, drop some whitewash in my eye. Little pigeon, I don't cry. I'm just glad that cows don't fly, and I think that's worth an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of my district not only can read things like this, but they can write, and they've been writing me letters telling me not to vote for such junk as this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote. One minute. Representative Leverenz, you have your light on there."

Leverenz: "All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was going to talk about the six top people and their 9½% raises, but I'd like to relinquish my time to Representative Totten to carry on."

Speaker Flinn: "You can't release...relinquish time to explain your vote. The rules doesn't provide for that. Have all voted who wish? Representative Pullen, I'm sorry, I overlooked you. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, to explain her vote. One minute."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss something about the involvement of the Illinois Arts Council in my district. The Illinois Arts Council was very helpful to a community in my district by giving them several thousands of dollars for a piece of so-called sculpture done by an Indiana



artist to symbolize the spirit of a certain community in my district by a large aluminum arch, which is lit blue at night. Boy, it really turns us all on. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. One minute, and the timer's on."

Skinner: "I don't know whether I can, so I won't even try. I would point out that if this is the most successful project, this project that Representative Totten was talking about that the RTA runs, then perhaps their creativity should be directed in other directions. Perhaps, in filling the buses that run empty in my district."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye' and 48 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed: We're going to back up to one we just...the Gentleman was not available at the time. Senate Bill 350. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...I see that this Bill passed by a healthy margin, and I would ask, not only for a brief recess, but would some of you younger Members recommend a disco that Representative Braun and I could go to. I...I...at my advanced years I haven't been frequenting these places, and we're on our way if you'll tell us where to go."

Speaker Flinn: "Senate Bill 350."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 350. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Klosak."

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 350 deals with insurance companies, trust companies, banks, money, stocks and bonds, and other securities. Now, the



insurance companies have a lot of money, and they buy these stocks and bonds. Now, for safe keeping they put them in the trust companies and various banks. All that Senate Bill 350 does is permit these trust companies and banks to avail themselves of a new system of bookkeeping, which is called the book entry system wherein they do not need to have the physical custody of these stocks and bonds and other securities. This method is very accurate, very safe, and the Department of Insurance feels that insurance companies should be able to avail themselves of this new system. I ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 350 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye' and none voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 559."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 559. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to credit unions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Molloy."

Molloy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Senate Bill 559 was discussed at great length yesterday on Second Reading. It's the...the net result of 15 months of work with the credit union industry and the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions. The major changes in this Act are rules and regulations by the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions under the Administrative Procedures Act. This is the first time that this...you would have rules and regulations for credit unions, and the second big item is that it creates a mandatory federal share insurance for credit union members. They insure their accounts to forty thousand



dollars, and this would have to be done within the three-year period. There are 1,055 state-chartered credit unions in this state and there are 450 federal credit unions. This Bill actually brings the one thousand and fifty-five state-chartered credit unions to the same... with the same type of an Act as you have with the four hundred and fifty federal credit unions that are now operating in Illinois. I would ask your support of this good Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 559 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 574."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 574. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Is Representative Terzich on the floor? I don't see him. Take it out of the record, I guess. Senate Bill 758."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 758. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 758 is the Senate version of the Bill that would create a life and health insurance guarantee fund in the State of Illinois to protect policyholders against the possibility of the life or health insurance company failing financially. The Bill is very similar to the one that was passed out of here under the sponsorship of Representative Epton, and I'd be happy to respond to any questions anyone might have."



Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 758 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye' and none voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 882."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 882. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe. Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative McAuliffe and myself are the House Sponsors of this legislation, Senate Bill 882. Senate Bill 88...882, sponsored in the Senate by Senator Knuppel, eliminates the present five-year limit for tax for constructing or maintaining gravel and hard roads, and the reason this brought it down, many counties have had trouble on bringing these up every five years. The people forget what the tax is, that something's been custom, and as far as I know I think that practically all counties have this tax on, and this would eliminate that. But, there is some safeguards in it. It will... it will be a...it shall be done on an annual tax on a permanent basis, unless a petition of 25 legal voters is submitted to the district clerk, and then that provides for a referendum to be held and road districts that can repeal this special tax. It also...Senate Bill 882 has an Amendment on it which would allow...put on in the House by myself, which would allow maximum county highway tax rates to be increased from 10 to 20 cents on...on a front door referendum. Now, at the present time, they can have a 10 cent tax, but without a referendum, and, as we know, many counties and townships are having trouble at this



time with inflation like it is, and this will allow them, with a referendum, to raise it up to 20%, but it does give the people this choice whether they want it or not. If there's any questions to be asked, why I'll be glad to answer them. Otherwise, we would appreciate affirmative vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 882 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 voting 'aye' and 8 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. All right, now we're going to back up and get some Bills that are on Third Reading at the request of the Sponsor in order to save the Sponsors a day and let them move them back to...~~for the purposes of Amendments, and if anyone~~ else has any...they're sponsoring Bills...as that this will be the time to do it. We will start with Representative Huff's Bill. Representative Huff, are you ready to move on your Bill, Senate Bill 384? You're not ready yet? All right. On Senate Bill 1314, Representative Cullerton requests that we...asked leave of the House rather that we move Senate Bill 1314 back to Second for the purpose of...of Amendment. Is there leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Bill's on Second Reading. Read the...are there Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill 1314 on page 2, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 changes the effective date of the Act from January 1st of 1980 to July 1st of 1980, however it does allow for the Advisory Board for Services to Crippled Children to come into existence on January 1, 1980. I would ask



for a...that this Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the...the Gentleman has moved to adopt Amendment #...#1 to House Bill... Senate Bill 1314. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading."

Cullerton: "Can I have leave to have that returned to the...?"

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have that... it's not on Short Debate, I understand, by the...the Clerk advises me that it is not on Short Debate, so you don't need leave. It just goes right to Third Reading. Senate Bill 354. Representative Telcser has...moves to...asks leave rather to move Senate Bill...I'm sorry...359. Can't read my own writing. Representative Telcser has asked leave of the House to move Senate Bill 359 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Telcser, amends Senate Bill 359 on page 1, line 1 by deleting, Act, and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I've discussed this Amendment with both the House Sponsor, Representative Gaines, and the Senate Sponsor, Senator Newhouse. Both of whom have agreed to accept the Amendment to their Bill if the House votes to adopt it. Some of you may have seen the program called Sixty Minutes about three or four weeks ago in which a story was told about a...a severely disabled woman in the State of California. She was a quadriplegic, and she was on SSI and receiving aid. She was able to obtain employment by acting as a telephone operator and referring out nurses to places where they were supposed to go to work everyday. She earned \$500



a week...a month for performing these services, and upon receiving that money her federal assistance was discontinued. Needless to say, the woman was found in Never Never Land caught between a devil and deep blue sea. As it turns out, she became severely depressed, and she committed suicide. It was a very moving story, and it was typical of the bureaucracy which all of us find between federal and state government. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 359 addresses itself to that particular problem. What I am asking for in this Amendment is that any citizen in the State of Illinois, who is severely disabled as defined in Amendment #1, who is receiving aid, and who can find some type of gainful employment, that person would not lose that particular aid, and the state would pick up the difference from what the federal government would cut off from that recipient. The State of California has a similar Act, and my understanding is that with the limitations which I have delineated in Amendment #1, California only has 25 people who would qual...who qualified during the first year of the program. The cost was only \$250,000. I think we should do this in Illinois, and I offer and move Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 359."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, is recognized."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, right now in Christian County, Illinois we are not quite finished with this matter, there's a family. I won't name them. The man is in a wheelchair, in his seventies, hasn't been able to work because of the wheelchair and being injured years ago, and the mother... his wife is working. We have these letters right now in my office where they received a notification, and we have the actual photostatic copy of the letter, that because a green thumb gave them a little extra produce to sell to help...help them get by, and they're on SSI, and they were on green stamps. They...they no longer have



the green stamps. They've been...been taken away from them, because they sold...didn't report this very small income from sending some produce from the green thumb of Mt. Auburn. That these things happen to them, and they received a letter that they were going to be indicted for fraud. Now...now that has been stopped, but the whole thing is incredible thing to me and ridiculous that this kind of thing can go on by the coldness and the...the lack of care of bureaucracy, and when I had my investigative assistant discuss the matter with the case worker involved, he nearly had to tell her and put her in the place, because...in her place, because of the attitude she took towards him, so I think we should support this Amendment that's been suggested by Representative Telcser."

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further discussion, the Gentleman has moved that we...to adopt Amendment #1 to...to Senate Bill 359. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 320. 1320. I got the wrong number here. Representative Getty asks leave of the House to move Senate Bill 1320 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, it's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Griesheimer, amends Senate Bill 1320 on page 1, line 1 and 6 by deleting Section 27.1 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is a matter that came up in Judiciary Committee. It was a Bill handled by Representative Getty to increase the charge for jury fees. In Cook County when the Bill was drawn, it was state-wide. It is not the practice to charge for juries in downstate



Illinois. This Amendment will remove the charging capacity in any way, shape, or form for juries and jury matters in downstate Illinois. I believe Representative Getty agreed to this Amendment, so I would move its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1320. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Appearing on the Calendar on page 13 is Senate Bill 486. I understand there's a... we have a good reason to try to move that thing today, and we have some Amendments, and they're supposedly non-controversial, so the Clerk will read Senate Bill 486."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 486. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Emergency Service and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Are there any motions pertaining to the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Representative Mahar, I think was withdrawn previously today. Is that right?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 is being offered by Rea, Reilly, Donovan, and so forth. Rea. Representative Rea."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Rea is recognized."

Rea: "Yes, Amendment #2, sponsored by Representatives Rea, Reilly, Donovan, Mautino, and Vinson, increases the appropriation for the personal services for retirement and social security for the Department of Mental Health and line items of...and this will increase the...the amount of two million one hundred and sixty-one thousand



six hundred at various facilities. This increase will allow the Department to maintain the current head count through the end of this year. The Department originally requested an increase over the '79 original appropriation of nine million. The Senate reduced that amount to six million two hundred and ninety-eight thousand five hundred thousand minus 2.7 million. This Amendment here would bring the appropriated level to eight million four hundred and sixty thousand one hundred dollars. The total appropriation will reflect a decrease of five hundred and thirty-nine thousand nine hundred thousand from the original request, and this has been an agreed Amendment... have spoken to the minority spokesman on this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, is recognized."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representatives Rea, Reilly, Donovan, Mautino, Vinson and all who have sponsored this Amendment, are entirely correct in doing so, and what Representative Rea has indicated to the House is correct. The Department will be short some two million dollars for their payroll to the end of the month. This is an emergency supplemental appropriation. Both staffs have looked at the figures, have concurred in the amounts here, and we would urge a 'yes' vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Campbell, amends Senate Bill 486 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this simply transfers two million dollars from the FDC to the individual applica-



tions for family grant program to pay recipient claims in the 29 flood disaster counties, and I would appreciate a...I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #3. It's supposed to be Amendment #3 up there on the Board, I believe."

Campbell: "Three. Three."

Speaker Flinn: "Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Peters, Reed, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 486 as amended on page 1 by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I would ask leave of the House to also add, as Sponsor of the Amendment, Representative Pierce."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has requested to add Representative Pierce as Sponsor. Is there no objection? Leave is granted. Representative Pierce is Sponsor."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what House Amendment #4 to the Senate Bill 486 does is, it adds a \$170,000 to the appropriation of the Illinois Office of Education for repayment to a school known as the 'Klingburg' School in Lake County. There has been some litigation, I understand, involved in here. The Department of Mental Health has finally agreed, and we are in receipt of a letter from Dr. 'Devito', director of the Department, and he indicates in that letter that the Department is now convinced and certain that the school is entitled to money for the cost of a third shift to care for the handicapped and other children who are at this 'Klingburg' School, and I would move adoption of the Amendment, and I...I believe...well, I'm not sure if there's opposition. Okay."

4



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Peters, I have a letter which has been addressed to us from the Attorney General's office by Special Assistant Attorney General Wexler relative to a claim currently pending before the Court of Claims in which the Assistant Attorney General suggests that a...an appropriation might be sought to pay for \$187,000 claim which is pending before the Court of Claims. Now, is this the same or part of the same claim which is currently pending?"

Peters: "The staff informs me, Representative Getty, that it is the same claim, although our figure is \$170,000."

Getty: "All right. The Attorney General goes on to say that ...that accordingly, that to appropriate this prior to the hearing and the trial would be violate of chapter 30, Section...37, Section 439.23. Have you considered that?"

Peters: "Representative Getty, I have not considered that, and frankly, in all due respect to the Attorney General's office, I have had some experience with the way they handle the claims of some people who come before the Court of Claims who are entitled to money, and, in all due respect to the Gentleman who called you, I think some of his staff members don't exactly do the job that they are hired to do, and I am somewhat critical of the Attorney General's office in that regard."

Getty: "Have you made some independent investigation to seek to determine if indeed this would be proper for us to appropriate?"

Peters: "In all honesty, Representative Getty, I have not made a personal investigation of it. I was informed of the matter. We did contact...or did receive a letter rather from the Department of Mental Health, and that letter indicates to us that they have removed their



objection to the payment, that they are now in agreement, that they were in error in not making the payment, and I would assume that probably is the basis of the...of the suit at the Court of Claims, and it does seem to me that when you are dealing with schools of this nature, taking care of the handicapped and so forth and so on, that \$170,000 waiting another year really by the time we come back or so to take care of that appropriation, is an awful lot of money to...to keep away from them. Also, I might just indicate, Representative, that this will go back to the Senate, because it is an Amendment, and I would assure you that between now and then, and I'm sure the Senators also will be looking into it, that if the matter is not clear enough to them, that I certainly would urge the Members of the Senate to remove this if there is something quote, fishy, unquote in offering of this money."

Getty: "All right. I...I'm not sure if I clearly understood you. Did you say the Department...is that the Department of Public Aid?"

Peters: "No, I have a letter here dated June 4, Representative Getty. If you want, I will read it, and...so it'll be in the record at any rate. From the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, it's to Mr. Robert 'Klingburg', President of the 'Klingburg' Schools. It says: Dear Bob, The 'Klingburg' School is currently one of the private sector facilities that is providing full third share...full third shift coverage for its residents in compliance with the January 1, 1970 license standards as published by the Department of Children and Family Services. Since the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board, created under the provision of Senate Bill 395, has identified that the Illinois Office of Education is responsible for educational costs and other participating state agencies are responsible for program costs, I would



contend that the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities should be responsible for supporting the program effort related to night shift coverage. As such, I intend to raise this issue at the next regular meeting of the Governor's Purchase Care Rate Review Board. It is signed Robert 'Devito', Director."

Getty: "Well, then wouldn't we be better if we were to appropriate this \$170,000 that the Department says is now due in owing in either the Department's Bill or an omnibus appropriation, so it would go through the Department and would obviate the necessity of having it on the Court of Claims, where it raises some possible problem?"

Peters: "Representative, I am informed that ordinarily these monies are paid out by the Illinois Office of Education, and...and our appropriation herenow is to the Comptroller, so that he can end up paying those monies out. As I said, Mike, I...you know, if there is a lot of turmoil about this, and there does appear to be a lot of question about it, I certainly don't want to be, you know, a part or a participant of something that does not sound right. But, on the information we have, it looks okay."

Getty: "All right. Then what you're saying is, this will not go to fund a claim awarded or that has not been awarded through the Court of Claims, per se, but will be used by the Department to pay what they feel is a proper outstanding obligation. Is that correct?"

Peters: "That's correct."

Getty: "All right."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster. Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Peters, is this to come from General Revenue monies, or what is the source of funding?"

Peters: "The source, Representative Satterthwaite, is General



Revenue funding."

Satterthwaite: "Is it not true that if payment were made through the Office of Education that it might qualify for federal mon...monies given to us to cover 94142 payments?"

Peters: "That...that is an excellent question, Representative Satterthwaite. We...we are perplexed to give you an accurate answer right now."

Satterthwaite: "Well, it does seem to me that there are enough questions about this mechanism of paying what may be a perfectly legitimate claim from the school that I would suggest that we might want to hold this and see whether or not it would qualify for federal funding instead."

Peters: "I...I have no direct answer for you now, Representative Satterthwaite, and I would hesitate to make a guess and to lead you astray in your determination as to how you would vote on this. But, if there...as I indicated to Representative Getty, ~~if there does appear to be some~~ problem with this, I would assure you that I would urge the Senate Sponsor to not accept this Amendment when it gets there. If we can find the federal government can end up paying for this, I would certainly ask that the language in here be changed to do that."

Satterthwaite: "Well, in...in response to that it would seem to me that there are enough questions that have been raised here on the floor right now that we either ought to reject this Amendment and wait until we can find a better way of funding it, or else just go ahead and... and, you know, vote it up or down, but I really think there are a number of questions that need to be addressed on this issue. I'm quite surprised, quite frankly, that the minority Representative on...minority spokesman on the Appropriations Committee would be coming in asking us to expend General Revenue Funds directly to a private institution when instead we might be utilizing federal monies and saving our General Revenue monies for other



purposes in the state, and I would urge a 'no' vote if we persist in a vote on this Amendment."

Peters: "Mr. Chairman..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham..."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I...if I might. Representative Satterthwaite, what we are moving...progressing under is the fact that presently the private tuition grants in the Illinois Office of Education budget are General Revenue Fund monies. We assume this would be the same, but I cannot say that to you with 100% certainty, and, you know, don't want you to come back and say that I mislead you, but that is our impression, that we are taking it from the right place."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, is recognized."

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The main question's put, and the Sponsor's recognized. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would just hope for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', and all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 voting 'aye' and 6 voting 'no', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Gaines, amends Senate Bill 486 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is to appropriate \$1600 to the Equal



Employment Opportunity Office in its commodities line for the rest of this year. They were formerly when this budget...their budget was originally passed last year... they were a division of the Department of Personnel. At the beginning of this year they were made an independent department, and there were some additional expenses incurred, and they need this to pay the bills."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments? The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Steczo-Mahar, amends Senate Bill 486 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 2 the following: Section 2A..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 486 appropriates \$100,000 to the Department of Mental Health for permanent improvements at the Howe Developmental Center in Tinley Park. This money will pay for renovations to...to license seven buildings that were brought under compliance under the new Mental Health Code we passed last year. The buildings will serve as an admissions center...emergency admissions center at the center. The project has been completed, and the cost was \$200,000. The bill was sent to the Comptroller's office, and the Comptroller refused payment for \$100,000 of the work and said that the payments would go through provided that they money...or the building was listed as a permanent improvement. This project has nothing to do with the proposed conversion of the Tinley Park Mental Health Center. The Department of Mental Health is in favor, and I would appreciate the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor say 'aye'."



Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. I have two requests up here for two Bills to be taken back from Third left, and then we're going to go back on the Priority of Call. The first one is 1341, and the second one will be 1099 when we get to it. Representative Hoffman requests leave to move Senate Bill 1341 back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1341 on page 1, line 2, and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These three Amendments, two that I'm proposing and one that Representative Hallstrom's proposing, take care of a couple of school problems...or three problems that have come up recently. The first Amendment deals with the question of alternative education, and the relationship of educational service regions who provide this alternative education and the local school district. The regional superintendent over in Decatur made a request to the Illinois Office of Education in terms of...of the ability of the...his office to contract with local school districts and receive support...financial support from the local district to run an alternative education program. The Office of Education indicated that there was no authority in the law to do that, although many school districts have contracted with not only regional superintendents, but also with the private agencies for this purpose, and what this Amendment does is provide the statutory authority for them to do what many people are already doing, and I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."



Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1341. Representative Waddell is recognized."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "This alternative business is rather new to me, and I would imagine to some of the Members here. Are you saying that these students that, for one reason or other, that are kicked out of school, then because they cannot transfer to another school within that district that then we should be supplying an alternative school and then turning around and funding that school when they can't get back to the school that they were kicked out of?"

Hoffman: "This...the alternative...the alternative programs don't necessarily apply to people who have been, using your expression, kicked out of school. For a whole variety of reasons, some which have nothing to do with discipline, some individuals have a difficult time adjusting to a typical or a regular type of school program. In a number of places where, Decatur this happens to be, they have set up programs where smaller number of students who come in from a number of different schools who run on different kinds of schedules than you normally run on in a typical school setting. In some cases their...the difficulty that the child may have had in the typical school setting is caused by that particular environment. In another environment frequently he can or she, as the case may be, can succeed very successfully, and that's the purpose of...for these programs."

Waddell: "Well, I may be sympathetic, but I'd like to know for my own information just what...what are some of these categories of some of these kids besides being incorrigible and what have you?"

Hoffman: "Some of them have a difficult time adjusting to the...the regular schedule type of program, the large



group, the...the classroom-size instruction, the inability to stay in one...one place for 55 minutes. It's a whole variety of reasons that people have this kind of difficulty. In some cases, the issue of incorrigibility, of course, is involved."

Waddell: "Well, the two that I'm acquainted with, Lake County, for example, is a private, for profit school. By contrast, in McHenry County it is not, will not, and they don't want to finance that type of school over there, and that's a not-for-profit one. Are there any other types?"

Hoffman: "Basically, in terms of their organization, there aren't. The one that I have particular reference to is a non-for-profit kind of organ...school run through the regional...the regional superintendent. There's no other charge in the law in terms of age or anything else or in terms of funding. It merely provides that the school, if they wish and there's no one forcing them to, wishes to contract for this service with the regional superintendent, this gives them the authority to do so."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further discussion, the Gentleman from DuPage has moved...Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Van Duyne: "Along the same line, Gene, I'm...I'm getting the scenario that if these children, for whatever reason, can't cope with the normal school, you're going to provide through some kind of a grant here to place them in a private institution, whether it's non-for-profit or whatever?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "No, that's...that isn't correct. Number one, the local...the local school district has to make the agreement or has to agree to do this. We're not making anybody do anything. This is putting into the statute language



which permits these kinds of contracts to be worked out between local school districts and regional superintendent if they...if they so wish. It is...no...nobody's being forced to do anything."

Van Duynes: "Okay, yeah. Yes, I understand that, but how would the pay ba...the...would they divert the payment that would ordinarily be...?"

Hoffman: "No, no. The...the payment would go...the payment would...the payment would be no different. It goes, you know, they go at ADA count with the local school, but this makes it possible for that local school then to contract a regional superintendent and use the resources that they get in to pass it on. That's all."

Van Duynes: "Okay. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "No further questions or discussion? The Gentleman has moved to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1341. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1341 on page 1 in line 1 and 5, and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment relates to the supervision and control of the school districts by a county superintendent. All we do in this Amendment is provide that the county superintendent, which the majority of the children attend school at the time the district is organized, shall exercise supervision and control over that particular school district. It clarifies the law as it exists now, and until such time as this determines that 60% of the children are in some other county, then that particular county would accept the responsibility for supervision. We have a number of school districts which lie across county lines, and the intent of this is



to...is to maintain whatever degree we can, the status quo of the relationship between county superintendent of the schools and local school districts."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1341. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Hallstrom, amends Senate Bill 1341 on page 1, line 1 by inserting after..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment simply answers a need in my area. There's a section of Skokie that belongs to the Evanston school district, and yet the parents of the children going to Evanston school district cannot vote for the township trustees. This Bill...Amendment simply takes care of that situation. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 it is, I think, isn't it on the...Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1341. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, seeks leave to move Senate Bill 1099 back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Catania, amends Senate Bill 1099 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1099 provides that school bus seat backs in the State of Illinois will have to be fitted with seat back crash pads if federal funds become



available, and this would be effective January 1, 1981.

I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved...Representative Getty."

Getty: "I don't seem to be able to find that Amendment. Has it been distributed?"

Catania: "Yes, I have a copy."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm advised it has been distributed. The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1099. All those in favor say 'aye'."

Catania: "Aye."

Speaker Flinn: "Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Representative Beatty has requested that we move Senate Bill 1019 back from Third Reading to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amend... Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 1019 on page 2, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Amendment #1? I...are you sure Amendment #1 hasn't been adopted yet?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, this has not been adopted yet."

Beatty: "I'm sorry. Would you take this out of the record for the present?"

Speaker Flinn: "You want to leave it on Second Reading, I take it? Let's put it back on Third, so we keep our Calendar straight and then you can make the request when you...you want to...Representative Beatty, do you request that 1125 be moved back? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, has moved...has asked leave of the House to move Senate Bill 1125 from Third Reading back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objections? Where is it on the Calendar at, John? The



Clerk hasn't been able to find it so far. We found it. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1125. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund and the State Employers Retirement System Article of the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions...oh, this Bill was read a second time previously. No motions filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 1125 on page 1, line 1 by deleting Section 7-137 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "I'd like to have Amendment 2 withdrawn, because it's defective."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman requests permission to withdraw Amendment #2. No objections. Amendment's withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 1125 on page 1, line 1 by deleting Section 7-137 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Yes, this Bill deals with CETA employees, dealing whether or not they would be covered by the retirement system. The Bill itself says that...that...makes it mandatory that they not be covered, but my Amendment makes it optional for the retirement system to cover these employees. We think this is a better way, and the federal government's supplying the funds. This Amendment makes it optional. It also adds three retirement systems to this. The teachers' retirement system, the judges' retirement system, and the state universities' retirement



system. I ask for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yeah, indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "Do I understand that we're now going to allow CETA employees to draw a retirement..."

Beatty: "The federal gov..."

Griesheimer: "...for seeking employment?"

Beatty: "All right. That's right. The...the federal government's supplying the money for this, and I believe it's one of the requirements that we make it optional that they do benefit. The federal government sends the money in, and during the...during the time the government is supplying the money, we would like it...to make it a...to give them this benefit."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the CETA program is probably one of the most ghastly programs that's ever been designed by the federal government. It's a rat hole of money. Senator Hayakawa has written a number of very interesting articles of how the program, which started at about a half a billion dollars, has grown into a five billion dollar boondoggle, and now this program that was initiated to give people an opportunity to work their way into the business community, find employment, establish trade, we're now going to give them retirement for this temporary employment. I think that this follows right through. This is the ridiculous end, and...and I certainly appreciate the Sponsor's desire to use federal money, but, on the other hand, I don't think we should participate in this. If the federal government is this stupid, I don't think the state government should participate. I don't think we should adopt this. I think the Bill should be left as is, barring CETA employees from any form of retirement."



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

Friedrich: "Well, I'd just like to embellish a little bit on what the last speaker said. We now have CETA employees who are working for the state, and when there's a layoff, the CETA employees stay on and the...the certified state employees, who have taken examinations under the personnel code and qualified, get laid off, and I'd say this is one more straw, and I'm opposed to it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty to close."

Beatty: "Well, I think the...the Members may be confused. The initial Bill made it mandatory that they not participate. This merely says that they can participate, and I think that the finding is that maybe the Members' wishes will come to fruition eventually. I think it's a good Amendment for the present. I think that we should give the benefit to CETA employees. We may not...personally, some of our Members may not agree. I think it's a good program. It's putting people to work who are not able to get work. If they are working, they are doing their work, and the federal government is supplying the money, and they work the number of years sufficient for a pension. I would think that they should be entitled to one. I think it's probably a good program, and I ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1125. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. All those in...all those in favor vote 'aye', and all those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Borchers to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Borchers: "I'd just like to point out in my town, Decatur, Illinois, we have a \$50,000 a year engineer. At least that amount...minimum, and his wife is on CETA, and I think it's a good rea...one good reason why to vote 'no'."



Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 63 voting 'aye' and 59 voting 'no', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Let's move back to 1019 now. First, does the Gentleman have leave to keep 1125 on Short Debate? It was on Short Deba...leave is granted. Is there objections? There's objections. It's on Long Debate. Senate Bill 1019. Does the Gentleman have leave to take Senate Bill 1019 back to Second? Hearing no objections, leave is granted, and the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 1019 on page 2, line 21..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "This is a Bill dealing with summary administration, and there...it's just a technical Amendment changing words like from decedents to decedents, spelling it properly, and things of that nature. It's a simple Amendment. A clean up Amendment. It does nothing at all to the Bill, except correct the term...the words. I ask for adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1019. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 540. Representative Terzich. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 540. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning clerks of courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill...Amendment is Repre-



sentative Lee Daniels' Amendment, which I...I mentioned I would agree..."

Speaker Flinn: "Let's...let me..."

Terzich: "...to do in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "...get it to move back to Second here first. I'm sorry, I shouldn't have recognized you so soon. The Gentleman has asked leave to move Senate Bill 540 from Third back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Daniels, amends Senate Bill 540 on page 1 by deleting lines 13 through 28 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, this Amendment deals with the fees for clerks. What it does is it leaves the salaries for the clerks up to the County Board to determine the...the amount of remuneration, and I have no objections to Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 540. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. That's the last request I had for moving Bills. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. That's the last request I had for moving Bills back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment, so we'll go back to the Priority of Call, and I think we left off at Senate Bill 1068. Senate Bill 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz." You're on Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Take that out for just one second."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1120. Representative Neff, you're next up. You're on deck."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1120. A Bill for an Act to amend the Aviation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff. Senate Bill 1120."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1120 is sponsored by Representative...as said...the House Sponsors is Representative Garmisa and myself. The Senate Sponsor was Senator Nimrod, and actually what we're doing is amending the Illinois Aeronautic Act, and as...as the Bills have amended there why it ends up we're able to get some help actually for 'Pelwaukee' airport. Also, it must be with the agreement of Midway and, also, O'Hare. And, through this legislation, with federal money we may be able to get some...some help for these three airports, and this has been okayed by the Department of Transportation, and we have no objections to it. It passed the Senate 52 to nothing. It passed the House Committee in the House 17 to 1, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Sponsor hold this Bill for a brief time? Can you hold it a minute, Clarence?"

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Well, I have noticed that this Bill was moved to Third Reading even though Representative Lechowicz and I have filed an Amendment in a timely fashion. I don't know how that happened, and I wonder if someone could shed some light on it. Were both of us off the floor when the Bill was called for Second Reading?"

Speaker Flinn: "I don't have any idea. Representative Neff is the Sponsor, and it...it's out of the record now..."

Skinner: "Well, the Bill, as it is, just is not acceptable in my opinion, and I really think it ought to be taken



to Second Reading and put the Amendment on it..."

Speaker Flinn: "Discuss that with the Sponsor."

Skinner: "...Illinois."

Speaker Flinn: "You can discuss that with the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1220."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1220. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff. Senate Bill 7...1220."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1220 is sponsored by Senator McMillan in the Senate and sponsored in the House by Representative Domico and myself. This Bill all it does is amend the Highway Code and particularly the portion of it relating to townships and road district bonds. This raises the permissible maximum rates of interest from 6 to 8 percent, and I think we're all aware of how interest rates have gone up, and these folks just can't sell these bonds at 6% and it would allow them to go up to 8 if it had to, and the way interest rates have gone up the last year, why, I think they'll have to have the 8% if they raise any...sell any bonds."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1220 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1226."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1226. A Bill for an Act amending certain Acts herein named and rate...in relation to maintenance of grade crossings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1226 is sponsored by myself and



Representative Kornowicz, and what it would do, it would permit money from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund to be used for maintenance of grade crossings upon order by Illinois Commerce Commission. Presently, the money...well, the money in the Grade Crossing Protection Fund is derived from the state's motor fuel tax receipts. The Department of Transportation places \$500,000 in the Grade Crossing Protection Fund monthly amounting to six million dollars annually. The Illinois Commerce Commission obligates the money and DOT expends it. Present law dictates that such money may only be used for separation of grades, construction, and reconstruction, and such other projects as ICC finds necessary. Nothing is in there to allow for repair and maintenance. According to ICC, in 1978, there was 767 highway-railroad grade crossing accidents involving motor vehicles, and this...this would just allow the Department of Transportation and the ICC to use part of this six million dollars for repair and maintenance of grade crossings. It passed out of the Senate on a unanimous vote and passed out of the House Transportation Committee also with a unanimous vote."

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

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

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Winchester, this amount of money does not come out of the local motor fuel tax, does it?"

Winchester: "No, it does not."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "No further discussion? Further discussion? Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Chairman and Members of the Committee and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1226 is a Bill that's been passed by the Senate Transportation Committee and also by the Senate, 50-0. This is a Bill that's really needed.



In fact, I just faced the Senate Transportation Committee, and there was two Bills that were passed in regards to railroad crossings and obstructions, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is...Representative Anderson, the Gentleman from LaSalle, is seeking recognition."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Sponsor."

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

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Sponsor, under this particular Act I understand that the state's...by protecting new...by installing new devices, that is their share of the crossing, and the railroad is to maintain the particular lights, and it's also my understanding that there's 8 to 10 thousand nonprotected grade crossings in Illinois. Now, if we start spending money for maintenance, which I understand the railroad is to do, how are you going to, you know, start moving in the direction of putting new devices where they're needed?"

Winchester: "Representative Anderson, I agree with what you're saying. All this Bill does is allow the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Department of Transportation to use it for maintenance if they so have the money to do so with. If they don't have it, then they can't apply it. There's other areas where there is some obligations already for funds, but if there is available money, they can apply it. The railroads do still have obligations to the...the repair and maintenance, also. But, this just allows them to use the money if they have it available."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Chairman...Speaker and Chairman of the...Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."



Hallock: "Will the priority still be to establish grade crossings where, in fact, there are none today under this Bill, or will the priority now be to maintain only and exclude building ones in the future?"

Winchester: "It's my understanding that the Illinois Commerce Commission still feels that it's main obligation is the installation, not the repair and maintenance."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "As I understand this, Representative Winchester, the...the gist of this Bill is to allow them to go into these funds with direction of this...with the Department of Transportation direction for the purpose of maintenance. Is that correct?"

Winchester: "With the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Illinois Department of Transportation."

Griesheimer: "All right. Now, this would probably be in an emergency situation, would it not?"

Winchester: "I would imagine. Yes, that would be correct."

Griesheimer: "All right. Is there any provision in the Bill to require the large railroads to reimburse the fund for the cost of this emergency repair?"

Winchester: "I'm told that there is not."

Griesheimer: "There is not?"

Winchester: "That is correct."

Griesheimer: "So that, in other words, we are facing up, or the taxpayers in this state, are facing up to doing that which the railroads should do. Is that correct?"

Winchester: "Well, that's one way of putting that. That's not the intention of the Bill, but that's one way of putting it. Correct."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again we find ourselves in the position where our government is obligating itself in a wholly new area, and I would merely call to the



attention of the Members the railroads are in business for a profit. Part of their profit is to cover their outlying costs. One of their costs is maintaining grade crossings, so that they can be used safely by the citizens of our state. I don't believe it's the position of the State of Illinois to go into the...the repair and maintenance of grade crossings. I think they're just more than lucky that we even allow this money from the state to be used for the purpose of installing these facilities. Actually, I think that's the railroad's responsibility as well, but I don't think at this point in time that we should expand this any further."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the sentiments of the last speaker. Right now the railroads have the responsibility of maintaining and repairing the ...the crossings, and it seems to me if the state takes on this burden, the railroads will not only become more delinquent, but they will look forward to this type of legislation, because it's going to save money in their own pockets. This is not a responsibility of the state. It's a responsibility of the railroads themselves, and with passing this, then the State of Illinois would have no...no choice but to fight, fight, fight, and they would lose every battle, and I would think that this should be amended to make the railroads reimburse for any railroad crossing repair that was done. I think it should be taken back for an Amendment to do that purpose and if not, I would say we ought to vote 'no'."

Winchester: "To close, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "No, we have someone else here...they turned their light out now, so you're...you're recognized to close. Oh, Representative Skinner, that's who it was. I'm sorry. I apologize to you, Sir."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, somebody has to speak for the administration on this floor. The administration is opposed to this Bill, and the reason they're opposed to this Bill is that there are 8 to 10 thousand unprotected grade crossings in this state right now. Now, we can either spend the money that is coming from road fund money to protect grade fund...grade crossings that have no protection other than a wooden crossing right now, or we can siphon the money off over time to subsidize the railroads under a...a mandate they now have under state law, which they are now attempting to squiggle out from under...to squirm out from under. It's their responsibility to maintain the grade crossings, and I certainly oppose this Bill, and I think anybody from a rural area that votes for this Bill ought to think very seriously about how they're going to feel the next time some rural resident ends up getting killed at an unprotected grade crossing. At that point you're going to have to ask yourself, did the money to build the grade crossing...to...to protect the grade crossing at which people died...did it go to repair a grade crossing instead? And the answer probably will be 'yes'. For that reason I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester to close."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the House. Most of the comments that have been made on this Bill are probably true, and I...I respect the opinions of those Members on their views. However, all this does is give the Department...allow the Department of Transportation and the Illinois Commerce Commission to use these funds if necessary. We need some flexibility. There are lots of maintenance...repair and maintenance that need to be done to...to our grade crossings now. There's been tremendous amounts of accidents. The railroads are in the process and are doing as much repair and maintenance as they possibly can, but there are special occasions when we



need some additional money...money that maybe the railroads can't handle that the Department of Transportation and the Commerce Commission can authorize to take care of that particular grade crossing where there have been serious accidents. All we're doing is allowing...allowing the Department of Transportation and the Commerce Commission to be flexible with this money and to use it if they see the necessity to use it. It doesn't mean now that we're just going to go out and mass spend six million dollars on repair and maintenance that's the responsibility of the railroads. It just means that we have some flexibility to use it in specific incidents where we actually really, really need it. That's all, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1226 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish'? Representative Conti to explain his vote.. One minute. Timer's on."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a grade crossing in my district that's killed close to 19 people. We have been trying for years to get an underpass and overpass, and we're unsuccessful for the simple reason that if you do put in an underpass and overpass, it would dissect the community in two and completely emasculate that community. However, we've asked the railroad, the Milwaukee Railroad, which is in the hands of the receiver to repair the crossing...the grade crossing we have now, which is a 300 foot diagonal grade crossing. There have been motorcycle...people who drive motorcycles and students that have to go from one end of the town to the other end to go...get to the high school actually have to get off of their bicycles or their mopeds and walk the 325 foot diagonal crossing. This... the Milwaukee-St. Paul claims they haven't got the funds. We have tried to work along with the state on it. The



total cost to a small municipality was over \$450,000. We need this crossing very badly. When you lose 19 lives in the last 15 years over this crossing, we need legislation like this."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye' and 47 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We're... Representative J. J. Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, a few moments back I had objected to Senate Bill 1176, going back to the Short Debate Calendar. There was a misunderstanding. I would like to remove that objection, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "What...what was the Bill number?"

Wolf: "Senate Bill 1176."

Speaker Flinn: "1125, I believe it was. Representative Beatty's."

Wolf: "Beatty's. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty, was your Bill #1125 that Representative Wolf objected to? The Gentleman has withdrawn his objections. Are there any further objections to leaving this Bill on Short Debate? Hearing none, the Bill remains on Short Debate. Let's back up now. Representative Leverenz was not ready a minute ago, and he's now informed me he's ready. Back up to 1068. Senate Bill 1068."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1068 would require that the Director of Insurance report annually also to the General Assembly as well as they do now to the Governor of the State. The report would have to include abstracts of the companies that operate in the



State of Illinois, their annual statements, the summaries of the official examinations, the statement of receipts and expenditures by the Department, and other information and recommendations relevant to the insurance or any insurance laws in Illinois, and I would solicit your 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "I have two questions, Ted. The first is, who would read it? And the second is, who would understand it?"

Leverenz: "Oh, your first question, I think the Chairman of the House Insurance Committee would most definitely read it. The information is vital to the operation of that Committee as well as it is to the operation of the House and the Senate. Secondly, the staff needs this information to provide the Members of the General Assembly and those Members on that Committee with the needed analysis, so that they can make right decisions."

Kempiners: "I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that it would be a lot easier for the staff to those Committees to, once a year, make a request to the Director for whatever they need, and it would save the taxpayers of this state an awful lot of money than to have the Director spend the money to print 236 copies of this report when at least 234 of those...or 232 of those copies probably won't even be read. I think that this is just an added requirement that's unnecessary, and those who are interested could make the request, and I'm sure the Director of the Department would be more than happy to respond to that request, and it's right...while it might be just a small savings, it would be a savings if this Bill were not passed."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huff."



Huff: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a..."

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Huff: "You enumerated, Representative, that some of the things that you would want to look at would be expenditures, and...and what were the other things you talked about this Bill would do?"

Leverenz: "It would include the annual statements of the insurance companies regulated by the state, summary of...of the official examinations which is extremely critical to the viability of those insurance companies as they operate in Illinois..."

Huff: "Well..."

Leverenz: "...and it would open up to view information that is not now available, and I believe would not be provided by the Department of Insurance unless it was so stipulated by state statute."

Huff: "Well, let me ask you one question. Would this include also the earned profits, or, in other words, I mean the earned premiums, or, in other words, the profits that the...each company makes at the end of the year?"

Leverenz: "Yes, it would."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones..."

Huff: "If I could speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh...oh, you're not done. I'm sorry, Representative Huff. Go ahead. Continue."

Huff: "I...I'm rising to support this, because as a Member of the Insurance Committee, I was appalled this summer when we requested information relevant to rates from the Director of Insurance only to find out that he didn't have this information. I think that in the long run this will...this consolation of information that this Bill seeks to gather will help go a long ways in...in setting actuaries that we'll all be able to look at and evaluate and take out the rather subject...subjective



posture that usually surrounds the question of rates. I think this is a good Bill, and...and it's worthy of our consideration and it's definitely good for the consumer."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1068. I just had a meeting this afternoon with the Director, and the Director indicated to me at that time they are trying to do all they can in gathering information so that we can determine whether or not insurance companies are redlining. In response to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, I think most Members of the General Assembly read the information that is given to them, and I think all 236 copies that will be published will be read by all the Members of this General Assembly so that they can intelligently vote on legislation when it comes before them concerning insurance, so I urge a green vote on Senate Bill 1068."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion on the...in support, I would ask that you take into consideration that we should know in a report the affirmative action that is taken by the Department of Insurance and the financial operation of the companies that are controlled by that Department. Certainly their financial condition should be spelled out in detail. The report would also provide the staff the critical information that is not now gathered by the Department of Insurance. The Bill passed in the Senate 51-3, and I would, too, ask for your 'aye' votes here on the House floor."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1068 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye' and



63 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 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. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very simple Bill. All the Bill does is prohibit local mutual insurance companies from cancelling an insurance policy solely on the basis of claim. This is already in the insurance code, but local mutual companies are exempt from the code, so they will... it will require them to fall into the same category as other insurance companies, and that is to prohibit them from cancelling your policy solely on the basis of claim, and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose 1348. I suggest to you that if somebody has a claim, that can very well be an indication of a bad risk. I put you in the position of, not an insurance company because that's too large to consider, but consider yourself a local grocery store or a local department store that issues credit, perhaps takes in checks from people. If you have a couple of checks bounce, that is a claim. You look at that, and you consider that person a bad risk, and you drop them from your policy of accepting checks. This is the same kind of thing that the insurance companies do. If, indeed, they have a claim, they investigate the claim and through that investigation, determine that somebody is a bad risk, they should then be allowed to drop that risk. Now the companies that we're dealing with here are mostly



downstate companies. They're mutually companies, primarily farmers put together to help insure farmers. You're not talking about the Allstates; you're not talking about the Prudentials, you're not talking about the big guys. These are small companies. There are a great many of them downstate. For the most part, they are farmers who have banded together to provide fire protection for themselves, because the large companies don't want to. Now, to take away their ability to protect themselves and their mutual organizations they have formed, I feel is bad. I do not think this Bill should pass, and I recommend your vote against it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Cal Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I reluctantly oppose it, and...and its... the good House Sponsor, but I think that...that we should recognize who we are affecting here. This Bill seeks to preclude the small county and township mutual insurance companies, most of which write just farm insurance and small town insurance throughout downstate Illinois. It seeks to make certain that they cannot cancel an insurance policy because of claims that have been paid. Well, I'd like to point out to you that most of those small companies write policies for a five-year term. They're not like the Allstates, and the State Farms, and the Kemper companies, and all the others, the...the giants in the industry. They're very, very small companies, but most of them write their policies for five years. Now, this...this legislation if it's passed, will say that an insurance company cannot cancel a risk because of claims which may have resulted from poor maintenance. It may be a case of arson, it may be a lot of reasons that are associated with the risk, but the Bill would stop that small insurance company from cancelling the risk, and it...they



may not be able to get off that risk for five years. Now, I submit that the Bill which passed the General Assembly in passed years that affects Allstate, State Farm, some of the big giant companies, was not so serious, because most of those policies are only written for one year. But, I think that...that this Bill, which has no affect on the City of Chicago at all and only affects those downstate small companies should not be passed."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker hit it right on the nose, and I'm a little bit surprised to see Chicago Legislator, my good friend Representative Jones, sponsoring a Bill that would tinker with the downstate country, small town, township, and county mutual firms that when they have a loss, they're made up by assessment among the members and primarily write the kind of policies Representative Schuneman was discussing and primarily are writing policies for their friends and neighbors whom they know, and if they want to cancel their friends and neighbors, I think to...to lessen the impact upon the rest of the members of the mutual firm, and I think everyone here should understand that distinction that assessment procedures are necessary to a mutual firm to keep it afloat, that this Bill ought to be defeated and you ought to leave us alone Chicago."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones to close."

Jones: "All right. Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies... and Ladies and Gentlemen. In response to the previous speakers, you know, I...I may live in Chicago, but I also have a farm in my district, and this Bill is a design to help the farmers. Not the local mutual insurance company, but the famers. Local and mutual insurance companies write hail insurance, windstorm insurance, cyclone and tornado insurance, and just because the farmer happens to have a claim, because he has some heavy



hail and damage his crop, that's no reason for the insurance company to cancel him. It is already in the insurance code for the...for an insurance company that...that offer fire and extend the coverage to a homeowner's policy, for instance, either in Chicago or other Members in the State of Illinois. But just as Representative Birkinbine pointed out, if you want to represent the local mutual insurance company, you speak for them, but if you're talking about downstate farmers, you will vote for this Bill, because the farmers want this Bill, and I solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1348 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brummer, one minute to explain your vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I...I would have to take exception with Emil Jones speaking on behalf of the farmers. There are some of us downstate who speak on behalf of the farmers, also, and there were no farmers that testified on behalf of this Bill in Committee. In fact, the...the Director and the people who operate these local mutuals are the farmers. They are the ones that you're now saying you can't cancel as a result of risk. The local farmers are the board members, and if the...if there are not sufficient assets to pay the claims, all those local farmers are assessable for the losses as a result of those claims, so I think those farmers ought to be able to make a decision to whether or not a...a policy can be cancelled or not to protect your own solvency."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm a Member of the Insurance Committee, also, and ...and although the people that I heard testify, the need for this Bill didn't have labels on the forehead, I must say that the testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of this Bill, and that's why the Bill passed out 10-4."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand that this is Representative Jones' announcement for the United States' Senate seat in his state-wide campaign?"

Speaker Flinn: "I think he missed all that anyway. Representative Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I think there must be a mistake up on the board. Something's wrong electronically. You know, we're coming down to the closing weeks of the Session, and I want all my downstate friends to know that we are trying to help you. We are not always coming here with our hands out trying to get what belongs to us, so this is a good downstate piece of legislation. You are voting against the farmers in your own district, and I want you to remember that a...a Legislator from Chicago with a farm in his district, who is concerned about the farmers, tried to help you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "In response to the last remark, with friends like this we don't need enemies."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 50 voting 'aye', 84 voting 'no', and this Bill having not received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. We want to back up now. I understand Representative Neff... Representative Neff has got some...some of the problems worked out with Senate Bill 1120, and we'll back up to 1120."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1120. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Aeronautics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff. Just a minute. Let me try to get...let's have a little order. Let's be fair to the Sponsor now. He...Representative Neff."



Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1120, which we explained briefly a short time ago, and somebody had some questions on it, but after we discussed it, why, to my knowledge there's no opposition on this Bill. Senate Bill 1120 passed out of the Senate with 52-no votes. It passed out of the House Transportation Committee with 17-1 votes. The Bill... Bill is sponsored by myself and Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is..."

Neff: "The main intent of the Bill would be to help those airports in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, especially 'Palwaukee' Airport in Cook County, which is in some serious financial trouble according to the Division of Aeronautics of the Department of Transportation. 'Palwaukee' acts as a general aviation airport as well as a reef airport...relief airport for O'Hare by basing... by basing at least 500 aircrafts, mostly corporations. This would be a severe handicap if we did not have the airport in Milwaukee, because it would definitely overtax O'Hare airport and...and I want to add, also, that this Bill...there would be not...no money appropriation. There's no money in it this time. None will be appropriated unless the General Assembly do so, and it would be done to specially...specific referencemendation...recommendations of the Department of Aeronautics in Illinois. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1120 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. I would appreciate it if the Members would not conduct themselves in such manner over bananas. It might imply something about us. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 voting 'aye' and 3 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 57."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 57. A Bill for an Act to amend the Section of an Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 57 increases the fees that States Attorneys charge defendants convicted of certain crimes. The monies collected by the fees go into a special account which is used to pay for Assistant States Attorneys, and I would urge your support of Senate Bill 57."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 57 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 122 voting 'aye' and 10 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 65."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 65. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to designation of an emergency telephone number for use throughout the state. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Katz on Senate Bill 65."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the General Assembly, a few years ago, enacted House Bill 911 that established a state-wide emergency telephone number, and it projected a ten-year system within which the entire State of Illinois would be able to have 911 service. What is taking place is then that due to the problems that we all know about in the revenue field, some areas have not been able to implement the 911 program, because they have not had funding with which to do it. Senate Bill 65, sponsored by Senator Joyce, is simply a Bill that delays the date within which the compliance must be had with the provisions of House Bill 911, and



it defers it until the General Assembly provides funding for the program. It is a reasonable Bill, and it is a fact that local units of government do have problems coming up with the money, and I support Senate Bill 65. It would defer for a maximum of three years, the dates provided, but the three years would run from the time that we provide the funding rather than being a fixed period as it now is, and I would urge the adoption of Senate Bill 65."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is in the identical form in which it came from the Senate. It does nothing about furnishing funding, as Representative Katz pointed out. All that this Bill does is say that no one has to implement the 911 system until three years after the state provides the funds. Well, obviously, since we are not providing any funding it really doesn't do anything. I might point out that my Bill is making 911 permissive rather than mandatory. It passed out of Senate Committee unanimously this morning. I see no reason why this Bill should not be voted for."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Katz, to close."

Katz: "I appreciate the...the support of Mr. McMaster. The Bill, in my opinion, is needed in view of the absence of adequate funding. I would urge support for Senate Bill 65."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 65 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...it went out. Okay, we got to do that again. We...we lost that one. The question is, 'Shall House Bill...Senate 5 ...65 pass?' All those in favor...Senate Bill 65 pass..."



all those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We're going to back up and pick up Senate Bill 256, which was bypassed before because of a staff mistake, and that's been corrected, and the Clerk will read 256, if there's no objections. Hearing none, read 256."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 256. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning dental practice. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I'd like to take a minute to thank Representative McAuliffe and Cullerton for sponsoring this Bill with me. Senate Bill 256, as amended, no longer sets up an additional board. It gives the already existing Dental Examining Committee additional authority, and the dentist fees will cover the cost. After much work and cooperation with the Dental Society and Members of both sides of the aisle, we now have a good Bill that I don't believe anyone can object to, and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. Your light's on. There's no further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I know the Illinois Dental Society or whatever it's called was initially in favor of this Bill, but many of its Members were opposed to the Bill. Have the objections of the Members within the organization been resolved?"

Sumner: "Yes. They have been...the Amendment took care of that. There...everything is all ironed out, and the Chairman of the Committee and everyone is in agreeance."



Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 256 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 164 voting 'aye' and none voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 87."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 87. A Bill for an Act relating to medical expenses of prisoners in county jails. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 87 was sponsored in the Senate by Senator...Senators Grotberg and Maragos and in the House by myself and Representative Harris, and it deals with a very touchy question of payment of medical bills of the prisoners in county jails who are being held on state charges. We've had this issue before us in the past, and I feel a reasonable compromise, in my opinion, has been reached in this Bill in that the county would be required to pay the first \$2500 of the medical expenses, and then the state would pick up any expense beyond that \$2500. Under current law the county pays the full cost of all medical care for incarcerated persons, and I'd like to emphasize again this is...this would be for persons who are confined to or awaiting trial in a county jail where the confinement is pursuant to a state law, and I would urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Rep...Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. If you can remember back about five years ago, my first year in the House, I sponsored a Bill where the state would take care of all the expenses. And, my contention at that time was that if a fellow was injured



in a tavern brawl, or in a shootout, or a knifing, or anything like that, it had really no bearing on...on the county jail or the money that the...the people in the county had to allocate for these medical purposes. As the law states now, it...it merely states...a general vague statement saying that the sheriff is obligated to provide the incarceration with the food, lodging, and, if necessary, medical care, but I really believe, in all the wisdom of the Legislature in those days, they meant any injuries suffered while this person was in jail, having nothing to do with the injuries suffered before he...he became in contact with the...with the sheriff, so I'm in support of the Bill, but I wish to good God I would've known it was...it was on the docket. I would've liked to amend it where the...where the state pick up all the expenses, so I...I encourage everybody to support the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Campbell: "Bill, do you have any figures on what it costs per average person to the counties? Now, in other words, what I'm getting at is wondering how much help this is actually going to be to the counties."

Kempiners: "It would...it would fluctuate, Chuck. The Department of Corrections in their fisc...fiscal note said that it would be a cost of approximately 2.6 million dollars per year. However, Sandy 'Gam', who is an employee of the County Problems Commission did a survey of...of some of the...a random survey of some of the...of the counties, and most of the counties that she surveyed did not have expenditures in excess of 2500. I have two in Kane County, one was for 23,825; one was for 3,78...63. There was one in DuPage County for 14,000, so it would vary from year to year depending on, you



know, what the circumstances are."

Campbell: "Mr..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Campbell: "I...I rise in support of this Bill. I agree, too, that I think that, although it has been a compromise, I know that we've been trying to do this for some time, but it's certainly better than nothing, and I...I support the concept, but I'd like to see us pick up all of the tab on state charges. But, nevertheless, it doesn't seem to be possible to do so."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I'm not against the Bill, but I want to know what checks and balances would we have. Say I go in collusion with my colleague, Ed Bluthardt, and I have him falsely accuse me of some felony, and while I'm waiting trial I know I need a bypart...bypass heart operation, and after I'm in the county jail waiting for a hearing on this false accusation, he drops the charges after all my medical...do we have any checks and balances on that, and how are we going to protect the counties from something like that?"

Speaker Flinn: "You're asking me?"

Conti: "Yeah...no, I'm asking the Sponsor."

Kempiners: "Well, right now, Representative Conti, the...the county must pay all charges, and the only answer I could give you is that you'd have the same checks and balances as we have now, and...and I think that's part of the problem. I think there's been an abuse here, and if the state is going to pick up the tab, we might become a little rougher and establish some of those checks and balances, which we do not allow the counties to take off with now. That's all I can answer you. It'd be the



same as we have under the existing situation."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners to close."

Kempiners: "But, I agree with you. There are abuses."

Speaker Flinn: "You wish to close, Representative Kempiners?"

Kempiners: "Well, I would just like to reiterate that I think

that this is a...a good balance...a good compromise.

Many of us who feel that the county is...should not pick up the tab for prisoners being held on state charges, and have supported legislation in the past to have the state pick that up, feel that this is a step in the right direction, because basically on a catastrophic instance the state's going to pay for it, but if it's...a cost below 2500, the county's going to pay for it, and I would urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 87 pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye' and 9 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 209."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 209. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this amends the Article of the Illinois Pension Code relating to the State Board of Investments. It provides for an Executive Committee with authority to conduct Board business during the interim between the Board meetings and to report such business for ratification at the next Board meeting. It also adds the Board's investment authority through the trading and purchase or sale of listed options underlined securities owned by the Board. Apparently, the inability of the State Board of Investments to obtain a quorum at



its monthly meetings prompted the proposal of an Executive Committee. The business would be able to be conducted by the Executive Committee regardless of the presence of the Board Members. The Executive Committee would consist of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, recording secretary, and one other Member shall constitute an Executive Committee of the State Board of Investments. This was brought to the floor by one of the Members or the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission, and I would move for adoption of Senate Bill 209."

Speaker Flinn: "The...no further discussion? The quest... Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "A question of the Sponsor."

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

Friedrich: "Is the State Board of Investment a salaried Board?"

Terzich: "Yes, it is."

Friedrich: "And they can't get a quorum, and they're going to ...you're going to have somebody else hired to do their job?"

Terzich: "No, that's the...the pro...No, the problem is, is that the...some of the ex-official Members of the Board consist of the...the State Treasurer, the Chairman of the Illinois Public Pension Laws Commission, and other Chairmen of each pension fund or retirement system. The Executive Board is, in essence, salaried, but not all of the Members."

Friedrich: "The Pension Board is not salaried? Is that right?"

Terzich: "I believe they are. I said that, however, the ex-official Members and other Members from the other pension systems are not."

Friedrich: "Well, it seems to me if that's their duty, they should be there."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."



Waddell: "What safeguards are built into this so that you wouldn't have a fast, small meeting?"

Terzich: "Well, again, that they will present the...the thing after the monthly meeting for ratification by the full Board. It's just that, in essence, the Executive Board is basically in control of the daily operations of the State Board of Investments, and they would report at the next meeting, you know, for ratification by the full Board."

Waddell: "In other words, there couldn't be any possibility of a...of a short notification...a short meeting, and..."

Terzich: "No, not really, because all of the Members that are participating in this are, you know, bonded Members... are covered by a bond."

Waddell: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "I move for adoption of Senate Bill 209."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 209 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Darrow, one minute to explain your vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation not only would allow this organization the authority to speculate on the stocks they already own, but they would also be able to speculate on those which are called puts. I don't believe that they should have this authority at the present time. They'll be out there speculating with these funds. Therefore, I solicit a 'no' vote."



Speaker Flinn: "Yeah, just a minute. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative...Representative Ralph Dunn to explain your vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I was going to ask, but they cut off the debate if this was the same Board that bought W. T. Grant stock. It's gone bankrupt, and had lost the State Pension Committee a lot of money. If it is, why, I'm voting 'no', because I'm not sure that they're doing a good job. I...I won't ask Mr. Terzich right now, but I just wondered if they have the power to invest and maybe make some bad investments. once in a while, because they don't attend."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I did mention on the Bill, number one, is that it adds the investment authority through the trading and purchase or sale of listed options. So, all it...all it is an option on underlying securities owned by the Board. It doesn't provide for the purchases of those stocks. They are, like I said, it's the sale of options...that there's approximately 2 or 3% loss because of the...the fact that they cannot get a quorum, you know, immediately, and that is has been recommended by the Board, and certainly all of the Members, who are participating in the State Board of Investments, are bonded. They do have a bond. The performance of the State Board of Investments over a period of years has been very, very good. This, I believe, resulted a number of years back when there were some losses by the State Board of Investments, but they have been making all of their investments very prudently, and has enjoyed a much favorable return for all of the systems that they are charged with investing these funds for, and why all a sudden someone would think that everyone's trying to make a quick grab off a rip-off. This State Board of Investments are carefully scrutinized. They



have qualified investment counselors. They have enjoyed a favorable return on their investments and a very low expense factor, and, in addition, that all of these Members who make these decisions on these investments are also bonded for any losses that might occur due to imprudent investments or malfeasance in the performance of their duty, so certainly I think that this is something that should be given to them. They have shown a very, very fine performance in the past, and I don't see why there would be any question of their performance now."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 voting 'aye' and 50 voting 'no', and the Bill having not received...Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Like all their other investments, I'll postpone this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has requested leave to postpone the consideration. Leave...leave is granted, hearing no objections. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, on the Order of Motions I have a motion filed, and I'd like to call that motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I...I cannot recognize you for that motion at this time."

Totten: "Well, I...I have a motion on file to go to that Order of Business, and I'd like five Members to join me, and I'd like to move to that Order of Business then."

Speaker Flinn: "You got more than five, so you...you didn't do any good. You wanted five only? Representative Totten, as I stated, I didn't recognize you for your... for your motion to begin with, and we're going to go on to the next Bill. You can appeal to the Chair...ruling of the Chair if you wish. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, the Rules give the Gentleman the right



to do what he wishes to do, and I know that you're an exceptionally fair presiding officer. I would hope you'd abide by the Rules, Representative and let Representative Totten put his motion, and let's see how the Members feel about it. That's the only fair and equitable thing to do. We've been getting along just fine today. We're moving Bills along. We haven't had any confrontations with the presiding officer, and I'm sure we won't have any with you in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Repres... Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Rules clearly provide for Mr. Totten to have this option. The requisite number of Members are joined with him. You've got an obligation under the Rules to recognize him and to put the motion. If it loses, it loses, and if it wins, it wins. But, he does... is a Member, and he does every Member's right to do this, and I would urge you to do it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I think it's clear that you ruled that you did not call on him for that purpose. I wish we'd move on. We have a number of Bills to hear. If he wants to appeal the ruling of the Chair, he can."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, rather than to interrupt the whole thing, I'm going to change my mind and recognize his motion. It does take 89 votes to move to another Order of Business, so would you read the motion, please."

Clerk Leone: "Pursuant to House Rule 10B we move that the Order of Business be changed to motions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten has moved, on a motion, to change the Order of Business to go to motions at this time. All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no', because if we go to the Order of Motions, we have to start at the Calendar on Motions. We're going to waste a lot of time."



We know what happened last night when we went to the Order of Motions and wasted a lot of our precious time, and I think the Members ought to be aware of that... that if we go to the Order of Motions, as I understand it, the first motion ought to be House Bill 23, Kelly's, and then go right down the line. And, I think, not that I've got anything against Kelly, but I...I think that we're going to waste a lot of our time, and we ought to be doing what we were doing, hearing Bills and moving the Calendar, and, therefore, I vote 'no' and would urge other Members of this floor, also, to vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion for many of the reasons enunciated by Representative Matijevich. Certainly, we have a sufficient number of Bills on the Calendar to occupy our time today and for the remaining two weeks of the Session. This Gentleman who is offering this motion is attempting to move to an Order of Business of Constitutional Amendments, which we need not consider until sometime next spring. There is absolutely no requirement to consider Amendments to the Constitution before next spring. That would be the deadline for action by the General Assembly on proposed Amendments to the Constitution, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, on the reason to move to the Order of Motions is to get to my motion on the Constitutional Amendment that's on there, and although the Gentleman who just spoke says there is not a deadline till next spring, that is true, but to send a matter such as this through the General Assembly in next spring's Session would be less than deliberative by this Body. Constitutional Amendments in their House



of origin probably should all be either reported out this spring or brought out of Committee this spring, so that the Body can begin their deliberative process on these... on these Amendments. To send an Amendment out of the House next spring and then hope to get it passed by May of next spring would do...be a big disservice for the Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question ...on this motion there are 95 'ayes' and 66 'nos', and the...the motion carries. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Verify the Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman's asked for verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Vinson: "You had declared that the motion had carried. It was the same situation as last night."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I...I failed to recognize that he had his light on. I've done that a few times today, and I've backed up. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman's requested to poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E. M. Barnes. DiPrima."

Speaker Flinn: "DiPrima votes 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Donovan. Ebbesen. Ewell. Emil Jones. Kane. Kozubowski. McGrew. Pechous. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. And Your...Sam Wolf. And Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the verification of the...for what purpose does Representative Schneider arise? Votes 'no'. Vote Schneider 'no'. Any further changes before we start with the verification of the affirmative? Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "To ask the Members to be in their chairs and to ask the Clerk to read slowly."



Speaker Flinn: "That's right. The Members should follow the Rules and be in their seats and sit down. I have noticed there's a number of people who persist in standing up during a verification of a Roll Call, and it's only fair that we sit down and let everyone see who is and who is not here. Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you arise? I didn't hear you."

McAuliffe: "Can I have leave to be verified now? Can I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman, Representative McAuliffe, has asked leave to be verified. Is it all right, Representative Madigan? Representative Madigan says okay. You're verified. Representative... Representative Sandquist. I thought Totten..."

Sandquist: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Sandquist, 'aye'. What are we starting with now, Mr. Clerk? We're starting with 96 'aye' and 66 'no' ...68 'no'. Proceed with the verification call of the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Harris. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson."



VonBoeckman. Waddell. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff.

Williams. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. And Woodyard."

Speaker Flinn: "Questions from Representative Madigan?"

Madigan: "Anderson."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Anderson. He's in his seat."

Madigan: "Bell."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Bell's in his seat."

Madigan: "Bianco."

Speaker Flinn: "Bianco's back by his seat."

Madigan: "Virginia Frederick."

Speaker Flinn: "Virginia...Virginia Frederick is in her seat."

Madigan: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Flinn: "Griesheimer's in his seat."

Madigan: "Harris."

Speaker Flinn: "Harris?"

Madigan: "Johnson."

Speaker Flinn: "Who'd you...who'd you call last?"

Madigan: "Harris."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, Harris. He's in his seat."

Madigan: "Johnson."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Johnson. I don't see him in his seat.

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Kempiners."

Speaker Flinn: "Kempiners is in his seat."

Madigan: "Kucharski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kucharski. I don't see the Gentleman. How's
he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Peters."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters is not in his seat.

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Piel."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bob Piel's in the back."

Madigan: "Polk."

Speaker Flinn: "Polk. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat.
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Rea."

Speaker Flinn: "Jim Rea. I don't see him in his seat. How's
that Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Gale Schisler's in the back in his seat."

Madigan: "Stearney."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson is back. Put him back
on the Roll. Who was the last one?"

Madigan: "Stearney."

Speaker Flinn: "Peters has returned. Stearney was the last
one. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. How's the
Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Stuffle."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle's in his seat."

Madigan: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman. I don't see the Gentleman in
his seat. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "Williams."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Williams. I don't see him in
his seat. How's that Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Madigan: "J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "J. J. Wolf is in his seat. Any furth...he's
in his seat. J. J. Wolf is. Stearney has returned.
Place him back on the Roll."

Madigan: "Molloy."

Speaker Flinn: "Vince Molloy. He's in his seat, or he's back
there. He's in his seat."

Madigan: "Hoffman."

Speaker Flinn: "Gene Hoffman...in his seat. Representative
Brummer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Brummer: "Yes, would you record me as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Change Brummer from 'no' to 'aye'. Further
ques...?"

Madigan: "No further questions."

Speaker Flinn: "On this motion there were 92 'ayes' and 67
'no', and the motion carries. We'll go to Order of
Motions right now. Appearing on the...under...on page
24 under the Order of Motions is a motion with respect
to House Bill 23. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the
House. I've got three motions on House Bill 23, and
House Bill 134, and House Bill 2661 asking that these
Bills be taken from the table and placed in Interim Study.
I'd ask leave of the House that a vote be taken on all
at one time, and if I can get leave to have them placed
in Interim Study."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked leave to hear all three
motions in one Roll Call. Does he have consent or is
there objection? Objections...objections have been
heard. Take House Bill 23 first."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that House
Bill 23 be taken from the table and placed in Interim
Study."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Do you want the...Rep-



representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Membership ought to know what the Bill does, so I think the maker of the motion ought to apprise this House of what the Bill is, what it does, and...and why he wants to place it in Interim Study. That's his motion, but we ought to know what's being done here."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kelly is willing to explain the Amendment...the Bill."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be willing to explain the Bill. The subject of the Bill concerns violent material. It...it would add on to the obscenity statute a violent material Section. In other words, violence, in certain aspects, violence would be considered obscene. Now, I had this motion and the other motions filed on that very bad night when we called motions very late at night, and I did not have an opportunity to get any kind of a fair hearing on discharging the Committee on this Bill, and I have...I have asked that it go back into Interim Study if, for nothing else, at least for the fairness of the...of losing but not having a fair opportunity to have this motion heard that evening."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stearney. He indicates he will."

Stearney: "What Committee are you seeking to discharge or take from the table from?"

Kelly: "I'm not doing that right now. I had a motion filed earlier..."

Stearney: "Well, what Committee was this Bill in?"

Kelly: "Judiciary II."

Stearney: "Was it given a hearing?"

Kelly: "Pardon me."

Stearney: "Was it given a hearing?"

Kelly: "It was...it was given a hearing, and believe it or not, it didn't lose by that many votes."

Stearney: "But, it lost."



Kelly: "It lost."

Stearney: "Okay. So, that being the case, it...was it 'do not pass' motion?"

Kelly: "I think that any time that you can come close to even passing a Bill from Judiciary II that's somewhat of a conservative in nature that..."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Kelly, I would most readily disagree with you. Don't make it. I would respectfully object to the Gentleman's motion and ask that we vote 'no'. The Bill was given a hearing. I...it was given a fair and impartial hearing."

Kelly: "Come on, Rog..."

Stearney: "He lost."

Kelly: "Come on."

Stearney: "So be it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, with all due respect to our Minority spokesman, Representative Kelly accorded every courtesy in this Bill to put it in amendable form. The rea...it really didn't ever have a full hearing at all. It went in a Subcommittee. We had Amendments prepared. The deadline came. Representative Kelly deserves the courtesy of this motion at the very least. It did not have a full hearing. It was not defeated, and I certainly urge you to let him do at least this with the Bill. It's my fault it's in this posture, because he agreed with me to let me prepare some Amendment, and, as a result, we are delayed, and I certainly urge your 'yes' vote on Representative Kelly's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think we're getting far afield here. All the Gentleman wants, as I understand it, is to put the Bill in Interim Study. The Bill did have a fair hearing, but he would like to put it in Interim Study and study it some more,



so that I do not agree with my distinguished Minority spokesman who is objecting to it. I have no objection to further study. The Bill needs a lot more study, and if the Sponsor wants it, I personally have no objection to his being allowed that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly to close."

Kelly: "I would just ask for your favorable support on this motion to simply place this Bill in Interim Study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This motion...this motion will take 107 votes. The question is on Representative Kelly's motion on House Bill 23. Would it be placed in Interim Study? All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote I ordinarily always support every Member who wants to put a Bill in Interim Study Calendar. However, I know of no Member who didn't have the opportunity to place their Bill in Interim Study Calendar. Every Member...the Speaker, time and time again, said you have an opportunity to place your Bill in Interim Study Calendar. Dick Kelly had every opportunity like all of us. I've got a few Bills in Interim Study Calendar. Well, you didn't take the opportunity then, because the opportunities were open and available, and I think at this late date any Bill that didn't go to Interim Study ought to be dead. Somebody said we'd save money by putting it in Interim Study. I think we'd save money by killing a Bill, and this is a way of killing a Bill, by voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes', 37 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman does have...receive the necessary vote to put the Bill in Interim Study. The Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 134. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."



Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thanks to the Members of the House for supporting me on that motion. The House has been very courteous to me, and I would ask that the motion on House Bill 134 be tabled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're tabling it? The Gentleman withdraws the motion. House Bill 1037. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun...we're at the wrong ones, and we'll all be gone. Mrs. Braun. Is she here? Out of the record. House Bill 1267. Mr. Bowman. Read the Bill. Read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion pursuant to Rule 31F, I move that House Bill 1267..."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill pertains to judicial selection. It was assigned to Executive. I...it's...I put it on the Interim Study Calendar. I think it is more properly belong to the Interim Study Calendar Judiciary Committee, and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, as the Minority spokesman, the Gentleman ...the Bill was assigned to Executive. The Gentleman didn't see fit prior to the hearing in Executive to have the Bill transferred to Judiciary Committee. It was heard in Executive Committee. He apparently...it was placed, I believe at his request, in Interim Study, because it was apparent that it needed further study. There's no reason to change it from the Interim Study Calendar of Executive Committee, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Capparelli: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the Minority spokesman that he did come to our Committee and ask to have it put in Interim Study, and we will study it, and



I would ask everyone to vote against this motion. Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe we...we all know what happens to any judicial selection proposals that go to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, in my opinion, has given...you know, has a...a pretty consistent view of judicial selection. It seems to me, however, that the Executive Committee is not the proper Committee of the House to be making decisions regarding the appointment or election of judges. I think that the Committees that pertain to the judiciary are the proper ones to be making such...such decisions. It seems to me that that is where the...the Bill belongs. This is still on the Interim Study Calendar. It does not bring the Bill out on the floor for a vote at this time. It simply puts the...the Bill in a Committee that I...I think it's properly suited for considering these matters. I...I don't think we should have any of our Committees burial grounds for legislation, and...and that is why I'm urging the House to cast an 'aye' vote for this motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the motion be adopted on House Bill 1267?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Matijevich: "Well, I...I was going to explain my vote. I remember Ralph Capparelli is now Chairman. He was my Vice-Chairman. We always had an ongoing Committee studying merit selection, and I'm sure Ralph has still got that Committee working, so I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 'ayes', 68 'nos', 2 recorded as



'present', and the motion does not prevail. It's lost.
House Bill 1400. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move to amend Representative Hallock's motion in regard to House Bill 1400 by deleting 'Third Reading' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Second Reading'. Representative James Taylor."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My reason for filing that motion is because I feel that House Bill 1400 needs further study, and I feel that we should move it back to Second Reading in order to be able to adopt the Amendment if need be."

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

Hallock: "If the Representative Taylor would be happy to support my motion, I would be pleased to move this... take it from the table and move it back to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "I'll support his motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Would you state our posture, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The posture is that we went to House Bill 1400 in the area of motions. Mr. Taylor had a...an Amendment to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. The question is that if Mr. Hallock agreed that he would accept the Amendment of Mr. Taylor's to bring..."

Hallock: "No, no. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Hallock: "I said I would be pleased to move the Bill back to Second Reading..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If you would support the motion."

Hallock: "...instead of to Third. I did not say at this point that I would support the Amendment. The motion is, Speaker, to take it from the table. Move the Bill back to Third Reading. He requested that I move it back to



Second by this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Hallock: "And I said I would support that and move back to
Second, but not necessarily to take his Amendment."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman persist in the Amend-
ment to the motion? Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I would like you to make a ruling. I
do wanted to my motion to be...that is, placed on Second..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Second Reading."

Taylor: "...Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to amend the other
Gentleman's motion, and we will take the Amendments to
include requiring the simple majority. All in favor
vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. We're on the Amend-
ment to the motion. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr.
Hallock."

Hallock: "Now, so all Members can understand, the Amendment
being offered by Representative Taylor is only, as I
understand it, to take the Bill from the table and move
it back to Second Reading. That's the Amendment we're
talking about at this stage. Correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Hallock: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If this carries, this will change your
motion. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take
the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', no
'nays', 1 recorded as 'present', and the Gentleman's...
and the Amend...Gentleman's Amendment to Mr. Hallock's
motion carries. Now Mr. Hallock's motion is amended.
Mr. Hallock's."

Hallock: "Now it's on Second Reading now. No, I have no
Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hallock, now it's on Second Reading.
It's still your motion. You have amended the motion."



Your Bill's on Second Reading."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, I have no Amendments on Second Reading to offer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We have amended your motion, Sir, and the posture of the Bill now is that you've got a motion to take from the table and put the Bill on Second Reading. Do you wish to put the motion, Sir?"

Hallock: "Yes, I move that we take it from the table, put it on Second Reading, and that we also suspend the deadlines and the Calendar deadlines, so we may act on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that motion, all in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 6 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present', and the motion carries. House Bill 1838. Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very simple motion. All I'm asking for, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that we take House Bill 1838 and move it and place it on the Interim Study Calendar for next fall. I wasn't able to attend the Committee which is run by Representative Williams. It's the Cities and Villages Committee, but I did send a notification asking for the Bill to be repl...placed on the Interim Study Calendar, and for some reason or another the Committee saw fit to kill the Bill, and that's why I filed this motion. I don't think I'm out of order. All I would like is one day to have the opportunity to have a fair hearing in the Committee, and I ask that this motion to allow House Bill 1838 to be placed on the Interim Study Calendar get a favorable Roll Call in this chambers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1838 be taken from the table and placed in Interim Study?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have



all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'ayes', 4 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 2661. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The motion I filed on House Bill 2661 is to, also, place this Bill on the Interim Study Calendar. It...the Bill itself...I'll explain what it does. It prohibits the RTA from using public funds for advertising on television and radio. I...I think it...that's basically really what it does, and I believe we know the issue, and I just happen to think that before the RTA the Illinois Central Gulf Railroad in my area and the...the Rock Island and other transportation units...they have advertisement spots right on...right on the units themselves...on the trains and on the buses, and that would be free advertising. Instead of that, they're using...they spent over a million and a half dollars during the last year...or during the current year on advertising, and I think that's a total waste of money, and we're trying to search now for additional money for the RTA. This is one place where we can save a few dollars."

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

Friedrich: "Excuse me. Mr. Speaker, there isn't anymore room on the CTA buses, because the Arts Council has all the space taken up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, that's up on top of the bus. Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Gentleman take from the table and place in Interim Study House Bill 2661?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The motion prevails. Senate Bill 32. The Gentleman from



Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 32 would create a penalty for mass murder, or multiple murder, or second conviction for murder. The Bill did receive a hearing...a fair hearing in the Committee. However, there wasn't very many people present, and it's hard to get a Bill out of the Committee when you only have one more person necessary than to get the Bill passed. I think the Bill is necessary in cases like John Wayne Gacy...would be a mass murder, and it would provide for life imprisonment on the conviction for mass murder, multiple murder, or the second conviction for murder if the death penalty is not imposed. I'd like to have this Bill placed on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McAuliffe, I've been advised by the Parliamentarian, that I believe you want to amend your motion to place this matter on Second Reading."

McAuliffe: "That's right. I do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to amend his motion? Hearing no objections...objections have been raised. Who objected? Mr. Katz. The Gentleman moves to amend his motion to place the Bill on Second Reading. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. This is on the Amendment to the motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 11 'nays', and the motion is amended. Now, on Senate Bill 32. Representative McAuliffe on his motion as amended to take from the table Senate Bill 32. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. We're waiting for the machine. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman is seeking to discharge



a Committee where he states that he had a fair hearing. Now, the House last evening denied to other Members of this House that opportunity. Mr. Kosinski and other Members who had had Bills were denied the right to come out. The House backed up the Committee system. We have large numbers of Bills here. We have plenty of work to do. There is simply no reason to discharge a Committee at this posture of the House's work, and I would strongly oppose this as contrary to our Rules as being totally unnecessary. And, in addition, being unfair to Members last night whose Bills were not permitted to be discharged. No special preference should be given to a Sponsor here coming in this late when we have rejected the right of other Members to fly in the face of the Committee system. I would strongly oppose this motion."

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

Cullerton: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Cullerton: "What was the vote in this...when you brought this up before our Committee?"

McAuliffe: "Six to four. I guess."

Cullerton: "Do pass?"

McAuliffe: "Do not pass. Six to four. Do not pass."

Cullerton: "Did you indicate that you had a...a long enough hearing to present all the issues?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, but there wasn't enough attendance."

Cullerton: "Wasn't enough votes."

McAuliffe: "There wasn't enough attendance, either."

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

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this motion. This Bill was called at a time in the Session when a number of Members had Bills in other Committees. As Representative McAuliffe indicates, there was a limited Membership, and I think the key



thing is this, since the Rules now permit us to explain the Bill in a motion to discharge, for all of you people who have been saying now, particularly those that opposed capital punishment, that what we really need is a law that allows us to put the Specks, and the Gacys, and the Mansons away for life. This Bill is an opportunity to do it. This Bill will say, for the first time in one of the first states in the Union, that if...that a mass murders, the multiple murders...if you don't put them to death under the Capital Punishment Bill, at the very least, society should expect to those people and have an opportunity to go out and do it again. Do you want to perpetuate the system where people could go out in five or six years or fourteen years, commit another mass murder, then vote 'no' on this motion. But, if you believe that that's a bad system and it ought to be changed, I urge a 'yes' vote on Representative McAuliffe's motion to discharge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. Your light's on, ma'am. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd just like to clarify something. The hearing on June 6th resulted in a vote of six for the Bill, four against, 2 voting 'present'. That's 12. There are only 14 Members. I don't think that it failed for lack of having sufficient people present. It was given a full and fair hearing. I'd like to further point out that there is presently, as a result of the enactment of House Bill 1500 in the law, a provision for mandatory life imprisonment without the possibility of parole in circumstances that already are suggested that would be covered that this Bill would seek to address. This Bill was not reviewed by the Criminal Sentencing Commission, the Bill that was statutorily set up for that purpose. It would seek to make radical changes in...in an area which this General



Assembly recently addressed in a very comprehensive and meaningful way, and on that basis and awaiting a full review of the Criminal Justice Act that we recently submitted, I would encourage you not to support this motion."

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

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

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

McAuliffe: "Well, I think in a day of mass murders when we have people like Gacy and Speck running around loose, I think it's not only reasonable to impose a penalty. I think life in prison, for the rest of their natural life if the death penalty is not imposed, is not too unreasonable a penalty in a case like this. People are out committing murders. They could go to jail. They're out 12 years later. They go back out and do it again. This is a reasonable Bill. This is a good law and order Bill, and I don't think it should really have too many serious objections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is to take Senate Bill 32 from the table and place it on Second Reading. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to this motion. This did have a full and fair hearing in Judiciary II, and it does not address only mass murders, as you have been lead to believe. Statistics show that murders are most often a crime of passion...a one-time crime, and, if someone were to commit such a crime of passion, and someone walked through the door just as the crime was committed and observed the crime and that person was also murdered



that would still be a crime of passion..."

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

Catania: "...probably a one..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, ma'am. There's a point of order being raised. I'll give you your time."

Johnson: "If the speaker wants to speak to the Bill, she should look at the transcript of the Bill. That's not what it said. This is not a crime of passion Bill. It's exactly what Representative McAuliffe says it was, so if you're going to quote the Bill, quote it right. Read the Bill."

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

Catania: "As I was saying before I was interrupted, if someone walked through the door and observed the crime being committed and was also murdered, the person who was convicted of that double murder, which I agree is a double murder, would be imprisoned for life even though all the statistics show that it is extremely unlikely that that person would ever commit any kind of crime again if that person had no previous criminal record. I ask you to oppose the motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'ayes', 37 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "A verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's entitled to a verification."

Katz: "What...what is the vote required, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "107."

Katz: "I want a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, Mr. McAuliffe wants a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bradley. Darrow. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Bell as 'aye'."



Unknown: "Who?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vinson as 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Goodwin.
Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Huff. Kane. Keane. Kozubowski.
Madigan. McGrew. Pierce. Polk. Schlickman. Sam
Wolf. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What are we starting out with? We're
starting out with 114 'ayes'. Would the Membership
kindly be in their own respective seat? All unauthorized
personnel remove themselves from the floor. The Clerk
will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco.
Birchler. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek.
Bower. Brummer. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi.
Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Dawson.
Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. Ralph
Dunn. Ewing. Flinn. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich.
Garmisa. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hannig.
Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave
Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kornowicz.
Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz.
Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Mahar.
Margalus. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom.
McClain. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey.
Murphy. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel.
Preston. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney.
Robbins. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schoeberlein.
Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Margalus, for what purpose
do you seek recognition? All right. Hello. Please
proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. E. G.
Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom.
Terzich. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek.
VonBoeckman. Waddell. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff.



Williams. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. Young.
And Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz, are you ready? Do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Katz: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Ackerman. Is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ackerman is here. In his chair as always."

Katz: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco's in his chair as always."

Katz: "Boucek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Boucek. Right there standing in the aisle by Mr. Conti."

Katz: "Bower."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bower is standing next to Boucek. Looks like they're all here."

Katz: "Yes, okay. Mr. Friedland here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Friedland. John's always back there. Mr. Farley wants to be...how's the Gentleman record... record him as 'aye'. Record Farley as 'aye'."

Katz: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Bradley as 'aye'."

Katz: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew as 'aye'. And Keane as 'aye'. Sam Wolf as 'aye'. Abramson as 'aye'. Anderson as 'aye'. Take Garmisa off."

Katz: "Dave Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Katz: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's recorded as 'no'. You want to take him off?"

Katz: "No, I don't."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right."

Katz: "McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain? Mr. McClain? Where? How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off."

Katz: "Mr. Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Katz: "Mr. Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Klosak? He's there."

Katz: "Okay. Mr. Leon."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leon? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr. Matula."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Simms wants to be verified."

Katz: "No objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Matula's back there."

Katz: "Mr. McMaster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tom is there. McMaster's there." No."

Katz: "Mr. Rea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rea? He's right here."

Katz: "Mr. Richmond."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Richmond?"

Katz: "Henry. No, Henry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Richmond in the chamber? Mr. Richmond.

Remove him."

Katz: "Mr. Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rock?"

Katz: "Mr. Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh."

Katz: "Oh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gordon's here."

Katz: "Mr. Ropp...Mr. Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's always here."

Katz: "Is he here? Okay. Miss Stiehl."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Kojak' get...get back in your chair. I'm
sorry. Who was that, Harold?"

Katz: "Miss Stiehl."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Stiehl is here."

Katz: "There's so many people congregating around. It's very hard to see."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, they all want to get on the Roll Call."

Katz: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Terzich? Is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Katz: "All right. Mr. Van Duyne? Is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's always there."

Katz: "Okay. Mr. Wikoff here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Thank you. Wikoff is here."

Katz: "And Mr. Donovan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? Donovan?"

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Donovan? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him and kindly record Mr. Darrow as 'no'. What's the count, Clerk? Capuzi wants to be verified. He's through with the verification. On this question there are 117 'aye'...and what? And 39 'no's' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Matijevich: "Earlier today...and I...and I...the reason I voted against the motion to go to this Order of Business was because I thought we'd get into something like this. But, earlier today you indicated we were going to adjourn around 6:30. Is that still going to hold true? I don't want to hurt any Member, but...because I'll stay here as long as anybody wants to, but if you still feel the way you said earlier, I'm...I'm ready about 15 minutes from now, to make that motion. Is that your intent yet?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "It's the intention of the Chair to finish this Order. The...House Bill 1037, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 1037 amends...is a landlord-tenant Bill which prohibits the refusal..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, ma'am. Let's give the Lady some attention, please. Could we give the Lady some attention, please? Please proceed, ma'am."

Braun: "This motion is to take House Bill 1037 from the table. It was...it was received well in Committee. There were not sufficient Members of the Committee there to vote it out of Committee, and it died...would have died on the last day for hearing Bills out of Committee, and for that reason I filed this motion and urge your...your affirmative vote on it."

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

Johnson: "What does the Bill do? You just told us you want to discharge it. What does it do?"

Braun: "The Bill...the Bill provides that...prohibits the refusal to rent to families for the sole reason that there are children in the family. There was an agreement between myself and one of the Members from the other side of the aisle that an Amendment would be put on it exempting and excluding senior citizen housing, but again since the Bill was not heard out of Committee... did not get out of Committee, we have not had an opportunity to put that even on."

Johnson: "Isn't this Bill in Interim Study now?"

Braun: "No, it's...well, that's what I'd like to do with it."

Johnson: "Oh, you want to put it in Interim Study now?"

Braun: "Yes."

Johnson: "Oh, okay. Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...the Lady's motion. The question is, 'Shall the Lady's motion prevail and have House Bill 1037 taken from the table and placed in Interim Study?'"



All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present', and the Lady's motion prevails, and the Bill is placed in Interim Study. Okay. Senate Bill 44. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you'd just wait a second. I have to get my rose on. Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 44, I feel, is a very, very important Bill. It...it deals with abortion problem, and what it does, it requires a 40 hour...48 hour waiting period between the time of pregnancy test and abortion procedures conducted in the first trimester of pregnancy. I did, you know, wait quite a long time to have this Bill heard in the Committee, and unfortunately this is a very, very controversial type subject matter, and there wasn't an adequate number of people at the Committee, I feel, to get a proper hearing of such an important Bill as this. There were approximately 10 or 11 Members. It was at the close of the day, and I certainly feel that the Bill did not receive an adequate hearing, and I would urge support to discharge Committee on Senate Bill 44."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House take Senate Bill 44 from the Speaker's Table and place on the Order of Second Reading?' The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am really distressed to hear Mr. Terzich make the statement he... he just did. Our Committee had a very good attendance that day. On the Bill that was immediately before this one every single Member but one of the Committee was there. They knew that this Bill was coming up next, and I can only assume that if they did not stay, it was because they did not choose to vote on this Bill, which they knew had technical problems. There was a quorum



there. It received a hearing. It certainly appeared that the Sponsor felt that...that he was treated with fairness by the...the Committee. If we didn't have the Rule that requires a majority of those appointed, the Bill would have gone down, as you can see, by the fact that the Roll Call was reversed. After this, the fact that the Bill has technical problems. It is not in shape, and I don't see any way we can get this Bill in shape in the next two weeks. There...there are...are problems that...that would require a lot of attention. This House worked long on a series of five Bills, which were sponsored by Mr. Cullerton, Mr. Kelly, and me, and it sent a Bill that deals with the issues in Senate Bill 44 over to the Senate. It's a good Bill. It's a Constitutional Bill. It responds to the problems raised in the Sun Times' editorials. It's on Third Reading, and I fully expect that it's going to pass. I hope that...that you do not vote in favor of bringing this poorly constructed Bill, this unconstitutional Bill, to the House floor. Please vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Speaker in the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again my Bill was the last Bill heard in this Committee, and you could hear an echo chamber in their if everyone was in attendance. I...I won't dis...deny or anything in this...but I certainly know, and I can certainly count the votes that I...I feel that there wasn't an adequate hearing, and that this Bill...it certainly may be similar to a Bill that we passed, but it certainly is important not only to the



General Assembly but the people of the State of Illinois and certainly should receive that type of consideration, and I would appreciate your support on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to take Senate Bill 44 from the Speaker's Table and placed on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107 votes. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yeah, as the Minority spokesman on this Committee, I would just like to explain my 'no' vote. Contrary to what Representative Terzich just said, we did have very good attendance, and I just want you to know that if this motion passes, you'll go through the process of voting to pass the Bill, the Governor will veto it, we'll override his veto, a court challenge will come, and what has already been held unconstitutional will once again be held unconstitutional. So, if you want to save yourself the effort, just don't let this Bill go any further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the vote on this was 7-4-1. That means there were 12 Members of the Committee, and I tell you they were all there...that everyone that was there voted. The Committee was in a sort of a circus atmosphere by the time that we got to this Bill, and there were many people...excuse me, but I was there. There were many people who were not aware of exactly what it was that was coming up, and I think that it is a Bill that this House has the right to hear. It is an important right to life Bill for this Session, and I urge you all to vote 'yes', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 40 'no'. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I know that we have 33 good Members who are interested



in good government, and I would urge a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Balanoff. Beatty. Bradley. Breslin. Cullerton. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Getty. Harris. Hoffman. Huskey. Emil Jones. Kane. Kozubowski. Madigan. McGrew. Patrick. Pechous. Pouncey. Reed. Schlickman. Schraeder. Schuneman. Skinner. VonBoeckman. Wikoff. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

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

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative, state your inquiry. Mr. Parliamentarian."

Brummer: "Yes, I...I heard that this Bill was...was voted 'do not pass' on a 7-2-1 motion or 7-4-1 or something of that nature. In order for a 'do not pass' motion to pass and be...and a Bill to be reported out of Committee 'do not pass', does it not require the majority of the Members of the Committee to pass that out of Committee on a 'do not pass' motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me it's a simple majority on 'do not pass'. Anything further? On this question there's 102 'aye' and 40 'no'. The motion fails. 206. It's the intention of the Chair to proceed on the Order of Motions as long as it takes us to go through the entire list tonight. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "May I have leave to hear 206 and 208 in the same Roll Call? They're similar Bills..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Would the Sponsor indicate briefly what the two



Bills are before he asks to put it on..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz objects. Objection has been raised. Proceed on 206, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the objections have already come from the area that you would anticipate. Senate Bill 206 was before the Judiciary II Committee. The week prior to that I sat in the Committee and listened to the testimony on Senator Merlo's Bill which this House yesterday discharged from Judiciary II. That Bill dealing with aggravated battery of a senior citizen. The Bill before you, Senate Bill 206, deals with aggravated battery of a child under the age of 13 making it an aggravated battery crime. The next motion filed, 208, deals with the same subject, and that would make it a list of offenses for which probation could not be granted. Because of the fact that this House felt that we should bring Senator Merlo's Bill on aggravated battery of senior citizens to the attention of the House and before the floor, I filed Senate Bill 206 motion to discharge to bring the question of child abuse or aggravated battery on a child under 13 to the attention of this House and on the floor of the Second Reading, First Legislative Day. The Bill was not called for a full hearing in Judiciary II for the reason that it was indicated strongly that the same action taken on Senator Merlo's Bill on the senior citizens would be taken on this Bill, and that's why it wasn't called at the time. Now, I'm asking likewise for the same support that Senator Merlo's Bill had from the Minority spokesman, Representative Stearney, when he argued so profusely to discharge his own Committee that he join with me in protecting the children of this state, bringing this good Bill to your attention that passed the Senate 43... 44 to 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."



Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I've heard everything now. This is a Bill, that on the Sponsor's own motion, was placed in the Interim Study. He chose not to go ahead before the Committee. Now, having placed it in Interim Study, not having been willing to go ahead before the Committee, he now seeks to discharge and take it from the table. Now, this really is a total reckless abandonment of the Committee system, where the Sponsor deliberately puts the Bill in Interim Study, where we heard he came with a total of five Bills. He asked to be heard on three. We heard him on three. Some of those Bills were reported out favorably. He asked that two be put in Interim Study. We put them in Interim Study, and now he comes and asks that this Bill be taken from the table. That is an abuse of the Committee process, and I urge a resounding 'no' vote. This really has nothing to do with the other subject of senior citizens in any way. This is not a proper use of this motion, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do rise in opposition to the motion. The reason being is that the Sponsor came before our Committee with four Bills. One of which was a 20-page Bill we gave a great deal of thought to. We did...and I did support that. We voted that out of Committee. He knew, however, that these Bills lack merit, and he, himself, suggested that they, perhaps, go to Interim Study Committee. They were given no hearing. No one considered them at all. This is no reason to circumvent the Committee structure. By the way, he mentioned it's child abuse. I ask you to look at this Bill, because it considers the question of a parent being subjected to a class 3 felony. That is three to seven years, so if you or anyone else gave your kid a good whipping, and some crying social



worker came up and...and complained to the authorities, that the parent, himself, may wind up in jail. This Bill deserves a lot of study. It wasn't even given any consideration at all simply because the Sponsor asked himself that it go to Interim Study. So, I ask you to read this thing, to be careful about what you're doing here, because any of you or any of your friends may be subjected to this and wind up in the penitentiary for giving your kid a good kick."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not one who says that the Committee system is sacrosanct...that Committees never make mistakes. I've heard many people say, though, that we should defend the Committee system. I would like to just say something about how the Judiciary II Committee has worked this year, and I include Mr. Stearney, and Getty, and Johnson, and Katz, and Willer, and all the others. We have taken a lot of time on these Bills, because they are important Bills. They changed the criminal code. They impose sanctions and penalties on every citizen of this state if they should violate the terms of the Act. Now, I have seen Mr. Getty's Committee work overtime. I've seen the staff work overtime, and it's not simply a question of whether you're for law and order, or whether you're for abortion, or whether you're for capital punishment. These Bills require work. They require care, and we're lucky...we are lucky to have lawyers and non-lawyers in that Committee who really care about drafting a Bill that will be one that people can understand, that lawyers can understand, and the judges can understand. Now, you've heard what happened to this Bill. It was not ready, and the Sponsor wanted it to be put in Interim Study. Now, if we're just going to vote every Bill on the basis of a slogan, we might as well forget about draftsmanship, forget about the



Reference Bureau, and just have a sign saying, 'We're for this or we're for that', and either pass or fail... defeat the Bill on that basis. I urge that we reject this, because this Committee did consider it, and it should not be in this...should not be on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as a fourth Member of the Judiciary II Committee to stand up and speak on this Bill, I think you've really misconstrued the history of Representative Daniels' treatment of this Bill. The reason that he asked that this Bill and its counterpart, 208, go in Interim Study was because Representative Merlo's Bill, which is virtually if not identical touching on the same subject as to senior citizens, had already been voted 'do not pass', and in light of that and in light of the fact that we're going to be setting that we thought over the course of the next six months, he asked that this Bill be put in Interim Study. This is a very simple Bill. Representative Stearney hasn't looked at the Amendment, because the Amendment specifically exempts parents. The whole purpose of Representative Daniels' motion in this Bill is to assure that those people who are least able to defend themselves, whether they be senior citizens, physically disabled people, or, in this case, little children, aren't beaten up. This is a simple concept. It's something we can understand. It's...it's a perfectly coincident Amendment to the aggravated battery statute, and I urge a 'yes' vote on getting this Bill out to the floor. Give Representative Daniels a fair, and full, and first hearing on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, child abuse is one of the most serious crimes in the state. In the last year alone in the State of Illinois,



child abuse rose a thousand percent, and yet it's estimated that only 10% of all child abuse cases are reported. This Bill would go a long ways for tightening up the laws in child abuse, and I strongly urge your support for this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this five-piece legislation that is thoroughly needed to protect children. Representative Johnson put it very well. Parents are not included in this legislation. This is to protect children under 13 years of age from abusive treatment...from seriously abusive treatment. This legislation is needed, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "...Speaker...Mr. Speaker, in support of the Committee system of this Legislature, I move the pre...previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'.. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Well, we've heard a lot. We've heard a lot of statements about this legislation. The pure and simple fact of the matter is, look at the Digest, look at Senate Bill 206 and what it deals with. It deals with aggravated battery of a child...someone under the age of 13, and if that isn't applorable to you...if that isn't something that would turn your stomach, you wouldn't say that the laws ought to be tough and strict. This is a subject that we ought to deal with, and that's why I've asked to bring it before the House, so that we can act on it now, and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Daniels'



motion to discharge the Interim Study...or the Judiciary II Interim Study Calendar and many further considerations of Senate Bill 206 and that the Bill be advanced to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I want to tell you why I'm interested in voting 'yes' on aggravated assault of children. In Blue Mound, Illinois, less than a year ago, a...I think...perhaps Representative Donovan would correct me, but I think this child was about 2½ years old. He was put in the care of this couple. They had failed to check up, in fact. The Department of Children and Family Services had failed to check up and find out they had... the woman had mental disorder in the past. Anyway, this...this woman treated this child terribly, put it in the hospital, bounced it up and down by holding it by the legs on its head, and things of this nature. And, of course, the court case is still going on, but, nevertheless, these kind of things are happening all the time, and I, for one, believe we should do something to stop it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye' and 37 'no', and the motion fails. Senate Bill 208. Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels. I saw you, Representative Conti, and there's a good lawyer right next to you there. There's a good lawyer. Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels requests the same Roll Call on Senate Bill 208. Does he have leave to use the same Roll Call? Hearing no ob...no objection, the same Roll Call that fails by the same score. Senate Bill 222. Out of the record. Senate Bill 644. Representative Macdonald."



Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, before I explain the Bill I do want to say, that I appreciate the courtesy both by the Chairman and the Committee on Judiciary II, and I will not attack them as they have been attacked by others. I do, however, feel that this Bill is an extremely important Bill to be considered by the full House. I think that I got the impression at least that the Committee had some problems with the law of aggravated battery. The...the Bill 6...Senate Bill 644, at a time when there is unrest, or violence, and rioting in prisons, puts underpaid and overworked employees of institutions of correction, both prisons and other institutions, under the aggravated battery clauses and charges that can be pressed. Now, I think that we should understand that the reason this Bill was drafted that there was a condition that existed at Dwight, and the State's Attorney refused to prosecute the case, because he said that the statutes, as written, only included correctional officers. Now, at a time when we need help in prisons, and, as I say, when these people are underpaid it seems to me only fair that they be put under the same protection as anyone else serving in prisons. We need them. We are going to have to change our correctional systems, and it only seems fair to me that this Bill have a fair and clear hearing in the House of Representatives, so I ask for your vote to discharge this Bill to take from the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of the Lady's motion. I think possibly on the first Roll Call the other day on this Bill there was a misunderstanding as to some of the facts. Subsequently, there was an attempt to reconsider it, and unfortunately at that time there were not sufficient Members. I think that the Bill is very deserving of a...of hearing on this



floor, and I would urge the Membership to support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Gentlewoman from Arlington Heights conscientiously appeared before the Committee. She tried twice. She failed to get the necessary votes. She almost got enough votes. She did not quite get enough votes. Quite frankly, I was one of those who voted with her on the Bill, but the Committee system, does seems to me, require that we stand behind Committees. It's not an important Bill. It's a very unimportant Bill, and it is not really worth the time of the House, in my opinion, for the House to sit as a Committee of the whole. I believe she had her opportunity. She failed to get the necessary votes, and I do not believe that the House should discharge the ~~Committee or take it from the table.~~"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Our aggravated battery statute now says in a number of Sections that if you...if you batter a teacher or other school employee, it's an aggravated battery that if you batter a police officer or other police department employee, it's an aggravated battery. The whole Section deals with the addition of the language, employee. Representative Macdonald's Bill simply makes her...this aggravated battery statute and her Bill consistent with the balance of the Section. If it's an aggravated battery to...to...battery in those other Sections, it seems to me to be entirely consistent to do this. She had the eight votes, and then someone changed to 'no' at the last minute, and there were only nine or ten Members there, and I think this is the kind of thing. It's a logical change in the vo...in the law, and I urge a 'yes' vote on Representative Macdonald's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question



be put?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. No, no. Those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. It's the opinion of the Chair the motion carried. Representative Macdonald to close."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think that we have heard enough about this Bill, and to save the time of the House I would merely ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion that Senate Bill 644 be taken from the Speaker's Table and placed on the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 10 'no', and the motion carried. Senate Bill 644 is taken from the Speaker's Table and placed on the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Senate Bill 1070. Out of the record. To what? It's out of the record. 1246. Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would move to take from the Speaker's Table and place on the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day Senate Bill 1246. Senate Bill 1246 is designed to correct an administrative problem in the Department of Labor, which now has conflicting court decisions on whether to allow unemployment benefits in addition to company holiday pay. I wasn't aware of the court decision when we did hear this Bill in Committee, and, therefore, I think we should bring it out on the House floor so that the other Members can, in fact, consider this problem, so I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? No. Any discussion? The question is on Representative Farley's motion that Senate Bill 1246 be taken from the table and placed on the



Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 7 'no'. The motion carried, and Senate Bill 1246 will be placed on the Second Reading, First Legislative Day. House Resolution 81: Representative Ebbesen. Out of the record. House Resolution 178. Representative Young. Representative Young on 178."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House Resolution 178...that the Executive Committee be discharged and that this be advanced to the Speaker's Table. The subject matter of this Resolution is to merely continue a special Committee in reference to economic prosperity for East St. Louis until they have an opportunity to file their report. The Committee was set up during the last Session, and I merely want the Committee continued until it files its report, and I ask for your approval of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, as the Minority Spokesman, this...this Resolution did receive a full hearing. There was sufficient people there to have passed it out. The votes just weren't there to pass this out. I think it was the feeling of the Committee Members who didn't support the Resolution that the cost for continuing this Committee was just plain too high. I believe the Sponsor indicated that they had already spent \$60,000 last year, and they were going to come in for another 60,000 to complete this study, which probably no one will bother even to read. So, I think though...and the major issue...how it was handled in Committee. It was posted. It was heard in Committee at considerable length. It was debated by the Members. There were sufficient Members to get it out. It just didn't have the support, and



on behalf of the Committee system, I would urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Young: "Yes, I'd like to respond to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young to close. Representative Capparelli, pardon me. Then I'll be back to you, Representative Young."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Leinenweber was right. It did get a full hearing, and I think the cause that it did go down was because the cost was \$60,000, and I would ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young."

Young: "The Committee had spent no money. Absolutely no money. This was a matter that was caught in a pocket veto at the end of the last Session, and so, therefore, the Committee has had no funds available, and the motion is merely to continue the Committee until it has an opportunity to file its report, and I ask your support. I...I was in a different Committee helping other Members get their Bills out, and I got to the Executive Committee at the very end after many people had left, and, therefore, I...I ask your support in permitting me to get a fair hearing on continuing this Committee, so that it can file its report."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion that the Executive Committee be discharged with respect to House Resolution 178 and advance to the Speaker's Table. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. The Clerk will take the record: On this question there's 57 'aye' and 51 'no'. The motion fails. 284."

Young: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 is a...a motion to discharge the Committee on Executive and advance to the Order of Second Reading this Resolution, which is a Resolution asking the Southwest Port District to assist a group of...urging the Southwest Port District to assist



a group of employees to produce and establish job opportunities at the old site where they worked, and I ask for your support in discharging this Committee. It ...it did not have a hearing in the Executive Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "The Lady is right. She did not have a hearing. Principally, because she didn't call it, but I read the Resolution. I don't see any reason why it couldn't be debated on the floor of the House, so I would personally not object if we bring it from the table. I don't know if I would support it on the final passage stage, but I don't see any reason why we couldn't consider it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Yes, I also would support this. She did not get a fair hearing on this, because we were just adjourning. There wasn't enough Members there, and I will support discharge of my own Committee, which I usually don't do, but I don't know if I will support it when it gets a full hearing."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on Representative Younge's motion that Executive Committee be discharged with consideration of House Resolution 284, and it be advanced to the Order of Second Reading. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 8 'no', and the motion carried. 287. Out of the record. House Resolution 343. Representative Griesheimer. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "That motion of mine, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw it."

Speaker Redmond: "What motion are you talking about? 287? I thought that one went out of the record. Is that correct?"

Wolf: "Yeah, I'd like to withdraw it."



Speaker Redmond: "The motion is withdrawn. 343. Representative Griesheimer. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 11. Ebbesen. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 32. McGrew. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Constitutional Amendment...House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 is an Amendment to...Constitutional Amendment to limit state and local taxes. It was debated in the Committee and fell one vote short of...short of passage out of the Committee. I bring the motion before you tonight, because it's an item I feel should be debated by the full House, and it's an item in which many Members from both sides of the aisle agree should be debated by the full House. At a time when there is severe restrictions on our resources and...and continued uprising by taxpayers because of the share of taxes that are being taken to run government, this motion to have a full hearing is very apropos. Let me point out what's happened in Illinois. Since 1960 the cost of state government has gone up over 500%, while the personal income of the people of this state has only gone up about 200%, so we've increased the cost of state government and state taxes 2½ times as fast as the people's ability to pay. It's important that we address Constitutional Amendments, because statut... because statutory Amendments, although they are worthy, will probably be amended in the long run to suit the legislative coalitions that normally dominate in this General Assembly. A Constitutional restraint is one that is external; that will put some limits...some real limits on the General Assembly and on the Executive. There are the necessary relief valves that are needed in order to provide a Constitutional Amendment with some flexibility, and I would remind the Members of the



House that those relief valves include the creation of a...an emergency fund that can be expended with the Governor's request and the General Assembly's concurrence and the suspension of the limit with the request of the Governor and the General Assembly's concurrence should the emergency fund not be enough. In addition, the local limits can be increased with voter approval, and the state limits can be increased with voter approval. I'd be happy to answer any questions on the motion, and I would appreciate your favorable support, so that this House can at least debate this most important item."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a little confused here. I know we have motions today, because the Senate Bills, unless they're out of Committee, will die. But, Mr. Speaker, is this Constitutional Amendment, this House Joint Resolution, is this subject to our deadline of this week, or is it not?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, it is not."

Pierce: "Am I right that this Bill...this Constitutional Amendment, can be heard anytime till May of next year? May of 1980? Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Pierce: "So, Mr. Speaker, this matter came up once in Revenue Committee. The Gentleman had a full and fair hearing. We always treat him courteously. Two of his indexing Bills and his other Bills, one House Bill; one Senate Bill, passed out of Revenue Committee. We had 20 Members present. We scheduled it at his convenience when we had a good attendance. The Bill failed of passage in the House Revenue Committee. It's entitled to a second hearing...a second Roll Call. It's not subject to the deadlines. It'll be alive until next May, and if he wants another hearing this fall, we'll give him another hearing this fall. If he wants it next spring, he can



have it next spring. He's entitled to a second Roll Call. He only had one Roll Call. This Constitutional Amendment can't even be put on the ballot till November of next year, not November of this year. November of 1980 before the Constitutional Amendment would ever even be placed on the ballot should it be approved by the House and the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Now, it's for tax limitations, but we passed out a very good tax limitation Bill out of the House. The Democratic task force package of tax limitations Bills that...that Representative Schraeder had and...and that...the other Bills in the task force passed over to the Senate, and I understand have been approved or will be approved tonight in the Senate Revenue Committee. There's no emergency here. There's no need to discharge it. This is a strict derogation of the Committee system. This Bill was alive in the Committee on Revenue. It's entitled to another Roll Call. It's not subject to any deadline until May of next year. It won't be on the ballot till November of next year should it be approved in both Houses by a three-fifths vote, and because of that I ask that the motion to discharge Revenue Committee be defeated; and that I can assure you this Constitutional Amendment will get another fair hearing before that Committee whenever the Gentleman asks for it. I've always tried to accommodate him, and I will accommodate him again. This Constitutional Amendment is alive in Committee. It's not subject to deadline, and the motion should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "This Session, Mr. Speaker, will not be noted as, up to this point, for a great lot of accomplishments. But, this probably is the greatest project during this whole Session...is the passage of this Joint Resolution and giving it to the people. I can assure you that if



it's ever put on the ballot, it will be passed. I think you've all been aware of what's going on in your own district. People are demanding less government and a limit on spending. I've just taken a poll in my district, and that was the chief thing they commented on. Now, we don't want a meat ax approach like they had in California. What we want is a sensible approach like this, so that the cost of government does not go up faster than the cost of people's ability to pay for it. This is the approach in this Amendment. I can assure you on both sides of the aisle from Wisconsin line clear to Cairo that this will be the popular thing. This is what the people are asking for in my district. I think they're asking for it in your district if you've taken the time to ask them. I urge you to vote this out, so we'll have ample time to have hearings in...in...on the House floor and the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. McPike. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the motion. Not based on what the Chairman of Revenue said about the fact that the Bill should have another hearing in Revenue...nothing procedurally. I simply oppose the Constitutional Amendment on its merits. We have had some sensible Bills pass this House this year by Representative Schraeder and Representative Brummer that will give a sensible approach to putting limits on state spending and on local spending, but this simply is not the same. The estimates that have been put forth by the analysis that we have indicated that in FY '78 the State of Illinois would have spent about six hundred million dollars less than what we spent. In FY '79 it was about seven hundred and fifty million dollars less than what we spent, and in FY '80, which we are currently considering the budget, we would be required to spend nearly one billion dollars less.



Now, it's not easy to stand up on the House floor or anywhere else and say, 'Let's cut a billion dollars out of state government.' It's very much more difficult than to sit down and address yourself to that problem. It's much more difficult to go back to your school districts and tell them that the State of Illinois will not fund them. It's much more difficult to go back and say that we are not...no longer properly going to fund mental health or the various other programs in this state that we have determined that are absolutely necessary. It's very difficult to have a Governor submit a budget, and then there's a Minority party that is trying to support that Governor. They say we're going to cut one billion dollars out. I have not seen any proposals from the other side of the aisle that would address themselves to the seriousness of this question. Eight hundred to one billion dollars would have to be cut out of the Governor's budget this year if this were currently law, and there's no one on the House floor that's willing to do that. There's no one that's willing to stand up now and say this is what we're going to cut: education, transportation, mental health, right down the line. The easy thing is to stand up and say we're going to give the voters a chance to express their will. The difficult thing to do is be a responsible Legislator and say that the money is desperately needed to fund those programs that we think are necessary and worthwhile. For those reasons this should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Constitutional Amendment was heard in the Revenue Committee on which I'm the Minority Spokesman. Unfortunately, though, the vote was strictly partisan. There was no chance for this to come out to the floor for a full hearing. No, there was no chance for us to



do the will of our voters. I think that we all know, who went through the last election, what the people of this state want. Eighty percent of the voters said what they wanted when they voted on the Thompson Proposition. It's time that we heard this motion here on this floor; heard this Constitutional Amendment. Last June wasn't the time according to the Majority party to hear it. Now, this June isn't the time to hear it, and I'm certain, even with the assurance of the Revenue Chairman, that next spring won't be the time either. Let's get to the business of these people of the State of Illinois. Let's hear this Constitutional Amendment. Let's pass it out, and we will be known for something worthwhile this Session. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The motion fails. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Joint Constitutional Amendment 13. I think the issues are very clear in this legislation that Representative Totten and others are supporting. The people of Illinois spoke last November by over 80%. They want a limitation upon state government spending. They want a limitation on local government spending. I think it's time that Members of the General Assembly and perhaps those on the other side of the aisle realize that you have to make a decision once and for all. Either you are on the side of the taxpayers, or you are on the side of those that are the tax eaters that spend the money and spend the money foolishly. At the same time government continues to grow, and it continues to grow at an



astronomical rate. People want a limitation on government. People do not want more government. They want less government, and the only way that you are going to ensure that we have an adequate form in our state of having a limitation placed on the amount of taxes that can be charged against the citizens of the State of Illinois is through the process of a Constitutional Amendment, and Proposition 13 in California started the ball rolling. Even the spendthrift Congress that you have in the...in the United States government has heeded to what the people of California have said, and now I think it's up to the Illinois Legislature to address this very serious problem by giving an affirmative vote to Representative Totten's Constitutional Amendment 13 and bypass the Committee and place this out on the floor for a full and...consideration and debate by Members of the Legislature, and let's give the people of Illinois some meaningful task...tax relief ...some meaningful avenues in which they can express themselves in order to see that government is not expanded...that government does not take more of their tax dollars than what they can afford, and I would urge, and I would beg each and every one of you to search your soul and your conscience and vote for your constituents, and vote for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois rather than the big bureaucracy that continues to grow in Springfield."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Point of...point of order, Mr. Speaker. What is our posture now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Totten has moved that the Committee on Revenue be discharged with respect to the consideration of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13."

Getty: "Had we closed debate?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet. Representative Mulcahey."

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



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Totten to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd point out to the Members, that the member on the other side who cited statistics was using a report that used nominal personal income rather than personal income as defined by the U. S. Department of Commerce, and every statistic that he cited was not true. What this Amendment does, is just say that the share of income taken in taxes for local and state government stays at the ratio that it is now. It will not cut or impair any services. It is not a meat ax approach to the running of government. It will provide for a flexible and orderly growth in government yet limit that to within people's ability to pay. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask you to give me the opportunity and the people in this General Assembly to have this matter debated fully, and I ask that we discharge the Committee on Revenue from further consideration and put on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, House Joint Constitutional Amendment #13."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Totten's motion that the Committee on Revenue be discharged with consideration to House Joint Consti...House Joint Constitutional Amendment 13. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative...I hear somebody. Who is it? Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it looks like the Majority party may have gotten the message. Maybe you're not really afraid of the people. Maybe it continue...can continue to call yourself a Democratic party and...and not have to change your name to the Autocratic party. I hope so."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will



take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye' and 44 'no'. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Capparelli. Christensen. Dawson. DiPrima. Doyle. Ebbesen. Ewell. Flinn. Garnisa. Hanahan. Kane. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kulas. Laurino. McGrew. Mulcahey. Murphy. Rea. Richmond. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Slape. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Willer. Sam Wolf. Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Christensen. Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would you read the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "That was a poll of the absentees. Now, the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would you ask the Members to be seated?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please be seated on the Republican side. Representative Leinenweber, Collins, Ropp, Reilly, Simms. The Rules say, and you're law-abiding. You're law-abiding. Representative Reilly. Representative Winchester, please sit down. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Campbell. Capuzi. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich."



Gaines. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom.
 Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones.
 Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber.
 Leverenz. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino.
 McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy.
 Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen.
 Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler.
 Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms.
 Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl.
 Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk.
 Vinson. Waddell. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Williams."

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

Hoxsey: "Yes, I would like leave to be verified, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Hoxsey be verified? Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "How many votes at this time, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-seven."

Madigan: "Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Madigan: "Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco is here. Bianco."

Madigan: "Boucek."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco."

Madigan: "Boucek."

Speaker Redmond: "Boucek. He's in the back."

Madigan: "Capuzi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi. Is Capuzi here?"

Take him off the Roll Call."

Madigan: "Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Deuster."



Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Donovan."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Donovan here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "He's...Representative Ewing here? Representa-
tive Ewing? Oh, yeah, I see him. He's here. He's shy."

Madigan: "Virginia Fr derick."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Madigan: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Hallock."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly?"

Madigan: "Hallock."

Speaker Redmond: "Hallock. He's...he's here. He's in the
wrong seat, but he's here. He's warming Representative
Schlickman's seat."

Madigan: "Hallstrom."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Madigan: "Hudson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski. He's here."

Madigan: "Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Leverenz here? How's he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. He's in the press
box. He's got a better job."



Madigan: "Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think that's the right pronunciation.
Margalus. He's here."

Madigan: "How is Mr. McGrew recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Madigan: "Molloy."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Oblinger."

Speaker Redmond: "Oblinger. She's here."

Madigan: "Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Polk. Is Representative Polk here? How's
he recorded? That isn't Polk there, is it?"

Madigan: "That's Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Madigan: "Pullen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pullen. She's here in the wrong place."

Madigan: "Reed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed is here."

Madigan: "Schlickman."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Schlickman here? How's
he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Stanley."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Stuffle."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded? He's in the center
aisle. He's here."

Madigan: "Swanstrom."

Speaker Redmond: "Swanstrom is here."

Madigan: "Waddell."



Speaker Redmond: "I think he's way in the back. Is Representative Waddell back there? He's here."

Madigan: "Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Wrong place, but he's here."

Representative Donovan has returned. Put him back.

Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "How am I recorded, Mr...?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Yourell: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'. Any further questions? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote Representative Mulcahey 'aye'. Any further questions? What's the count? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Darrow: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Representative Van Duyne. Van Duyne, 'aye'. Representative Katz, 'aye'. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "How is Mr. Harris recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Harris? How's he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Madigan: "Is he here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Harris here?"

Madigan: "Would you remove from the Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative from the Roll Call."

Madigan: "Here he is. He can make up his own mind."

Speaker Redmond: "Put him back on. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a...I have a bet that there's going to be 122 'aye' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "It's against the law. Anything further?"



What's the count? I'll take that bet, Harry. I'll take the bet. Representative Harris. Representative Harris, do you desire to be recorded? Representative Leinenweber, do you still want that bet? I don't know. Will you record the Speaker as 'no'? On this question there's 96 'aye', 25 'no', and the motion carried. Forty-five 'no', and the motion carried. Is there any...page 22. Is there anyone that has a motion on the Speaker's Table that desires to have it called? No one desires to have any of the Resolutions on the Speaker's Table called? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "You...you just mean just the Speaker's Table on page 22, right?"

Speaker Redmond: "Twenty-two, twenty-three, and twenty-four."

Johnson: "We'd just like to move a couple of those Constitutional Amendments to Third Reading if we could."

Speaker Redmond: "Do what?"

Johnson: "No, that's all right. Forget it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Page 24, House Joint Resolution 46. It creates a joint House-Senate Committee to study the feasibility and the economical and social impact of mandatory auto emissions testings program in the State of Illinois. I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question...Representative...the question's on the Gentleman's motion that House Joint Resolution 46 be adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Whoops, whoops, whoops! I'm too fast on that one. It's on page 24. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90...103 'aye' and 6 'no'. The motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. Anything further? Any announcements? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a motion on the



Supplemental Calendar last night, and it was not heard last night, and it did not appear on the Calendar today. What is the reason?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was the motion?"

McMaster: "We had Senate Bill 58 assigned to Counties and Townships with Walter Kozubowski as Sponsor. He was not there to be heard. Representative Yourell did not feel that we could hear the Bill. He agreed with the putting of this motion before the House to discharge the Committee and have the Bill heard on Second Reading. The Sponsorship..."

Speaker Redmond: "You'd better...you'd better file a new motion to take it from the table, because under our Rules it was tabled yesterday. Yesterday was the deadline. Anything further? Any announcements? Agreed Resolutions. Don't forget to tell the Members that they have the opportunity to have all their Resolutions called on the Speaker's Table. Representative Giorgi."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 362, Skinner. 363, Bower. 364, Ralph Dunn. 365, Waddell. 366, Waddell. 367, Darrow. 368, Harris. 369, Pullen. House Joint Resolution 61, Giorgi-Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Do you have Senate Joint Resolution 8? Number 33, rather? Senate Joint #33, also? While you're looking for it, I'll read the...the House Resolution 362 by Skinner. He wants to study the effects of marijuana on driving. 363 by Bower tells about the present Illinois State Dental Society. 364 by Dunn marks a 4030...43rd birthday. 365, Waddell, notes the institution of marriage. 366 by Waddell notes the 50th wedding anniversary. 367 by Darrow deplors the termination of gas and electric service. 368 by Harris heralds the popcorn day. 369 by Pullen congratulates the Board of Trustees of Oakland College. 61 by Giorgi-Pierce says the energy



shortage, and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions, except for that Senate Joint. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

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

Clerk Leone: "No further Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any announcements? Representative Madigan for the adjournment. How many...how much time do you..."

Madigan: "Does the Clerk need any time?"

Speaker Redmond: "...need, Mr. Clerk? No time."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn to 9 a. m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adjourn till 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The House stands adjourned. Anybody wants to stay to listen to Representative Vinson, why they're welcome. Representative Vinson. Nine o'clock."

Vinson: "All right. Do you have any idea yet whether...whether it's your intention to work on Saturday?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Vinson: "You have no idea, or it...it's..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I don't in...I don't think we'll have to unless, you know, we get caught up. The plan is... the plan is to come in later Monday than we had contemplated, too, so..."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 14, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0023	MOTIONS	PAGE	186
HB-1037	MOTIONS	PAGE	205
HB-1267	MOTIONS	PAGE	190
HB-1400	MOTIONS	PAGE	192
HB-1838	MOTIONS	PAGE	194
HB-2661	MOTIONS	PAGE	195
SB-0007	3RD READING	PAGE	100
SB-0023	3RD READING	PAGE	101
SB-0032	MOTIONS	PAGE	196
SB-0044	MOTIONS	PAGE	206
SB-0057	3RD READING	PAGE	169
SB-0065	3RD READING	PAGE	169
SB-0087	3RD READING	PAGE	172
SB-0094	3RD READING	PAGE	14
SB-0139	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0154	2ND READING	PAGE	3
	2ND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0156	3RD READING	PAGE	90
SB-0176	3RD READING	PAGE	102
SB-0206	MOTIONS	PAGE	210
SB-0208	MOTIONS	PAGE	215
SB-0209	3RD READING	PAGE	175
SB-0250	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0265	3RD READING	PAGE	171
SB-0308	3RD READING	PAGE	17
SB-0312	3RD READING	PAGE	108
SB-0350	3RD READING	PAGE	123
SB-0359	2ND READING	PAGE	128
SB-0361	3RD READING	PAGE	24
SB-0417	3RD READING	PAGE	90
SB-0419	3RD READING	PAGE	90
SB-0421	3RD READING	PAGE	24
SB-0442	2ND READING	PAGE	92
SB-0450	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0486	2ND READING	PAGE	131
SB-0490	3RD READING	PAGE	115
SB-0513	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0518	2ND READING	PAGE	92
SB-0536	2ND READING	PAGE	93
SB-0540	2ND READING	PAGE	149
SB-0554	3RD READING	PAGE	26
SB-0558	2ND READING	PAGE	27
SB-0559	3RD READING	PAGE	124

SB185 →
2nd Rdy
Pg 3

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 14, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-0644	MOTIONS	PAGE	215
SB-0667	2ND READING	PAGE	4
	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0676	2ND READING	PAGE	5
SB-0693	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0700	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0708	2ND READING	PAGE	93
SB-0710	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0711	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0712	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0713	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0716	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0723	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0735	3RD READING	PAGE	41
SB-0755	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0758	3RD READING	PAGE	125
SB-0764	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0790	2ND READING	PAGE	5
SB-0795	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0797	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0811	2ND READING	PAGE	43
SB-0847	2ND READING	PAGE	93
SB-0862	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0882	3RD READING	PAGE	126
SB-0886	3RD READING	PAGE	48
SB-0892	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-0909	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-0930	2ND READING	PAGE	8
SB-0932	3RD READING	PAGE	45
SB-0933	MOTIONS	PAGE	48
SB-0952	3RD READING	PAGE	49
SB-0956	3RD READING	PAGE	50
SB-0975	3RD READING	PAGE	54
SB-0991	3RD READING	PAGE	56
SB-0994	3RD READING	PAGE	57
SB-1019	2ND READING	PAGE	149
SB-1025	3RD READING	PAGE	59
SB-1040	3RD READING	PAGE	93
SB-1041	2ND READING	PAGE	93
SB-1049	3RD READING	PAGE	60
SB-1068	3RD READING	PAGE	159
SB-1089	3RD READING	PAGE	61
SB-1099	2ND READING	PAGE	144

SB-1101	3RD READING	PAGE	57
SB-1107	3RD READING	PAGE	60
SB-1110	3RD READING	PAGE	62
SB-1113	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-1120	3RD READING	PAGE	167
SB-1125	2ND READING	PAGE	146
SB-1128	3RD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1134	3RD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1137	3RD READING	PAGE	66
SB-1142	3RD READING	PAGE	68
SB-1166	2ND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1167	3RD READING	PAGE	68
SB-1182	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-1190	3RD READING	PAGE	91
SB-1200	2ND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1204	3RD READING	PAGE	69
SB-1212	3RD READING	PAGE	78
SB-1219	3RD READING	PAGE	79
SB-1220	3RD READING	PAGE	152
SB-1226	3RD READING	PAGE	152
SB-1241	3RD READING	PAGE	79
SB-1246	MOTIONS	PAGE	218
SB-1259	3RD READING	PAGE	82
SB-1265	3RD READING	PAGE	86
SB-1284	3RD READING	PAGE	88
SB-1314	2ND READING	PAGE	127
SB-1320	2ND READING	PAGE	130
SB-1334	3RD READING	PAGE	89
SB-1336	3RD READING	PAGE	89
SB-1341	2ND READING	PAGE	140
SB-1342	2ND READING	PAGE	93
SB-1348	3RD READING	PAGE	163
HR-0178	MOTIONS	PAGE	219
HR-0284	MOTIONS	PAGE	220
HJR-0046	3RD READING	PAGE	235
*HJR-0013	MOTIONS	PAGE	222

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 14, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. SCHRACK - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. CHAPHAN - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
H.R. 10B/MOTION TO CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS	PAGE	180
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	236
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	237