

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order. Representatives please be in their seats. Be lead in prayer this morning by the Reverend Ophelius McCoy, the Grace of the United Methodist Church of Springfield, the guest Chaplain today."

McCoy: "Let us pray; Oh God, Thy knowest that today these, Thou sons and daughters, must make decisions which are going to effect the lives of many of Thy children. Help them to choose the right way. Grant them Thy guidance and with it, grant them the humble obediance to accept. Help them to choose <sup>what</sup> not what they want to, but Thy would have them to do. Grant that they may not be swayed by fear or by hope of gain, by selfish love, or ease of comfort, or by personal ambition, or by the desire to escape the longing for prestige. Help them today in humble obedience to say to Thee, 'Lord, what will Thy have me to do?' And then, to await Thy guidance and to accept Thy lead and hear this, our prayer, and send us an answer so clear that we can not mistake it. This I ask for Thy lovesake. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederick, lead us in the pledge of allegiance."

Frederick: "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: "Take the record. House Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate. Take 93 out of the record. 107."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 107, a Bill for an Act in relation to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the title of the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "107.."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the title of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "...chynopapain. It's a mistype."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 122."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act relating to garnishment. 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 Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 180. Representative Oblinger has been requesting that one out of the records. So, we'd better take it out. 263."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 263, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to adoption of persons. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 313."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 313, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Better take this one out of the record. 324."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 324, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 404."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 404, a Bill for an Act relating to Illinois industrial development authority and the Commission



for Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 432. Representative Getty?"

Getty: "I think 404 was to be held for an Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Was what?"

Getty: "404, for a technical Amendment. I think we just moved it."

Speaker Redmond: "We moved it to Third. Was there an Amendment  
on it?"

Getty: "There's a technical Amendment that's coming."

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have one here. 432."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 432, 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: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 494."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 494, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.  
Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 509."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 509, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Consumer Finance 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: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 553."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 553, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill  
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 567."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.  
Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 617."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 617, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 628."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading  
of the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on 617 why don't we move that to  
Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there was a Floor Amendment and I didn't  
see Representative Cullerton on the floor. He's the  
House Sponsor."

Getty: "I'd be more than happy to handle it for him, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 628. Any motion with respect to  
Amendment 1?" "Out of the record. The Amendment isn't  
here. 617."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 617, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 617 on page one by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner here? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, since the Gentleman isn't here, would you move it to Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 715. Wait a minute. Further Amendment? 617."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner here? I guess not. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 715."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 715, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the founding and operation of University of Illinois Hospital. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, are we moving Bills that Amendments have been filed? Are you moving them on to Third?..."

Speaker Redmond: "If the Sponsor of the Amendment is not here, that's always been the practice of the Chair. If you file an Amendment to a Bill you have to be here to present your Amendments."

Ryan: "Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, you ought to take those out of the record and hold them."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll meet that Bill by Bill, but that has always been my policy. If you have an Amendment to a Bill you have to be here to Sponsor it. It's not fair to the Sponsor of a Bill to file an Amendment and not be here."

Ryan: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but Members are absent for one reason or another sometimes. Sometimes they're legi-



timate, sometimes they aren't. And if you're going to persist in that, I'll have to persis... I'll have to ask for a quorum."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll meet it Bill by Bill. Generally speaking, I will accomodate the Minority Leader. 715."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 715, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections... Sections of an Act in relation to the founding and operation of the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 824."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 824, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 861."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 861, a Bill for an Act in relation to surface coal mining fees and the use of these fees. 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 Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 907."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 907, a Bill for an Act to amend Higher Education Student Assistance Law of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Hannig, amends Senate Bill



907..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Redmond: "Hannig, is he here? Out of the record. 983."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 983, a Bill for an Act in relation to conservation of energy. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1038."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act in relation to the penalties for failing to file or for filing fraudulent tax returns. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1047."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act in relation to investigations of liquor licenses and to the imposition of fines. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Emil Jones on the floor? Guess we'd better take it out. Now is it agreed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Mahar, amends Senate Bill 1047 on page one, line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 deals with the disposition of those fines and Representative Jones is aware of the Amendment and supports the Amendment."

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 carries. The Amendment's adopted.  
Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Tuerk, amends Senate Bill  
1047 on page one, line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you discussed this with..."

Tuerk: "Yes, Sir. I discussed it at some length yesterday. He  
has agreed to it. He has no objection to this Amendment.  
I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty. Getty."

Getty: "This says Amendment 2, is that right? Isn't this a Bill  
that was defeated at some time in the past?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, it never was defeated. It was on Postponed Consid-  
eration and this is an opportunity for me to get the Bill  
or the Amendment onto this Bill which would put the  
Peoria Museum in the same posture as the Chicago Museum  
which we passed two years ago. And as I recounted the..  
Representative Jones has no objection to this Amendment."

Getty: "With that representation, I won't object."

Speaker Redmond: "You say Representative Jones has no objection?"

Tuerk: "That's correct."

Getty: "Based on that representation, I do not object either."

Speaker Redmond: "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  
carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amend-  
ments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1061. Does the Gentleman  
have leave to retain it on Short Debate? Hearing no ob-  
jection, leave is granted. 1061."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1061, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of





the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Abramson, amends Senate Bill 1061 on page one, line two, by inserting after 'amended' the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Abramson on the floor? Out of the record. 1104."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Would you take that out of the record, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1140."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1140, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to contractors and material men's liens known as mechanics liens. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment... Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1146."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Steczo on the floor? Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment? Better take it out of the record. 1162."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Coroner's and Deputy Coroner's Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 1162 on page 3, line 4, by deleting 'Class A misdemeanor'



and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was an Amendment that was suggested by the Democratic staff. Originally the penalty for an unlicensed <sup>embalmer</sup> ~~the way~~ the Act read was Class A misdemeanor. It was suggested by the staff that it more properly ought to be a business offense. The Amendment changes it from Class A misdemeanor to business offense and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "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 carries. Amendment 1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1171."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance 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 Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1172."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1172, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Hoffman-Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 1172 as amended by Amendment #1 by inserting the following between lines 17 and 18."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle on Amendment 2. Hoffman Stuffle Amendment. Does Representative Leinenweber have



leave to retain 1162 on Short Debate? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1172 Sponsored by Representative Hoffman and myself is necessary because of our need to replace the corporate personal property tax. The Amendment provides that beginning with the school year 1981 when replacement revenue will have an effect on the school aid formula, but we would factor in the state's replacement revenue into the school aid formula so that we have an off-set against that revenue and so that school districts will not receive a wind fall from the fact that they're receiving corporate replacement revenue at the same time they should not be receiving additional state aid. Representative Hoffman and I have worked this out with the staff of the School Problems Commission, Representative Schneider the Chairman of the House Elementary and Secondary Committee. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

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 carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Hoffman-Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 1172 as amended by Amendment #1 and so forth."

Stuffle: "Amendment #3 again has been run by the same group of people. It's Sponsored by Representative Hoffman and myself and it provides that where a school district has an increase in its average daily attendance of more than 5%, currently 2% and in the Bill there is no supplementary claim, but where the district has a 5% increase in enrollment after the first month, they can file a supplementary claim for additional state aid. It's consistent with the rest of the Bill as amended and I move its adoption."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Does he have leave to leave it on the Order of Short Debate? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1201."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to private employment agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1205."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1205, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1232."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1232, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. 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: "Third Reading..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. 1234. 1238."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1238, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance 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: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1247."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consolidation of Elections Implementation Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1281."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance 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 Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1347. 1347."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1360."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1395, a Bill for an Act in relation



to the implementation and consolidation of elections.  
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, Bowman-Braun, amends Senate Bill 1395 on page one and line.."

Speaker Redmond: "Better take it out of the record. Representative Yourell is not here. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I understand Senate Bill 1232 was moved to Third Reading and I had agreed to hold that on Second while the Democratic staff is mulling over whether they might want to put an Amendment... I wonder if you could put that back on Second Reading with leave of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to return 1232 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1232 will be on Second Reading. 1423."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act in relation to fiscal support of County convalescent and nursing homes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 628.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Air Carriers 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... Representative Bower."

Bower: "In Committee, Representative Dunn had.. wanted an Amendment offered for that which I just received this morning, which I wanted to clear with him. So, I'd like to hold it on Second Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second Reading. 10... Senate Bills,  
Second Reading on page 10. Bill #10."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Parental Responsibility Law. Second  
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey on the floor? Huskey?  
Out of the record. 41."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 41, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Abulatory Surgical Treatment Center Act.  
Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 47."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 47, a Bill for an Act in relation  
to abortions and to establish penalties for the violation  
thereof. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amend-  
ments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly or Hannig.. neither one are here. Out  
of the record. Wait a minute. 50. Out of the record.  
80, Representative Stanley is not here. Out of the  
record. 100."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 100, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond : "Third Reading. 101."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 101, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 123."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 123, a Bill for an Act relating to wages of employees. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McPike, amends Senate Bill 123 on page one by deleting lines 4 and 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Is ... here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...And so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike. Representative Kornowicz, what's your pleasure? Out of the record. 133. 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 motions with respect to Amendments 1, 2, and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #3..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Daniels on the floor? Who filed the motion to table? Better take it out of the record. Daniels isn't here. 198. 198."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 198, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was withdrawn in Committee. Floor Amendment #2, Preston, amends Senate Bill 198 on page 3 by deleting lines 1 through 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment just deletes the mandatory 30 day jail sentence."





This was an Amendment that was agreed to and that I agreed on the House floor to make on this Bill."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Preston-Stearney, amends Senate Bill 198 on page 2 by deleting lines 26 through 28 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 makes a change that I also agreed to on the House floor. This makes it clear that a defendant to be found guilty of aggravated battery of a senior citizen would have to knowingly would have to know that the individual that he is battering is a person 65 years of age or older."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Now you have to be a mindreader? Senior citizens are looking younger and younger every day. You have to prove that the teen age punk knows that the person that he's assaulting or she's assaulting is over 65?"

Preston: "That is correct."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this Amendment. This is an Amendment that is definitely not good for senior citizens. It would... if this Amendment passes and senior citizens want to have protection, they're going to have to wear make-up to look like 80 year olds so that the young punk can have no.. no doubt whatsoever in his or her mind that he or she is assaulting someone over 65. "

Speaker Redmond : "Proceed. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Skinner, this is the same requirement that is contained in that code Section for knowing that an individual is an employee of



the CTA, knowing that an individual is a police officer, knowing that an individual is a teacher, and this is knowing the individual to be, in fact, a senior citizen 65 years of age or older."

Skinner: "I don't think that makes it any better. If you want to protect senior citizens, it seems to me you ought to be voting against this Amendment and I would ask for a Roll Call on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield? How in the world is somebody going to know that a person is 65?"

Preston: "Representative Waddell, that requirement of knowledge is the same as it is in any area of the Criminal Code. It's a matter of proof. You have to prove that the individual looks to be 65.. to be over 65 years of age. That's a fact to be determined by the trier of facts, either the Judge or the jury, as the case may be. If the individual does not look to be that age, there's no reason that the perpetrator of the crime was.. is to be held to know the age of the individual then that element would not be present. But it's a matter of fact to be proved at the trial, just like any other facts."

Waddell: "May I address the Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Waddell: "If this is, in fact, our law, I want to thank you for alerting us to how ridiculous it really is. If this is the way the rest of the law is, then not only should we defeat this Amendment, we'd better change the rest of the law."

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

Leinenweber: "I missed the explanation of the Amendment. I wish the Gentleman would once more quickly run through what the Amendment does."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Preston, to explain the Amend-



ment once more."

Preston: "The Amendment states that the, I'm paraphrasing now, that the individual quote, 'knows the individual harmed to be over 65 years of age, commits aggravated battery.'"

Leinenweber: "Is this the Amendment that you attempted to present in Committee, then withdrew when it became apparent that it would hurt the Bill?"

Preston: "No, this is not the Amendment. This is the Amendment that was drafted with Representative Stearney, with Senator Murlough, and myself."

Leinenweber: "Okay, thank you."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "~~Representative Matijevich in the Chair.~~"

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

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

Deuster: "And the question is this; I presume that the reason you are offering this Amendment to require knowledge is to make sure that this law is Constitutional since it's a criminal law. Is that correct or what is the reasoning for your putting the requirement of knowledge in the Bill?"

Preston: "The reasoning, Representative, is that this was required by Members on your side of the aisle in order for them to support this Bill. Representative Stearney drafted this Amendment. He was the one who suggested it and insisted upon its adoption in order to go along with the Bill. I think that since knowledge is required for other elements of aggravated battery, knowledge for this is better than not having this Bill. This is more protection for the senior citizens than they have without this Bill. I wouldn't ... my personal feeling is that if the knowledge element was taken out it would still be Constitutional. But in order to get



the support of Members on your side of the aisle, I agreed to allow Representative Stearney to add this Amendment."

Deuster: "Do you think that it's reasonably possible to prove ... I don't know what your age is. I don't think if I stood here looking at you I could really guess. I might take a wild guess. I don't know how in the world you could require somebody to know that someone else is 65. The Ladies wear wigs and rouge and you have facial uplifts and everything else. Do you believe this is..."

Preston: "Yes, personally a little too stringent. I think that it would completely gut the Bill, but I think it takes out some of the teeth of the Bill. I agree with that. This was not an Amendment that I insisted on and in fact, I would prefer to have this Bill passed without this Amendment. But I do think it is a matter of proof that is possible to have proof to the trier of the facts in any court proceeding. It is not a simple proof. I grant you that. But it is possible to prove that the individual is and looks to be over 65 years of age and that the defendant in a particular crime could be held to know the individual was over 65 years of age in many circumstances, not all circumstances."

Deuster: "My last question is this, if we don't adopt this Amendment, what does the Bill provide with respect to the criminal intent or the degree of knowledge or awareness?"

Preston: "Without this Amendment, Representative, the Bill would hold that a person who knowingly and without legal justification and by any means causes bodily harm to an individual 60 years of age or older, commits aggravated battery."

Deuster: "Well, if I would speak to the Amendment, the requirement of knowledge or knowingly is already in the Bill and in the law and I think the Sponsor is sincerely making an effort to try and improve the chances of passing this Bill, but there are more Members than just Representative



Stearney and a couple of others and I think unless this Amendment is really supported by knowledge and reason and common sense it shouldn't be adopted. I would urge that this Amendment be rejected and then on Third Reading we'll take our chances with the Bill, because knowingly is already in there and that's a good enough legal term in my opinion. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "In agreement, I would presume that.. Mr. Deuster, in agreement I would presume that one of the conditions the court would inspect as to whether the person knowingly committed such a crime and against a person over 65. The defense obviously would be, 'You know, I didn't know he was 60 or 65 or whatever it is.' That would be the prime consideration, the prime defense answer, factor whether we put on the Amendment or don't. Don't you agree?"

Preston: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevec: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask that this Amendment be taken out of the record until I have an opportunity to speak with Representative Stearney and with the Gentlemen..."

Speaker Matijevec: "Well, if it's Representative Stearney's Amendment, the policy of the ... Is it Preston's Amendment? I thought it was..."

Preston: "Preston hyphen Stearney."

Speaker Matijevec: "Oh, I'm sorry. Out of the record. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly glad to see you're in the Chair now and that you're giving courtesy to the Members that the real Speaker did not give earlier this morning."

Speaker Matijevec: "The next Bill is Senate Bill 228."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 228, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of Higher Education Student Assistant Law.  
Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that the Speaker Redmond did an excellent job and don't believe anything Representative Skinner says."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. I'll take that... Committee Amendments?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 235."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 235, a Bill for an Act <sup>reinstating</sup> the requirement for annual information returns to the Service Retailers and Hotel Operators Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 244."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 244, .."

Speaker Matijevich: <sup>Had</sup> fiscal note has not been filed. Senate Bill... One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, Representative O'Brien asked me to handle this for him and my understanding is it was filed..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, he's here and he says it's on the way. Let's hold just for a moment."

Getty: "Oh. Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm told by the Clerk's Office there's a difference between on the way and filed. Senate Bill 287."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 287, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Child Labor Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 362."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 362, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Teachers Retirement System Article of the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijeich: "Floor Amendmnts?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 384."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijeivch: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeivch: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 492."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 492, a Bill for an Act to amend the County Home Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeivch: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 495."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 495, a Bill for an Act to create the Regulatory Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Matijeovich: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 501."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 501, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Third Reading. One moment. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Robbins: "I have.. I have an Amendment that should up very shortly. I talked to Mr. McClain, the Sponsor, and asked him if he could put it on. He said... I asked if he would hold ..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative McClain, the Gentleman from Quincy, Representative McClain. Representative Robbins informs the Chair that you have said that you would hold Senate Bill 501. An Amendment is on the way. Is that true?"

Robbins: "I asked if he would hold it."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Well, the Chair is now asking him that. The Gentleman from Quincy, Representative McClain. That's true. Alright. Hold."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, no. I mean.. He didn't ask me to hold it. He said he hoped the Amendment would be ready and .. before we called, but out of courtesy to him, I'll hold it."

Speaker Matijeovich: Alright. Hold Senate Bill 501. Senate Bill 533."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 533, a Bill for an Act to create the State Fair Commission, defining its powers and duties. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Did you say Committee Amendment? Any.."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "Any motions?"





Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijeich: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment, a request for a fiscal note has been withdrawn by Representative Bullock."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 560."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act to revise the Election Code governing nominating petitions. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 619."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 619, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "I've been asked to take this Bill out of the record. The Sponsor's not here. 636. Senate Bill 636."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 636, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois State Fair. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Kane, amends Senate Bill 636 on page 4 by deleting lines 9 through 13 and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, on Amendment 1."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Amendment does to Senate Bill 636 is to require the State Fair to become financially self-sufficient over a three year period. This is something that we've discussed in the past, I feel that there is sufficient revenue available at the State Fair to make it self-sufficient. It would phase it in over a three year period. There are other State Fair, particularly in Wisconsin and Minnesota, that have been self-sufficient for a number of years."



They've run very successfully and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of the Bill I would ask the House to reject this Amendment. The testimony before State Government <sup>our</sup> <sup>Committee</sup> was quite clear. The reasons the Wisconsin and the Minnesota Fairs are able to be self-sufficient is because they're in major metropolitan areas where they are able to rent out the facility constantly year-round in million plus population areas. There is no way that we could do that in Springfield. The management of the Department of Agriculture under which this... this Bill would place the management of the fair is committed to doing the best job it can. It is committed to expanding the number of times we rent out the fair grounds. But the testimony was very clear that a fair in a town this size simply cannot be self-sufficient because it cannot generate that kind of income. Second of all, I would ask the House.. could we have some order, Mr. Speaker? I would ask the House to reject the Amendment. It seems to me that Representative Kane, who's a good friend of mine, is in this case being a little unfair. The House has already passed his Bill. I voted the Bill out of Committee. The Republicans supported it on the floor. We passed his Bill to the Senate. It's going to pass the Senate in the form that he wants it and it's going to go to the Governor's desk in the form he wants it, with this provision in it. It seems to me that as the Sponsor of this Bill, I am entitled to get the Bill to Third Reading in the shape that I want it. You can vote it up or down at that point. It doesn't seem to me that Representative Kane, when he's had this help from us to pass his Bill in his form, and it's going to the



Governor's desk in the form he wants it, ought now be offering this Amendment. So, for those two reasons, I would ask the House to reject the Amendment."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor of the Amendment could share with the House the contents of the letter to the editor that he wrote to Sunday's paper with regard to attendance at the State Fair here in comparison to the one in Milwaukee."

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

Kane: "Last year the State Fair in Springfield drew 126,000 people. The one in Milwaukee drew only 815,000."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "So the one in Springfield drew more than the one in Milwaukee?"

Kane: "Yes. (sic)."

Skinner: "Now, what about the contention that the Gentleman who spoke from Morgan... why is his mike still on? He's not the Sponsor of the Bill? From Morgan County, what about his contention that the only reason the Milwaukee fair is able to break even is because of the expositions that are not at the fair.. at the time of the fair? Is that a valid argument? And if not, why not?"

Kane: "No, I don't think that it is. I think that if you take.. if you look at the revenue from the State Fair in Milwaukee and the one here in Springfield, the.. and you don't count outside rentals, <sup>is that</sup> the State Fair in Illinois brings in only 50% of the revenue of the state fair in Wisconsin, even though the gate attendants fees are approximately the same. On the other hand, the cost of running the State Fair here in Springfield compared to the cost of running the same size fair in Milwaukee



is one million dollars more in Springfield."

Skinner: "Why on earth is that?"

Kane: "Well because I think in Milwaukee they have the discipline of having to break even. Here in Springfield there is ... there is no discipline to do that and so they spend money when they don't really need to."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to speak in favor of the Amendment. I would compare the State Fair to a county home that a county government operates. It is different from any other county department because it is an enterprise department. It is supposed to break even. It's not supposed to have a net loss. And because of the discipline that is placed on the county home by the County Board the manager of the county home does everything in his or her power to make sure that the minimum amount of money is lost, if any is lost, or to make sure that they can break even. It seems to me that the State Fair, since I've observed it, has been really the laughing stock of state government and that without statutory discipline our ordering the State Fair not to lose money, that it will continue to lose money. I remember, I probably will always remember, Representative Hanahan just hilarious question<sup>ing</sup> of one State Fair manager who admitted that it cost \$1.00 per animal per day to clean up the manure produced by the animals at the State Fair. Now, I'm not sure that's an exception. Another year after this scathing criticism in the Appropriations Committee, we found out we were renting golf carts at the State Fair for more money than it would cost to buy them. The State Fair really is an embarrassment to the State of Illinois the way it has been run in the past and I really think that giving the State Fair a three year warning that they have to break even is enough of a lead time. If this is too strenuous a standard, we can always change it two years from now."



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

Waddell: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "According to the newspaper here in Springfield, Representative Kane, is this the same Amendment that you're going to put on for your civic center?"

Kane: "I am in opposition to that Bill and I will speak against it on the floor of the House."

Waddell: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "Doug, how large is the State Fair facility in square, either miles or square acres out there?"

Kane: "There are about 300 acres."

Griesheimer: "And I anticipate there must be what.. at least a half a dozen to a dozen buildings?"

Speaker Matijevich: "What was that?"

Griesheimer: "There must be half a dozen to a dozen buildings used for display and for purposes of gatherings and conventions and things like that."

Kane: "Yes."

Griesheimer: "Can you tell me what this tremendous facility that could well prosper by additional business, why Springfield needs a convention center?"

Kane: "That decision was made about ten years ago."

Griesheimer: "I see."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify



by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the financial arrangements of the State Fair have been a subject of scandal for a number of years, for as many years as I've been in Springfield and I think, as many years as any of you have been coming down to Springfield. What this Amendment does is to say that the State Fair over a period of 3 years will have to break even. There's been a lot of comparisons between the Illinois State Fair and the Wisconsin State Fair and the statement has been made that the two fairs are not comparable and we shouldn't require the Illinois State Fair to break even. But let me tell you that if you look at the financial arrangements and compare those two fairs and if you leave out bond payments that Wisconsin has to make and you leave out premium and prize monies out of both fairs, and you compare the two fairs, as at the end of last year the Wisconsin State Fair ended up with a profit of 1. of \$800,000 and the Illinois State Fair ended up with a loss of 1.3 million. That's the difference between the kind of discipline that the Wisconsin State Fair has to undergo and the lack of discipline that the Illinois State Fair has to undergo. There has been some question about whether or not the agricultural community will continue to be subsidized and promoted by the State Fair. What this Amendment specifically exempts is the prize and premium monies that go to support agriculture. That is specifically exempted. It's only the operation and the direct expenses of the State Fair that would have to stand on its own. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 636."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, has moved for the adoption of Committee Amendment...



of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 636. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. Yes, Representative Reilly?"

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, I requested a Roll Call. I would appreciate..."

Speaker Matijevec: "I didn't hear that. That's why I paused. Alright. Are you joined by ... Alright. Those in favor of Amendment #1 signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Robbins.. from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very commendable Amendment. The only trouble of it is once it is put on this Bill, if the Bill passes, it becomes law. I think we should strive to make our State Fair break even and make money, but whenever you put something into law, it has to be that way or you close it down. Now, if you try to get.. we have voted a good bit of money for convention centers and to subsidize them and to keep them going and if you have tried to get a parking place or a hotel room in the city of Springfield, you know that the State Fair during the time that it is in town brings in Springfield... brings Springfield in more net dollars than any convention centers will throughout this southern Illinois and as a Legislator we're subsidizing them a good bit. I think you.. I think it's commendable that we should try to set this up. We have passed law.. We have passed new regulations and what have you and I just believe that you're making a bad mistake because once something becomes law there is no exemption to it."

Speaker Matijevec: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are



76 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand that Representative Oblinger from Sangamon has an introduction and a presentation to make. Josephine Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you look up here in the right hand gallery, we have the Members of the Great American People Show Company. A lot of you have already met them. They're the ones who put on 'Your Obedient Servant, Abe Lincoln.' A number of you have met their lead man and I want to introduce him to all of you today, Mr. Kirk Hard, and the director, John Aheart. They're hoping that all of us will come to see them. The reason for them being here today besides having you meet them is we're presenting to them the Resolution that you passed on May 25th and I would really appreciate it if you'd join me in welcoming the Great American People Show Company."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you, Josephine. We will now revert back to Senate Bill 198. Representative Preston informs me he would like to proceed with the Stearney Amendment. Senate Bill 198."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 198,..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston. I think we've heard the debate on this. Representative Preston to close on the Amendment, as soon as we present it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Preston-Stearney, amends Senate Bill 198 on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, Representative Preston, to close on Amendment #3."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate





Bill 198 as we discussed creates the crime of aggravated battery of the senior citizen. Amendment #3 adds an element to that crime to require the perpetrator, the defendant, to know that the individual that he batters, the victim, is 65 years of age or older. This was agreed to by myself... this is agreed to .. this is drafted by Representative Stearney. He supports this Bill and I ask for its due passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. We'll try a voice vote first. Representative Preston has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 198. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'... or saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Now I understand the fiscal note has been filed for Senate Bill 244. So we will call 244."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 244, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "The fiscal note has been filed?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 659."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 659, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2, and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 674."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 674, a Bill for an Act to amend the



Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading... Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "No Floor Amendments? Third Reading.

Senate Bill 676. Just one moment. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you arise?"

Leinenweber: "I have an Amendment I'm having drafted on 676.

I wonder if we could take that one out of the record so.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Out of the record, 676. I don't see the Sponsor there anyway. Mr. Clerk, I'm informed

that we put 659 on Third Reading and the Sponsor wasn't here and there's been a request to hold it. So, return 659 back to Second Reading and hold. Senate Bill 687."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 687, a Bill for an Act transferring the control of the Kankakee Dam property. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 688."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 688, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Conservation to convey the Rock River Dam site in Ogle County. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 745. Hold 745. Senate Bill 756."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 756, a Bill for an Act to amend an



Act relating to wrongful death. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "That Representative... Who's..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Currie, Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you ready?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 756 on line 15..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, on Amendment #1."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we take it out of the record? Is that alright with the Sponsor? No?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the Bill out of the record. Oh, no. Alright. Proceed with the Amendment."

Currie: "I'd like to move to table Amendments 1 and 2 and offer Amendment..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #1 and 2."

Currie: "And I'd like to offer Amendment #3 for approval..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments 1 and 2 are withdrawn. Proceed to Amendment #3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Currie, amends Senate Bill 756 on line 15 by inserting after the period the following and so forth."

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

Currie: "The purpose of the Amendment is merely to make it clear that we do not intend this, Senate Bill 756, to be in conflict with federal case law. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #3. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe the intent of this legislation is to go in this direction. I certainly don't see any reason why we should, you might say, spell out explicitly that it would not be under abortion. So,



I will oppose your Amendment, Representative."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, on Amendment #3."

Leinenweber: "I've got a question. I didn't understand the Lady's explanation. I wonder if she could repeat it."

Currie: "Alright. Thank you, Representative Leinenweber. The Bill itself makes a wrongful death action possible for a fetus that is wrongfully killed and the point of the Amendment is only to say that that Bill should not be understood to include fetus who are killed as a result of a lawfully performed abortion. It's really a technical Amendment that makes it clear that the intent of the Bill is not to do anything that's contrary to the legal standing of lawfully performed abortions."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, would you.. I wonder if you could read.. I don't have a copy of the Amendment before me. I did look at it yesterday. I wonder if you could read the text. I think its rather short."

Currie: "Yes. For purposes of this Section, no cause of action arises from a lawful abortion performed without negligence."

Leinenweber: "Well, does that have any meaning? It's my understanding that the act itself would not provide a cause of action unless there was wrongful death, which would presuppose negligence or willful and wanton misconduct."

Currie: "Perhaps this Amendment isn't necessary. Our thinking was that it would be useful to include this language so as to make quite clear that the wrongful death intended by the Act itself could not be interpreted to mean that lawful abortions performed without negligence would be so included."

Leinenweber: "You use the pronoun 'our'. Is that the royal 'our' or do you mean a group?"



Currie: "Yes, it's the royal 'our', Representative. Thank you."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly on the Amendment. I don't think it's necessary. The Bill itself is rather clear. I think the Lady points out that it probably isn't necessary and I don't think we should clutter up the law with unnecessary verbiage. Our laws are long enough so I would urge.. I would urge its defeat."

Speaker Matijevich: "The.. Lady from Cook, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think this is a useful Amendment. I think it's possible that Senate Bill 756, if it passed, may give rise to causes of action that are not intended by the Bill and it seems to me we've a responsibility to make it quite clear that this Bill is not intended to undercut the current federal case law, the current laws in general, with respect to lawfully performed abortions. I move the adoption of the Amendment "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, moves the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it. Further Amendments? Amendment fails."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 756 as follows after line 15 by adding and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is Representative Vinson here? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I'll carry Amendment #4 for Representative Vinson in his absence."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Amendment is withdrawn. Further Amendments?..."

Daniels: "No, no, no. Mr. Speaker, I'm handling it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, alright. We thought you said table it. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, on Amendment #3. (sic)."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Vinson filed Amendment #4 to cover a cause



of action as a result of wrongful death but you must prove that in an action in which a wrongful death is sought to be proven, the deceased party is a nonviable fetus. The plaintiff must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the defendant's misconduct was the proximate cause of the fetus' death. Now, it's my understanding that that is the current law, tying in proximate cause to the death of the fetus and Representative Vinson is trying to clarify that in this Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4.

On that, the Sponsor of the Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Daniels, does this change the standard of proof in a wrongful death case brought on behalf of a representative of a fetus?"

Daniels: "On this element, yes."

Cullerton: "Does it change the burden of proof?"

Daniels: "What the problem was that it's too easy to miscarry in the first three months of a pregnancy and what we're trying to do is specify that you must show that the death of the fetus was a result or a proximate cause of the action."

Cullerton: "Don't you have to do that right now?"

Daniels: "No."

Cullerton: "You don't have to prove causation in a wrongful death case?"

Daniels: "Your Bill would change this in such an extent that it's felt that we would not be able to determine whether or not the proximate cause in the first three months of pregnancy was as a result of the action of the defendant."

Cullerton: "Well, I have no problem with that, but what about the clear and convincing evidence? Isn't that a different standard of proof than.."

Daniels: "It's tougher. It's supposed to be tougher."



Cullerton: "For that reason I oppose the Amendment."

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

Brummer: "Yes, the Sponsor of the Amendment indicated that we had no way of determining<sup>ing</sup> that with certainty because of problems of the miscarriage. It is always the burden of proof of the plaintiff to prove by the preponderance of the evidence that negligence occurred and was proximate cause and damage resulted. Here, for some reason, by this Amendment, he is attempting to set up what I would preceive to be almost an impossible standard of proof with regard to the evidence required and in effect, would negate the entire purpose of the Bill. This Amendment ought to be opposed and defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, to close. One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. This is indeed, really a good Amendment. I think you have to take a look at the Bill. The Bill itself if left in its present form is really going to destroy family life. What you're going to be doing is you're going to have losses between husbands and wives, between children and their mothers and fathers, and I think the proof ought to be a little bit harder. And I think that Representative Daniels is absolutely correct that we would have a horrendous statue if this Bill passes out without the Daniels Amendment and I would urge an 'aye' vote on Daniel's Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're doing here is trying to cover the situation of a nonviable fetus. That means a fetus that cannot survive outside of the mother's womb. And in such a case, we're saying that the evidence must be clear and convincing that



the action of the defendant was the proximate cause of the fetus' death. Now due to the possibilities of miscarriages during that period of time, we feel that it's necessary to have this standard of proof and when you look at the Bill over all as Representative Jaffe says, you'll find that this is a fine Amendment and one that should be adopted into legislation. I urge your green support for the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 756. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 54 'ayes', 69 'nay's', one voting 'present'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Because of the urgency of the situation and the fact that we must have this standard for nonviable fetus, I have to ask for a poll of the absentees... on top of verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll of the absentees. Alright. Let's take a new Roll Call. Something happened to the machine, I guess. On this question.. Now, everybody vote and vote your own switch. There's been an indication that there may be a possible verification so vote your own switch. On this question all of those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 50 'ayes', 71 'nays', 4 'present'. And this Amendment, having failed to receive a Majority, is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third ... Third Reading. Senate Bills... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, for what purpose do you arise?"





Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the gallery to my left, we have visiting from Deerfield, Illinois, the Marcus family, Steve, Lynn, David and Mathew Marcus, from the 32nd District represented by Representative Dan Pierce, Representative Donald Deuster and Representative Betty Lou Reed."



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 752."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 752, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Was that Committee Amendment? Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #4, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 752 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, on Amendment #4."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to cope with this perennial problem we have about agricultural assessment, 'How to assess farm land', and I think that the best way to do it is to be quite straightforward. Allow everyone to know what we're doing and that does not occur with the present approach. I suggest a simpler approach and if you'll look at page six of the Amendment it's quite obvious what I'm attempting to do. I'm attempting to have the Legislature mandate that farm land be assessed at 10% of its actual fair market value. Now at the present time that's about what it's assessed at. It's somewhere between 10 and 12% according the Department of Local Governmental Affairs Counsel, Dale Young. If that's the result, why not <sup>do it</sup> in a way that ordinary human beings can understand? At the present time I would estimate there must be at least 10 to 20 people in the State of Illinois that can understand the agricultural assessment formula that we passed two years ago and which we have been amending every year since. I think this is a straightforward approach to give tax breaks to farmers. I believe that giving tax breaks to farmers is acceptable by the general public."



It is obviously acceptable by the General Assembly and I would ask for your approval of this fairly major Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, the Sponsor of the Bill, from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I definitely rise to oppose this Amendment. This is another move by Representative Skinner to get some legislation that's been put on the books of this state. This legislation bases the appraised value... the value of farm land for tax purposes, not only on its market value, but on its productivity. This doesn't make it simple. But his Amendment is an over-simplification of a very complex problem. And I would say that this is an obstructionist Amendment. It has nothing good to offer for it and I would ask for its defeat. The Sponsor of this Amendment couldn't get it adopted in Committee so therefore, he's now trying on the House to do something that the Committee in its deliberations found unacceptable."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Question of the Sponsor..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he'll yield."

Bradley: "Representative Skinner, I have the Amendment in front of me. You mentioned in a certain particular page where evidently now you're going to assess at 10% of the value of the farm land and that's all you're going to use in determining what the assessment would be on farm land. Is that correct?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes."

Bradley: "You're taking out the... the productivity of the grain



grown on that particular farm?"

Skinner: "That's right."

Bradley: "And you're putting... what are you doing with the buildings that are now removed from the farm land and are assessed at 33 1/3 %..."

Skinner: "That would remain the same."

Bradley: "That will remain at 33 1/3?"

Skinner: "That will remain the same as urban property, yes."

Bradley: "Well, may I speak to the Amendment then, Mr. Speaker?"

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, actually, in my opinion, this is a better Bill for farmers and I have a lot of farmers in my district, but I go to speak against the Amendment because when we passed the farm Bill 2 years ago with the support of this General Assembly and this House, we did it with good faith. We came down and asked and said that farm land should be assessed on some basis other than just the assessment process as we then knew it, that we could assess it... with determining or using the determination of productivity of the farm land. Now this Bill... this Amendment will remove the productivity and would, in fact, reduce taxes on farm land because with the present farm assessment Bill, with the formula, we start off with assessing 10% of the assessed farm land. That's number one in the formula. Then we take into consideration the productivity. Mr. Skinner, for some unknown reason, has completely removed the productivity in the farm land and removed, what I think was a fair way of assessing farm land. We can't... I would hate to... to be back tracking myself in saying this is better, we'll accept this. I think we ought to accept what we had 2 years ago and leave it... the formula the way it is, 10% of the fair value of the property plus the productivity of the land. That's what we came down here and asked for 2 years ago and it was passed and I



think we can live with it. I think we should leave it the way it is. Therefore, I'm going to have to ask that we defeat the Amendment, although it certainly would be a better package for farmers than what we had, but this General Assembly chose to adopt the formula. The farmers were happy with that. We'll be glad to accept it. Defeat the Amendment."

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

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise to oppose this Amendment of Representative Skinner's. The purpose of the Bill, 752, is to correct the problem that exists with the current farm land assessment Bill. And I think to change this Bill with this Amendment that Mr. Skinner has would completely do away with the purpose of the Bill. I think we should let the farm land assessment Bill go ahead, be used and be brought into play and effect and forget about the problems that Representative Skinner is bringing up. I think that it's time that we make the farm land assessment Bill work. It can work and I think we should get down to doing and seeing that they do what was started out a couple of years ago in this General Assembly. And that is, make the farm land assessment proper and make it work. I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. "

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no' and the main question is put. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think my Amendment has been fairly



accurately  
criticized... characterized by the opponents, although they are criticizing it for the wrong reasons. At the present time taxes, for example, or assessments in McLean County where one of the critics has his base of power, are \$413 per acre. Now, that's the assessment. Now let's assume that the farm land in McLean County is selling for about \$3,000 an acre. If you multiply 10% by \$3,000, you're having the assessment at \$300 an acre. Let's assume it is selling for \$4,000 an acre, which some of it does if it happens to be right next door to a farmer's plot and he really wants the piece of property that means the assessment would be \$400 an acre. That's less than \$4... \$413 an acre, which is what it is right now. Now the ironical thing about the debate on this Amendment is that virtually everyone who has stood up and argued against the adoption of the Amendment would have... he is not speaking in the best interests <sup>of the farm-owners</sup> in his or her district. The reason for that is that under the formula I'm suggesting the taxes would actually go down. Whereas, under the formula that was adopted 2 years ago, the promise was made to the farmers, or at least the farmers perceived the promise as having been made, the taxes would go down and taxes actually went up. Now, the arguments... So what I've tried to do here is craft an Amendment which a human being can understand on the one hand and on the second hand craft an Amendment which will actually cut taxes for farmers. Now I think it is... I think it's acceptable to the general public. It's ironic that it's not acceptable to the Representatives of farm areas whose taxes would actually be cut and whose taxes probably will go up if the Bill as in its unamended form will pass. Now those of you who represent urban areas and farm... with a lot of farm land in your district are going to be in a real quandary on this vote. Because the basic purpose of agricultural assessment Bills is to shift



the tax burden from home owner.... from farmers to home owners. Now that's about to happen, although if this Bill passes it won't happen for another year because there's a 3rd year hold harmless clause in it. That is going to happen regardless of whether my Amendment is adopted or whether the original Bill in its unamended form is adopted. I think that those who represent the farm areas should think long and hard on whether pride of authorship is worth more than lower taxes because this is definitely going to bring lower taxes for virtually every farmer in the State of Illinois and, unlike the present Bill, every farmer in the State of Illinois will be able to understand what his or her taxes will be because the farmer will have to estimate what the property is worth, then multiply 10% times that figure and then multiply it times the tax rate. Now something so simple probably is incapable of passing the General Assembly because our formulas that we generate, such as the school aid formula, we try to make them so complicated so that no one can understand it. That tends to concentrate power in a very few hands and because of that, none of the rest of us who are just ordinary Members, can figure out what they're doing and we vote blindly. No one has to vote blindly on this proposal. One criti..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Skinner: "One criticism which could be made is that classification is not allowed under the Illinois State Constitution. I have asked the General Counsel of the Department of Local Government Affairs and he says under a Supreme Court ruling on Senator Faywell's assessment roll-back Bill that we can classify darn near anything we want. Now, farm land in Cook County is assessed at approximately this level. Right now there's no reason not to give everybody else in the State the same break.



And I would ask for your thoughtful vote on this Bill... preferably favorable."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Aw.. it's not close and you know it. Well, we... Third Reading. Senate Bill 133. Revert back to 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 Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #3 by Representative."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative who? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, on the motion. I can read your writing. "Lee Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to table Amendment #3. We're going to replace it with Amendment #6."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to table Committee Amendment #3? Leave and Committee Amendment #3 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Daniels: "Representative Johnson has discussed Amendment #4 with me. It's a clarification in the Bill on fees to be paid to appointed Council and I have no objections to Amendment #4."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage has moved the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor signify by saying





'aye'; opposed 'no', and Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Johnson, amends Senate Bill 133..."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, on Amendment #5."

Daniels: "Representative Johnson would withdraw Amendment #5."

Speaker Matijevec: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #5 and it is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Daniels, amends Senate Bill 133 on page 14 by adding after line 27 the following and so forth."

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

Daniels: "Amendment #6 is the replacement of Amendment #3 and it is in the form that we desire to be in and the form that was ..."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no' and Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 760."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 760, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevec: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevec: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. The ... Senate Bill 765."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 765, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevec: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. There's been a request to hold 767, a fiscal note is on the way. Senate Bill 775. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a noncontroversial Amendment to 767. Could we adopt that at this time and then wait for the fiscal note?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I guess we can. Is that.. The Sponsor's not here so why don't we hold it anyway."

Schuneman: "Well, I talked to the Sponsor about it, Mr. Speaker. He has no objection to it. It's been worked out with him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Senate Bill 767."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 767, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Schuneman, amends Senate Bill 767 on page one by deleting 'facilities' and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, on Amendment #1."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 767 provides for a reduced assessment base for utility companies on their pollution control devices. One of the problems that came up in Committee was that often times these pollution control devices are in the form of large acres of land and in certain areas of the state, including mine, where utility companies have bought up large acreages and planned to build cooling ponds there was a concern that this Bill might take some of that land off the tax rolls and permit a reduced method of taxation. An Amendment has been worked out with the Sponsor of the Bill and with the utilities involved whereby the Bill would not affect any land that underlies a



cooling pond and that's all the Amendment does. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Sponsor, Representative O'Brien, agrees ... nods his head in agreement. Schuneman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no' and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Then I understand now the fiscal note has been filed."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 775."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 775, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Catania, amends Senate Bill 775 on page one, line one, by deleting Section 9-14 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see... the wish of the Sponsor to move to Third Reading? Stanley? Hold? Hold the Bill. Senate Bill 788."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 788, a Bill for an Act to create the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 799."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 799, a Bill for an Act in relation to providing information of the state's long term debt service. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 800."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 800, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Illinois Economic Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 828."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 828, a Bill for an Act to release from highway easement in Cumberland County. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 875."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 875, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "There's been an agreement to hold that Bill. Is that right? Wait a minute. The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, when I picked up this Bill from the House Sponsor and when it was heard in Committee there were certain questions raised about the lang.. certain language in the Bill and whether or not the Comptroller's Office agreed with it. I was given to understand at that time the Comptroller's Office was in agreement with the Bill. I have subsequently been... discovered that the Comptroller's Office is not in agreement with the Bill and I, therefore move to table this House Bill 875.. Senate Bill 875."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Lady have leave to table Senate Bill 875? Leave and Senate Bill 875 is tabled. Anybody else want.. Senate Bill 883."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 883, ..."



Speaker Matijeich: "A request for a fiscal note has been filed.

Hold the Bill. Senate Bill 889."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 889, a Bill for an Act to restructure the financing of state highways in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amend.. Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 890. Hold? 889, it's on Third? Hold? You want it back to Second and held, is that it? Alright. Leave to return Senate Bill 889 back to Second and held. Leave. Senate Bill 890, is that hold also? Yeah. Hold 890. Senate Bill 905. Senate Bill 905, 906, request for a fiscal note so those will be held. Senate Bill 918."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 918, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Forest Product Transportation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 927."

Clerk O'Brien: "House (sic) Bill 927, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 939."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 939, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of agricultural districts. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."



Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, .. Amendment #2, Mulcahey, amends Senate Bill 939 on page 4 line 5 by changing '160' to '500' and so forth."

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

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment puts the Bill back into its original form. It's very similar to the Bill that was passed out of the House. Bill was passed out previous to this particular time. It changes the acreage for a agricultural District from 160 to 500. They felt this was much more conducive and more a proper size. It eliminates also the... It also states that no public agency may exercise its power eminent domain on land within an agricultural District unless such land has first been withdrawn from the agricultural District. And I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "This abolishes the power of eminent domain over agricultural property? Is that what this does?"

Mulcahey: "Unless it has been removed from the agricultural District."

Getty: "In effect, then, the State of Illinois would not be able to condemn for public use or put a sewer through or have any use without getting prior approval from the local agricultural District?"

Mulcahey: "That's correct."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think



that you should pass over this as a light Amendment. This is a very, very significant Amendment that would completely destroy the authority of the State of Illinois to condemn for public purposes. I think that to do this, you, who are interested in roads, downstate roads, I think anyone here in the General Assembly who wants to see the public use honored, would oppose this Amendment."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is indeed an outrageous Amendment. What you're talking about is affecting the ability of the lawful use of eminent domain to go in and condemn land without getting prior approval from an agricultural District, which will be controlled in some other fashion. What is represented here is the highest case of a special interest group and in this case, it happens to be the agricultural District, whatever it might be, denying to the rest of the State lawful uses. Now, this includes transportation. It would include the public utilities. It would include practically every facet of life. It would make it impossible for smaller towns to expand simply because they no longer have the right of eminent domain. It would make it impossible for the railroads, the utilities, and the telephone companies to operate. I suggest to you that this is indeed a selfish Amendment seeking to put the interests of a few above the rest of the State. Now, this Amendment will affect not us just today, but future generations and generations after that. I don't think we want to straddle the street with this kind of an Amendment that's dedicated to the special use for just a few. Justice yes, but not this type of legislation. It's wrong inherently and it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney."



Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to make two points in regard to this Amendment. First of all, if you are serious about preserving agricultural land in the State of Illinois, you will do similar to what was done in the State of New York and some other of our sister States, and allow the State of Illinois to create agricultural Districts for the use of farm purposes only. Now, this Amendment puts the Bill back in exactly the same form that it was introduced by the Sponsor in the Senate. Unfortunately, it was watered down to the point where it was almost meaningless as it was passed over to the House. Now the second point I want to make to you, and I think one that has not been discussed, and that is that the language in the Bill as it stands right now, would mandate that we would not be able to use the agricultural the new agricultural evaluation procedures contained under the new farm land assessment law, we would not be able to use them in this State in an agricultural District. What it mandates at the present time is the old dual evaluation concept. Unfortunately, this language as I understand, was developed a couple of years back prior to the time that we adopted the new farm land evaluation law. And to mandate that we use another procedure for evaluating agricultural land in this state means that there is not one farmer in the State of Illinois that would ever seriously consider using the rights that are granted to him under the terms of this Bill. If we're going to make this Bill meaningful at all, if we're going to make it workable at all, we almost have to adopt this Amendment. And on that basis, I think we ought to allow the Sponsor to put the into the shape that he wants, that he has requested and then debate it on Third Reading on its merit. "

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





Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "Two questions. What is an agricultural District again?"

Mulcahey: "I beg your pardon."

Mahar: "What is an agricultural District by definition?"

Mulcahey: "An agricultural District is nothing more than acreage, in this particular case, if this Amendment were to pass, 500 acres which constitutes an agricultural District, which constitutes a unit within a certain locale."

Mahar: "Will this apply to the farming sections in Cook County?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, it will."

Mahar: "It will apply to Cook County?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, Sir."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Amendment?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "Proceed."

Mahar: "Well, if I understand this correctly, in my District we still have quite a bit of agricultural land, but it is being developed because there's tremendous growth, and I would hate to see the powers of eminent domain restricted by the municipalities of my District because of this legislation. If I understand it correctly, I oppose it."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, to close."

Mulcahey: "Well, the Cook County provision is in the Bill, not on the Amendment. Of course we're addressing the Amendment right now. Might as well also point out something,



this is on a voluntary basis too. This is not mandated throughout the State of Illinois, these agricultural Districts. It's done on a voluntary basis. And the previous question has been moved, now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, you are now.."

Mulcahey: "Then I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. The Amendment fails. Further Amendments? Alright. Roll Call. You won on the issue. What do you want? Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by ...by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. You were for it. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yeah, I'll like suburbanites to reflect very thoughtfully upon the eminent domain part of this. I'm in favor of this Amendment and I'm in favor of it because I think it will decrease urban sprawl. If you allow the farmers to build little enclaves between towns where you cannot exercise eminent domain, then you won't have rural subdivisions springing up all over the suburbs where they really shouldn't be."

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

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, all this agricultural District that we talk about it is required that they file with the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Supervisors of the County, or the Cook County Board, if it was within Cook County, would have to approve an agricultural District in Cook County or any other county in which they apply. So, this does not just let anyone set up an agricultural District. It is set up with the approval of the County Board."



Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'ayes', 69 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, asked for a poll of the absentees and the verification also, or not? No, a poll of the absentees. Did you want a verification too? Alright. Poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees; Bianco. Bluthardt..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bluthardt 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Breslin. Bullock. Collins. Davis. Doyle. Ebbesen. Greishiemer. Huff. Emil Jones..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Huff 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kane. Kozubowski. Kulas. Leverenz. Mautino. McAuliffe. O'Brien..."

Speaker Matijevich: "O'Brien 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stuffle 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Taylor. Vinson. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "I understand we start off 76-72. Is that it? 76-72. Henry.. Henry 'no'. Vinson 'aye'. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "May I be changed from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Walsh from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Piel, 'no'. Piel 'no'. The Clerk will proceed with the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bell..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd ask if the Members would be in their seats?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Members remain in their seats and when your name is called raise your hand? Stay in your seats. Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."



Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Campbell. Catania. Christensen. Darrow. Deuster. DiPrima. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewing. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Harris. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Dave Jones. Kempiners. Kent. Kucharski. Macdonald. Margulas. Matula. McBroom. McGrew. McMaster. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schlsler. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Totten. Van Duyn. Vinson. Von Boeckman. Walsh. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. No further."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before we go to Representative Getty, Representative Sandquist from Cook."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will you record me as 'no'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Sandquist as 'no'. Representative DiPrima from Cook. What was that? From 'aye' to 'nay'. Larry DiPrima. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "From. I don't believe I'm voting, Mr. Speaker. Would you vote me 'aye' please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester 'aye'. Gene Hoffman 'aye'. Representative Jacob Wolf 'aye'. Is that Friedland in the back? 'No'. 'Aye'. Jake Wolf was 'aye'. Friedland was 'aye'. And Bianco 'aye'. And Phil Collins 'aye'. Collins says because he doesn't understand it. Ryan... 'no'?.. Oh. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see that Representative Polk is recorded. I wished you would take him off the Roll Call. He's not here today."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Polk is not here. Please remove him from the Roll Call. Waddell?"

Waddell: "How am I recorded?"



Speaker Matijeovich: "Waddell, how is he recorded? Looks like a 'no'."

Waddell: "'No' to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeovich: "'No' to 'aye'. Bruce Waddell. The Clerk will give us a count where we start. Wyvetter Younge, 'no'. We're getting the starting count. 82 'ayes', 72 'nos', and Representative Getty on a verification. 82 'ayes', 72 'no'. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Flinn is not in his seat. I don't see the Gentleman in the chamber. Remove Flinn from the Roll Call."

Getty: "Representative Birchler."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Birchler. I don't see him either. Remove Birchler from the Roll Call."

Getty: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Boucek is standing in his seat. No pictures are permitted in the gallery or elsewhere. No pictures are permitted. Representative Leverenz. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, 'no'. Kulas 'no'. Kulas 'no'. Leverenz 'no'. Proceed, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Representative Friedrich."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Dwight Friedrich. I do not see him here. Remove Friedrich from the Roll Call."

Getty: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Sam McGrew is not in his seat and I don't see him in the chamber. Remove McGrew."

Getty: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Matijeovich: "McMaster, he's not.. Oh, here he is, right in front."

Getty: "Representative .."

Speaker Matijeovich: "What was that?"

Getty: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Vince Molloy is in his seat.. Talking about



credit unions."

Getty: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Slape. I do not see him.

Remove him from the record..."

Getty: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Matijevich: "By the way, the T.V. has permission to film.

Von Boeckman is not in his seat and I don't see him in the chamber. Remove Von Boeckman."

Getty: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Matijevich: "Satterthwaite. I hear her, but I don't see her. Oh, there, up in the balcony."

Getty: "Representative Kane wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Kane 'aye'."

Getty: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stanley is in his seat."

Getty: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle. I don't see him up here. I don't see him in the chamber. Remove Stuffle from the Roll."

Getty: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stearney hasn't been here all day. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Getty: "Representative Jane Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jane Barnes. I do not see her. Remove Barnes and Representative Beatty, did you want to be.. 'present' for Beatty."

Getty: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kucharski. I do not see Kucharski. Remove Kucharski from the Roll."

Getty: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Matijevich: "We already removed him. Only once. Leave for McBroom to be verified. Leave."

Getty: "Representative Campbell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Chuck Campbell is over on



the Democratic side."

Getty: "Representative Swanstrom."

Speaker Matijevich: "Swanstrom. I don't see. I don't see him.

Remove Swanstrom from the Roll. Representative Van Duyne.  
of persuasion

Van Duyne: "Many powers in the form of a checkered coat in front  
of me, so change me to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Okay. Change Van Duyne to 'no' on Kornowicz's  
persuasion. Continue with the verification. The Gentleman  
from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

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

I tried to help the farmers yesterday in their hour of  
need and they didn't respond so record me as 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Jones as 'no'. Put McGrew back in  
the Roll Call. Von Boeckman. McGrew, Sam McGrew and  
Jim Von Boeckman. John Beatty, back to 'no' with John  
Beatty. Schoeberlein in the center aisle wishes to be  
recorded as 'aye'. 'Aye'."

Getty: "What is the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Do we have a count? You got to be a magician  
to get this one. There are now 74 'aye' and 76 'no'."

Getty: "No further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions. And now Representative  
Mulcahey. Don't get all excited there, Representative  
Robbins. Mulcahey requests a verification of the negative  
vote. Proceed, Mr. Clerk with the negative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty.  
Bluthardt. Bowman. Braun. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman.  
Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Dawson. DiPrima.  
Domico. John Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Garmisa.  
Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hanahan.  
Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kelly.  
Klosak. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz.  
Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz.  
Matijevich. McClain. McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Mugalian.  
O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pierce.



Pouncey. Preston. Ronan. Sandquist. Schneider.  
 Sharp. Steczko. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne.  
 Vitek. White. Willer. Williams. Younge. and Yourell."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Return Swanstrom to the.. to the affirmative.  
 'Aye', Swanstrom. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative  
 Murphy. Murphy."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "'present'."

Murphy: "Vote me 'no' please."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Record Murphy 'no'. Alright. Representative  
 Mulcahey. Just a minute. Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "As not voting."

Griesheimer: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Vote Griesheimer 'aye'. Mulcahey with the  
 verification of the negative vote. "

Mulcahey: "What's.. what's the score, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "76 'aye' and 77 'nay'."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Alexander."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Alexander's in her seat."

Mulcahey: "Chapman."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Chapman, I don't see her. Remove Chapman  
 from the Roll Call."

Mulcahey: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Alright. Just a minute. Remove.. return  
 Telcser to the affirmative... or negative rather. Oh, he  
 was never taken off. Alright. Continue."

Mulcahey: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Matijeovich: "John or Ralph?"

Mulcahey: "John."

Speaker Matijeovich: "John Dunn, I don't see him in his seat.

How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk? Oh, here he is over here."

Mulcahey: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Farley is in his seat."

Mulcahey: "Representative Giorgi."





Speaker Matijevich: "Giorgi? I don't see him. Remove him for the moment."

Mulcahey: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Return Giorgi. I knew it would be for the moment. Representative Grossi? I don't see Representative Grossi. Remove him from the Roll."

Mulcahey: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Katz is not in his seat and I don't see him in the chamber. Remove him."

Mulcahey: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's back there."

Mulcahey: "Kosinski."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's there."

Mulcahey: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz is in the aisle."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Lechowicz is standing by his seat."

Mulcahey: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who? Marovitz? I don't see him. Remove him."

Mulcahey: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters, I do not see him. Remove him. I think he got enough, by the way"

Mulcahey: "Representative Telcser."

Speaker Matijevich: "Telcser is here. He's on the other side."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Representative Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wyvetter Younge, I don't see her. Wyvetter Younge, remove her."

Mulcahey: "Representative Younge... er Conti."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who's that?"

Mulcahey: "Representative Conti."

Speaker Matijevich: "Elmer Conti, I don't see him. Oh, Wyvetter Younge return... Wyvetter Younge and remove Elmer Conti."

Mulcahey: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Mautino 'aye'. Give us a count."



On this motion there are 77 'aye', 71 'nay', and the Amendment is adopted. Now, I understand on Committee Amendment #1, Representative Mulcahey, I.. we failed to recognize that there was a motion to table Committee Amendment #1.

On that, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "I so move."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motion to Committee.. to table Committee Amendment #1. Does he have leave? Leave and Committee Amendment #1 is filed. Are there further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Could we revert back to Senate Bill 133 which we passed over? 123...123."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 123, a Bill for an Act relating to wages of employees. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McPike, amends Senate Bill 123 on page 1 by deleting lines 4, 5, and 6, and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike...Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 123 provides that when an employee resigns from his job, that the paid vacation that he has earned must be paid to him as his final separation compensation. I move for the adoption now..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner on that issue."

Skinner: "Does he get this paid vacation in addition to workman's comp...or excuse me, unemployment comp, after 6 weeks?"

McPike: "This has nothing to do with workman's comp or unemployment comp. It has to do with what is due to the... what is owed to the employee. A vacation is earned just like wage is earned. This simply says that if you earn wages, or you earn vacation and resign from your job, the employee (sic) has to pay what is due to you. That is simple enough. That has nothing to do with workman's comp or unemployment comp."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on unemployment comp, but I think that vacation pay, which is received



in a lump sum at the end of one's employment, would not...would still mean that even though the person were getting paid for an extra 2 weeks, that that would not mean he would have to wait 6 weeks after the 2 weeks vacation pay in order to apply for unemployment comp. I think he would be able to get the unemployment comp 6 weeks after the day he or she resigns. Now, the Gentleman who is the Sponsor of the Amendment obviously understands unemployment comp better than I, and perhaps he could verify or tell me why my analysis is wrong. Would you do that?"

McPike: "This Amendment simply says that an employee is entitled to what is due to him. If at the end of a work week he's entitled to 40 hours of pay, then that is due him. You earn vacation as you go throughout the year. You don't receive it in a lump sum. You earn whatever your contract provides for. Usually it provides that for every month you earn approximately 1 day of earned vacation. That's paid, earned vacation. At the end of 2 months you have 2 days accrued. At the end of 3 months, 3 days. If you quit your job and you haven't taken all of your earned, paid vacation, the Amendment simply says that since you have earned it, since it is due to you, the employer simply must pay it."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Sponsor, with all due respect, I'm still not getting an answer to the question I'm trying to ask, and I guess maybe I can rephrase it. What effect, if any, does this have on the eligibility for unemployment compensation?"

McPike: "No effect."

Skinner: "Well then, I would suggest that perhaps one of my colleagues is better prepared than I to give a bombastic reply, and I will yield to one of them."

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

Daniels: "Is this Amendment germane to the Bill? I could



raise that question."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment.. While we're checking that out, I've been asked by Representative Satterthwaite to introduce some 4-hers from Moultrie and Shelby Counties with guests from Ohio. I believe they're in the back gallery. Would you stand? Glad to have you in Springfield. Let's take this Bill out of the record, and we'll look it over for a while. All right? Take this Bill out of the record, and we'll return to it. Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk...have all voted who are here? The Clerk will take the record. Now that there's a quorum, let's get to work. Senate Bill 942. Speaker's here. Put him on the Roll. I think he'll be recorded. Senate Bill 942."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 942. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 955."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 955. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to rivers, lakes, and streams in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2...Floor Amendment #2, Neff, amends Senate Bill 955 as amended in the first sentence of the third paragraph and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Whose Amendment? The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff, on Amendment 2."



Neff: "Than you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 955 just changes a few words. It takes out the word, 'stream', and puts in , 'ten square miles of drainage area'. The reason for this Amendment is that these small streams and so forth, the way the Bill is now as it was amended, it would mean that you would have to get a permit from the Department of Transportation at the head office.."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and opposed 'no'. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 973."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 973; a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading."



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 1002."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1002. A Bill for an Act to create the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment..."

Kempiners: "This is not on this Bill Mr. Speaker. It's one you just advanced to Third. The Sponsor of that Bill was going to hold it on Second."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is that 973? Leave to return Representative Barnes. We have leave to return 973 back to Second and hold it according to Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Representative Peters is the first Sponsor..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold 973. Proceed on 1002."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1002 as amended..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels on Amendment 2."

Daniels: "Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment. In drafting Amendment #1, which was the encompassing Amendment on the Bill, we referred to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Daniels has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1002 as amended by House Amendment 1 and so forth."

Daniels: "Amendment #2 is also a technical Amendment to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Move for adoption of Amendment #3. All



in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1037."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1037, a Bill for an Act relating to the time for commencing protection for violating certain Acts and opposing Occupation and Use taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1053."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Totten, amends Senate Bill 1053 on page one and line one and five and so forth."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1053 does two things. It's a job tax credit Bill and was amended in the Senate to include the subject of tax indexing. What my Amendment #1 does is remove the Section in relation to tax indexing so it is just a job tax credit Bill as I agreed to do in the Revenue Committee and I would appreciate support for Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. If there are no questions, all in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no' and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Has fiscal note been filed?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1100. 1100."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1100, a Bill for an Act to amend Sec-





tions of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1101. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jones. Leave to hold Senate Bill 1100 on Second. Leave. Senate Bill 1101."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act in relation to powers and authority of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1102."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act in relation to powers and authority of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1117."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act to clarify the type of property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1150."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1183."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act relating to an easement in St. Clair County. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1203."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1203, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health and Developmental Disability Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. 1207 out of the record. 1211."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1211, ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "1211 hold. There's a request for a fiscal note that has not been filed. Senate Bill 1217."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1217, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1227."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1227, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of a law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Floor Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. One moment. We have an introduction. Our good friend, head of the House Veterans' Affairs, anything that relates to veterans, Larry DiPrima has an introduction to make."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a bunch of boys here. They're all Members of the Premier Boys State from the American Legion, who've been convening down in Eastern Illinois University in Charleston and I want to elect.. I want to name the ones that were elected officers. I'll start from the bottom. Supreme Court Judge, Mark Allen Stevens, of Rantoul, Illinois. That's Mark Allen. Supreme Court Judge, Pat Birch, of Hoopston, Illinois. Supreme Court Judge, Joseph M. Ritter, of Peoria, Illinois. Supreme Court Judge, Joseph Reinholfer, of Zion, Illinois. Treasurer, Robert Leiski, of Libertyville, Illinois. Attorney General, Mark Nueman, of Champaign. Comptroller, Steven Thompson, of Woodstock, Illinois. Secretary of State, Greg Kasarian, of Lake Bluff, Illinois. Lieutenant Governor, Sam Williams, of Joliet, Illinois. And Ray Ewell's son, Governor, Eric R. Ewell, of Wheaton, Illinois."

Eric Ewell: "On behalf of my fellow officers in the 1979 Boys State, I'd like to thank the Illinois House of Representatives for receiving us here this afternoon. It's quite an honor. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "We welcome them and let the record show that three of them were from my District, Libertyville, Zion, and Lake Bluff. Very good. They're going down to see the Governor now. Good luck. Hope you have better luck than we do. The next Bill is 1239. Out of the record. 1271."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. We'll all relax now for a



moment. The Speaker of the House, Bill Redmond, has asked the Chair that a little.. a few moments ago we introduced the people who were responsible for Lincoln's farewell and if we'll all pay close attention, they're going to perform before us right now. Lincoln's farewell and I'd like to introduce .. Well, Representative Oblinger is going to introduce."

Oblinger: "We intended to do this before, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I had talked to Speaker Redmond, but I hadn't talked to Speaker Matijevecich and that's why he didn't understand what we wanted to do. Mr. Kirk Hart will give the farewell address when Lincoln left Springfield."

Hart: "(performance)."

Speaker Matijevecich: "I think I speak for Speaker Remond when I say that they are welcome to come back here and put that on again. Anytime, you can come right back and we'll be glad to hear you. Senate Bill 1277."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevecich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevecich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Stuffle-Steczo, amends Senate Bill 1277 on page one by deleting everything after line 23 and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

Speaker Matijevecich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, on Amendment 3."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. This Amendment to Senate Bill 1277 expands the provisions of Representative Pullen's Bill. Representative Pullen's Bill now deals with..."

Speaker Matijevecich: "One moment. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."



Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. I recall this Bill going to Third Reading yesterday. I now find that it's on Second Reading on the Calendar and I wonder how that happened. This Bill was advanced to Third Reading yesterday."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's on page 15, Second Reading from..."

Pullen: "It was advanced to Third Reading yesterday. I would like to have it taken out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment. The Clerk informs me it was not advanced to Third Reading yesterday."

Pullen: "It certainly was."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed with the Amendment, Representative Stuffle." Representative Ryan, the Gentleman from Kankakee."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt at this time, but I would like to know what the schedule is for the remainder of the day. I have several Members that are interested to know what time you're planning on..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. . ."

Ryan: ".. Adjournment today."

Speaker Matijevich: "So far the Speaker told me to go through Second Readings. Beyond that, I don't know, but we'll get back to you in five minutes. Alright?"

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to proceed."

Stuffle: "Yes, once again, Mr. Speaker and Members. What this Amendment does, offered by myself and Representative Steczo, is to expand upon the provisions in Representative Pullen's Bill which I voted for in Committee. Representative Pullen's Bill now provides for the Pledge of Allegiance to be recited by classroom students in elementary grades throughout public schools in the State of Illinois. It's my opinion and Representative Steczo's, if it's good enough for us to say everyday here, which it is and I supported that change in the rules, if we're going to do that in elementary schools in public schools



and we ought to do it in all public schools from the first grade through the 12th and this Amendment provides for that, that the recitation be daily, that the recitation be by the students as well as the people who work in the schools and might be visiting there and also that it be said at sporting events at these educational institutions. And I offer this in the serious vein in the hopes that we can expand this Bill. I think we've done very well on the floor of the House. It's added dignity to our proceedings and I think to expand the scope of her Bill would be beneficial. If it's good enough for us and good enough for the first six grades of school, and for the students, then it ought to be good for everyone in these various positions and I would move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Now in response to the Minority Leader, I have talked to the Speaker and we are going to go through the Second Readings. We're going to start the Priority of Call Calendar and we will work no later than 3:00 p.m. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder now if you could find out from Mr. Redmond what time he plans on coming in Monday."

Speaker Matijevich: "As of now, it's 10:00 a.m. It depends on .. it depends on how much work we do today. So, that could be revised, I guess."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I might add there are several people that are interested in trying to make some arrangements to come back. The Speaker I think had said earlier that maybe it would noon or 1:00 o'clock. Now, that shouldn't be too hard... "



Speaker Matijevich: "George, I think that will be revised. So, hang loose. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes. He has the same feeling, I think. Alright. The next Bill is 1316."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1316, a Bill for an Act prohibiting the pumping of gasoline.. of gasoline containing less water or sludge and requiring certain tests. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1325."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1325, a Bill for an Act to amend the Surplus Property Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1331."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1331, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions? Out of the record. 1331 out of the record. Senate Bill 1337. Fiscal note has not been filed. Out of the record. 1377 is out of the record. 1386. 1386."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fair Employment Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1406."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill 1406...Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1412."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act regulating currency exchanges. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1425."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #2, by Representative Capparelli and Hoxsey."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoxsey on the motion. From LaSalle, Representative Betty Hoxsey. There's a motion to table Committee Amendment, Betty."

Hoxsey: "The Amendment 1, I'm sorry, I was on the phone. I didn't follow what happened. Amendment 1 was, I want to accept the Amendment. Amendment 1 should have been adopted in Committee. The motion should involve only Amendment 2."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The motion is to table Amendment #2. Does she have leave to table Amendment #2? Leave and Committee Amendment #2 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. The ... we will revert back to Senate Bill 123."





Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. The...we will revert back to Senate Bill 123...123...the Chair...there was a question of germaneness on the Amendment...the McPike Amendment on Senate Bill 123, and the Chair rules that it is germane. It relates to the subject of wages, which is the subject of the Bill. Proceed with the Amendment, Representative McPike. I think we were on debate on this... Are there further questions of Representative McPike? If not, Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really don't know what could be more simple than this. I recognize that there were some questions asked, but in effect, what this is...that an employee not only earns wages, but an employee earns vacations. You earn it as you work. You work a month and you earn 1 day of vacation. Now, if you are terminated from your job, if you're laid off for some reason, or you're fired, or even if you decide to quit on your own, whatever wages, whichever compensations are due to you at that point, the employer is required to pay that compensation. He's required to pay the compensation to you if it's hours work, or days work, or if it is holiday vacation earned. It is not something that he is giving you, it is something that you have earned. This Amendment simply says that at the end of your employment, be it voluntary leave, or be it firing, or be it laid off, whatever it is, whatever compensation is owed to you as an employee, your employer is then required to pay it. It's a simple Amendment. I would move its adoption."

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

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, Wait a minute, I asked if there were



any other questions, there were none. He's closing, so we can go..."

Simms: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll have a Roll Call on it, and then you can explain your vote."

Simms: "I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The question is 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Tim Simms to explain his vote."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not just a simple Amendment. This goes far beyond that. This prohibits an employer and employee engaging in a contract, specifically an employment contract, where the employer shall not be able, by contractual agreement, to negotiate for the forfeiture of vacation time upon separation. What we're doing, once again, is entering into the private enterprise system of this state, and we're taking away from the free enterprise elements, the object of negotiations between management and labor. We're doing it through the tool of legislation, and that's not what the Legislature is for, is to become involved in an employee, employer contract negotiations. And I would urge more red votes. This is a totally anticapitalistic vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 62 'nays', 3 voting present, and this Amendment having received the Majority is hereby adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Consent Calendar, Second Reading. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day.

Page 16 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 48, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Abortion Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Senate Bill 203 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 219, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Surface Mine-Land Conservation and Reclamation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 482, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Senate Bill 514, a Bill for an Act in relation to persons alleged as miners or otherwise in need of supervision. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 626, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 722, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Space Needs Act and the Capital Development Board Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Senate Bill 966 is removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1072, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act redesignating references to game as wildlife. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1178, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Child Hearing Test Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Senate Bill 1287, a Bill for an Act to amend



the Mobile Home Local Sales Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act to amend the Anti Pollution Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act relating to fireworks. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The .. Third Reading. Now, Representative Deuster has asked leave to distribute notice of a Christian Fellowship legislative dinner next week. Does he have leave? Leave and they can distribute those notices. On page 18 of the Calendar, we have Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. There's one Bill, Senate Bill 82. Would the... The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, did I understand Senate Bill 966 did go to Third Reading just now?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill what?"

Braun: "966 is on page 17."

Speaker Matijevich: "That was removed from the Consent Calendar."

Braun: "It was removed from the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Braun: "Cause we have an Amendment for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "That was removed."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're on Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 82, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 82 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is Consent Third. There's only one Bill on it. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'aye', no 'nay' and 9 voting 'pre-



sent'. And Senate Bill 82, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Priority of Call Calendar, page one, the first Bill is Senate Bill 216. Read the Bill. We're on Priority of Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 216, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer, on 216."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill. Senate Bill 216 was Sponsored by Senator Jack Bower, at the request of the DuPage County Board. As written the Bill effects only two counties in the State, DuPage County and St. Clair County. It says that in counties where the County Board Chairman is elected at large by all the voters of the county, he should have the privilege of calling special meetings if they are suddenly needed for any reason between the regular Board meetings. The present rules are that he has to get the signature of a third of the elected Members of the County Board to call such a meeting. In order to do this, he has to give proper written notice of course, to every Board Member. A notice has to be published in the newspapers of general circulation. There's nothing sneaky. It's just a good housekeeping Bill that will help the two urban counties. It does not affect Cook County. We need this Bill in DuPage and St. Clair Counties. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 216. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Would the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Van Duyne: "Representative Dyer, does this preclude ten Members of the County Board from signing the call?"



Dyer: "Oh, no. It doesn't affect the Member's privilege at all. It's just that in today's world if an emergency situation arises where a Board meeting is needed it adds to the Member's privilege .. the privilege of the Chairman calling such a meeting."

Van Duynes: "Okay. I just want to make sure that the ten Members still can put out the call."

Dyer: "Absolutely."

Van Duynes: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, if there are no further questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 216 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'aye', 2 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 216, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Do we have leave to go out of the Priority of Call, Senate Bill 486 is a supplemental that must be passed. Leave. The next Bill is Senate Bill 486. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 486, a Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the Emergency Service and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, on Senate Bill 486. Mahar, rather. I'm sorry. They had Ropp... I looked at Ropp on the Priority of Call. I'm sorry, Bill."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker," and Ladies and Gentlemen. I look like Senator Ropp .. I can see where you can make that mistake. Senate Bill 486 is a supplemental appropriation for the ESDA and it was in the amount of \$500,000. Amendment #1 reduced it \$300,000 to \$200,000. Amendment #2 is an Amendment for the Department of Mental Health in the amount of 2.1 million dollars. Amendment #3 is a



transfer in Public Aid for two million dollars. Amendment #4 is \$170,000 for the Clingburg School. Amendment #5 is \$1600 for the Equal Opportunity Employment. Amendment #6 is \$100,000 to the Department of Mental Health for the House Center. Now, all of these are current FY '79 supplemental appropriations that are needed in their respective agencies before the end of the year. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mahar has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 486. On that, the Chairman of the Appropriations II Committee, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Merely to say that I agree with the Sponsor of the Bill. This Bill has been thoroughly reviewed and I believe that it should be passed at this point to meet the needs of these agencies."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 486 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'aye, 11 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 486, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 250."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 250, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Articles of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see... Is Representative Terzich on the floor? I don't see him. Out of the record. One moment please. Senate Bill 257."

Clerk Leone: "Senate..."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see McClain.. Oh, yeah. He's there. Proceed. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 257, a Bill for an Act to amend the Game Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative



McClain, on Senate Bill 257."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 257 is identical to a similar piece of legislation that Mr. Watson passed out of the House, sponsored by Senator Knuppel in the Senate. It provides for year round hunting of coyotes. Mr. Schisler, Chairman of Agricultural Committee, understands this Bill substantially better than I do, but in rural communities what's happening is coyotes are getting more and more plentiful and people are having some severe problems with coyotes in their areas. So because of that I would ask for a favorable vote. It passed out of the Senate 49 to nothing."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 257. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Yourell: "You indicated in your remarks that Senate Bill 257 was the same as the Bill that passed out of the House under the Sponsor.. with the Sponsorship of Representative Watson. Now it's my understanding after looking at the Bill that in the Watson Bill there was a provision put in by the Department of Conservation that they could curtail or shorten the season by general administration order if they found that the taking of coyotes was too extreme and that it might place them on the endangered list. Now, I don't believe that provision is in Senate Bill 257. Could you tell me about that?"

McClain: "Well, I did misspeak a little bit. But, the trapping methods are only during the period of September 1st to March 1st and there are some other methods of hunting. That time can be changed by the Department of Conservation. That's Senate Amendment #1."

Yourell: "I have House Amendment #1 that I must confess I let this Bill slip by on Second Reading before I had an op-





portunity to place the Amendment to it and what it said was that .. provided however that such season shall be set and may be shortened by administrative order. This is what the Department of Conservation wanted in the Watson Bill and this is what they wanted in Senate Bill 257. Now I'm not going to ask to have you return this Bill to Second Reading for that purpose, but this is a different Bill entirely than the Watson Bill."

McClain: "Well, Bus, I'll be glad to take this back to Second Reading to put that Amendment on."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Do we have leave to take this Bill out of the record? Leave. And Senate Bill 257 will be out of the record. The next Bill is Senate Bill 280."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 280, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is Representative Virgil Wikoff here? I don't see him here. Out of the record. Senate Bill 291, Mary Lou Kent here? I don't see her. Out of the record. Senate Bill 29.. Wait. I'm not on Priority now. Oh-oh. No wonder. 298, rather. Rigney is here. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 298, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to license and regulate grain dealers engaged in the business of purchasing grain from producers thereof and making appropriations in connection herewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney, on Senate Bill 298."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 298 merely requires when the Department of Agriculture either revokes or suspends a grain dealers license that they have to at that time take an additional action to post a notice on the facility advising the producer that the facility .. the license has been revoked and also it requires that they must publish a notice in the newspaper within 7 days of that revocation."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 298. There are no questions. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 298 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'aye', no 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 298, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 302. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 302, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Senate Bill 302 is a Bill that was introduced and is supported by the Illinois Farm Bureau and the Lake County Farm Bureau. This Bill does not affect Cook County. It only affects the five counties; Lake, McHenry, Kane, DuPage and Will, that are located in the northeastern Illinois metropolitan area planning Commission area. What it does is it allows that where land is being used for agricultural purposes, although it may not be zoned for agricultural purposes, that if a farmer wants to put up a pole barn or a shed or something else he does not have to pay the permanent fee and the problem lying behind this Bill is that in some places in these counties you will have a farmer that is using land on one side of the road that is zoned one way and land on the other side of the road if he wants to put up a barn or some kind of a structure on side, he doesn't have to pay a permanent fee, on the other side he would. It would make the law clear and equitable. As I say, it's supported by the Farm Bureau. I know of no opposition and I would urge support for Senate Bill 302."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Representative... Representative Deuster"



has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 302. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been able to find the Bill quickly but the synopsis indicates that it has nothing to do with fees, but would indicate that if land is used in any one of those five counties for agricultural purposes, that county Board regulations concerning construction or alterations of buildings would not apply which would mean that safety codes and building requirements for homes and any other building would be inapplicable. It would seem to be a tremendous abdication of responsibility on the part of counties for the health and safety of residents in those areas. If this Bill does what the synopsis says, it's one of the most remarkable pieces of legislation I've ever seen. It would totally rid these counties of their police power."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, you mentioned it doesn't apply to Cook, but it does apply to the collar counties and so I include Will in the Bill?"

Deuster: "Yes, that's correct."

Leinenweber: "I'm looking at our analysis and it's not an extraordinarily clear indication of what the Bill does. Now, this prohibits the county from enforcing its building code in areas that are zoned agriculture .. or where.. have been used for agriculture?"

Deuster: "If you look at the Bill, Representative Leinenweber, rather than the synopsis, the provision in the Bill is a very narrow one. It says, 'with respect to buildings and structure used or to be used for agricultural purposes,' so it only relates to things like sheds or a pole barn or something else. And the present law says that .. that there's an exemption where the land is zoned and used for agricultural purposes. All that Senate Bill 302 does is



to strike out the word zone. And we have all kinds of instances in Lake County and I'm sure you have in your county, where.. where land is used for agricultural purposes and it's zoned something else. The only practical effect of this Bill will be to provide that the farmers don't have to pay the \$700 or something as a permanent fee the way they would.. they would be exempt if they put the barn up on one side of the road and they'd have to pay a fee on the other side."

Leinenweber: "Well, the County of Will has a zoning code which applies throughout the county in the unincorporated areas which includes most of the agricultural areas. It also has a building code which requires a permit for the construction of buildings. Now, would the affect of this Bill then if the property is being used for agriculture to prohibit the county from first of all, reviewing plans for a building and receiving <sup>a fee</sup> for the inspection?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Deuster. Deuster."

Deuster: "I'm not sure that I understood or heard your question. It was, 'Would this prohibit a fee for inspecting a shed or barn?'"

Leinenweber: "Well, right now, if.. because of the building code in Will County if a farmer or anybody else wants to construct something in an unincorporated area, they must go to the county building department, fill out an application and pay a fee , presumably for the inspection of the .. to make sure that the building to be constructed complies with the building codes of Will County. Now, is the effect of this Bill to remove that necessity?"

Deuster: "To a limited degree, yes. But let me say this, Representative Leinenweber, the present. The present law is that where something is used for agricultural purposes and zoned for agricultural purposes, they're exempt from the building permit fee. The.. all this Bill does is it says that where something is already being used .. the



land is already being used for agricultural purposes, planting corn or something, and they want to build a shed or something and the purpose of that building, either an alteration or a construction of it is purely for agricultural purposes, that they are exempt."

Leinenweber: "Alright. Well, Mr. Speaker, just briefly on the Bill, I'm looking at it. There doesn't appear to be any Amendments to the Bill and it's probably one that is a little too simple. The words 'zoned, and', are stricken and that's the entire Bill. I think the effect of this would be rather unfortunate by removing the power of the county to control construction of property which.. in an area which may very well be... currently being used for agricultural purposes, but is obviously nonconforming use in the sense that every area around it is either being developed for single family or for whatever else, and I'm not sure we want to give people the right in an area which may have been rezoned for residential purposes to put up these poll buildings or other kinds of farm structures without complying with the various ordinances and requirements that either the zoning code, which apparently this Bill is limited to, or the building code of the particular county. I know it's a problem in Will County because we're undergoing rapid urbanization where there are farms right in the middle of.. rather large track developments and I don't think the people who live in the track developments would be all that pleased with some of the.. with unlimited, unfettered construction activity on the part of the person who may or may not be a farmer who happens to control the.. own the land that is being used for agricultural purposes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really this Bill is only four lines and it makes me very apprehensive. Now Will



County is .. has been going through the last seven years new zoning ordinance, very comprehensive. We have adopted a flood .. flood plain ordinance when I was on the County. just before I left, on the County Board and it seems to me that in terms of agricultural land whether or not they're zoned agricultural or whether they're .. as long as they're being used for agricultural purposes, why they pre-empt all the zoning laws, #1, in the county. It negates the whole idea of the.. of the flood control ordinance that we passed here about five years ago, which would allow, and I say this from the point of view of the people who are doing the building, years ago they used to go in there and build buildings under this flood control and they wouldn't able to get any insurance for this. Now, we passed a flood control ordinance in Will County in order to enable these people to qualify and be eligible for flood insurance. As I say, you know, the Bill is so vague that it really doesn't say what it's going to do, but it just says that it removes the requirement that agricultural land be zoned or agricultural purpose to be exempt from regulations imposed by the County. Now as far as I'm concerned, as Representative Leinenweber pointed out, whether or not Representative Deuster wants to admit it, it preempts all control the county Board has for zoning. And I, you know, unless you can clarify it better than I can, I think it's a terrible Bill."

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

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "For most of the arguments I'd be for it, but would you answer one thing? What are you going to do and in your county, how would you do.. treat this if it's a mink farm?"

Deuster: "That's a good, novel question."



Waddell: "It's a smelly one."

Deuster: "What would I do if this was a mink farm.."

Waddell: ".. Mink farm. Think about it."

Deuster: "Well, first of all, Representative Waddell, the answer I think is that this Bill only allows the construction or alteration of the .. of the building if it's already being used for the agricultural purposes. And secondly, it is my understanding that this change of the law only.. only affects the.. the building permit. So, the net result, and this is the intention of the Farm Bureau, is simply that they should not have to pay the fee and it's a minimal thing. I have a couple of examples here; one fellow put up a grain bin. Somebody else put up a small pole building. The truth is there's not really much agricultural construction going up.."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman.."

Deuster: "And I might.. Go ahead."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous.. previous question prevails. Representative Deuster to close."

Deuster: "One thing I neglected to say was that this Bill will bring Lake, McHery, <sup>Kane</sup> DuPage and Will County into the same shape of the law that we have the rest of the state, as I understand it, and that is simply that where land is already used for agricultural purposes the farmers don't have to pay this fee. And I think we are just exchanging equal the law as it exists in other parts of the State of Illinois for these five counties. It does not affect Cook. It is supported by the Farm Bureau and I'm



sure that the farmers who are using the land for agricultural purposes would appreciate your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Deuster has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 302. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 302 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe on reading this Bill that it's a farm.."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Excuse me. Would Representative John Cullerton come to the podium? Proceed, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I think if you carefully read this Bill this isn't a farmers Bill at all. There's darn few farmers left in the five counties surrounding Cook County. And I think what this Bill really is is the large developers Bill and here's what I would point out to you. A developer could buy 200 acres, track it out into houses in 150 acres. Now the balance of the property can be left in agricultural nature, although it's not zoned that way. And he could put up any form of junk building he wants to store his implements, his various building equipment and the people would have no recourse through the county. Now just a few moments ago, I was down in Judiciary Committee and the Senate Sponsor of this Bill killed one of my Bills suggesting that she's in favor of the county and supporting the county officials and wasn't in favor of the concept of the little man. I would suggest to her that this particular Bill, it would be anti-county. It would be anti-county zoning and I think that just in good deference, we ought to drill this Bill about 20 feet under the ground and hope that by planting it that deep it might grow to something by two years from now."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative





Skinner, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't care about the fee. That doesn't make any difference whatsoever. But I do care about the building codes and I don't think we ought to repeal building codes the year after, less than one season after pole barns collapsed all over northern Illinois. Now what an agricultural building one day can the next day be a motorcycle shop, repair shop, that people could be in and end up getting killed when the thing collapses. Now if you want to limit it to the fee, that's fine. But don't limit it.. don't repeal the building codes in the six county area."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from.. from Macon, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, all you people are looking at this in the wrong direction, from my point of view, particularly Representative Griesheimer. Now, I come from a farming area where we have farms that have been in the same family for 150 years. One hundred years is common. They have a centennial sign on the door.. on the barns. What you are doing is refusing a farmer the right to continue what he 's done... Am I still on? I'm sorry. I didn't know. Something happened. What you are doing is taking away the right of a farmer to build on his own land and this is what we should permit. This business of putting in a developer, of course, it's going to be you city slickers coming along building all around us, but that should be the right.. of that. I know. That's why I pointed it out. You should not take the right of the farmers that have been there to keep working and developing his own lands."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, with his usual observation, I'm sure. He declares he has a conflict of interest and in fact is not voting because of that conflict.. Oh, wishes to be recorded 'no'



anyhow, in voting his conscience, as usual. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 51 'aye', 75 'nay', 13 voting 'present', and this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 304 I understand we'll have leave to take it out of the record for about ten minutes and return to it. Leave. Senate Bill 309. Is Lechowicz on the floor? I don't see him. Out of the record. The.. Are <sup>you</sup> looking for recognition, George? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to handle 309."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, alright. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, on Senate Bill 309."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 309, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Administrative License Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this allows the Department of Registration and Education to revoke or suspend the license of any nursing home administrator who is employed by a facility or had a financial interest in a facility which during the time of its association had its license suspended or revoked. It's one of three Bills that's been developed as a comprehensive nursing home reform package and I think there's I know of no opposition to the Bill and with that I..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 309. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 309 pass?' And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There would have been on opposition. If Representative Lechowicz had proceeded with this Bill, I see where it's



under his Bill. I wonder if the Sponsor or whatever he calls himself will yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "I would yield to anybody on the floor but Mr. Epton."

Epton: "In view of that, I withdraw my request."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Now that they have all that culture in Kankakee County under the Arts Council. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 309 pass?' All.. those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye', 4 'nay', 3 'present', and Senate Bill 309, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 310. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 310, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is Giorgi there? George Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 310 allows the Illinois Health Facility Authority to issue bonds to .. not-for-profit, hospitals and medical organizations now and we would like to include that for profit organizations."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 310. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 310 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'aye', 5 'no', 1 'present'. And Senate Bill 310, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 316. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 316, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to the reform of nursing home care and long term care facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the comprehensive Nursing Home Reform Act, Senate Bill 316. It creates a new nursing home care reform Act for 1979 and repeals the current Nursing Home, Shelter Care Home and Homes for the Aged Act. It provides for licensing of nursing homes by the Department of Public Health and establishes standards and requirements for the treatment of residents and establishes administrative procedures and penalties. I'd be glad to attempt to answer any questions. And I would move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 316. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the perhaps most significant piece of nursing home reform legislation that this General Assembly has before it, or has had before it in the last several years. This provides, first of all, a comprehensive Bill of Rights for nursing home patients with a number of enforcement mechanisms, including a private right of action. It's similar in many respects to House Bill 1997 which passed this House overwhelmingly last month. Furthermore, it provides additional mechanisms by which the Department of Public Health can enforce its rules and regulations in the .. regulating nursing homes, providing for receiverships and administrative fines. This.. this Bill has been worked out with nursing home consumer groups, with the Illinois Health Care Association. It has the support of all parties concerned. It passed the Senate 51 to nothing. And I urge the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 316 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'aye', 5 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 316, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We revert back to Senate Bill 304. I understand that's been worked out. Read the Bill. 304."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 304, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when people from out of the State of Illinois will come into a community and, for example, have a severe accident and the medical payment then are the responsibility if the person involved is unable to pay for it, the responsibility of the township. And many of our townships now are finding that these costs are becoming more exorbitant than they can even handle. This particular Senate Bill 304 transfers the responsibility of medical assistance to non-residents of Illinois from the township to the State Department of Public Aid. I urge your support on this Bill, 304."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 304. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 304 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'aye', no 'nay', no 'present'. And Senate Bill 304, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 328, out of the record. The Sponsor is not here. I understand Senate Bill 330, they want to move it back? Senate Bill 330, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 330, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain road Districts and townships. Third Reading of



the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there leave to return that back to Second? Leave? Senate Bill 330 is now on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, McMaster, amends Senate Bill 330 on page <sup>three</sup> by deleting lines 13 through 15 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The.. Tom McMaster, the Gentleman from Knox, on the Amendment."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen .., to explain the Amendment I will have to explain the Bill to some extent. I'll try to keep it short. I did not like the form that Senate Bill 330 was in when we received it from the Senate. What it would <sup>int</sup> have done, or would do if we leave it in its present form, is take the approval of the road commissioner of a township's budget from the township Board of auditors or trustees and give that approval to the road commissioner himself. I did not think that would be a good practice so I prepared this Amendment that would say that the road commissioner's budget would have to be approved by the electors at a public hearing. The road commissioner of course is a politi.. required to have a public hearing upon his budget and this gives the right of approval to the electors, not to the township Board, not to the road commissioner, but to the electors themselves. I think it makes a good Bill out of Senate Bill 330 . I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McMaster has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Representative McMaster, doesn't the town fund budget have to be approved by the electors at a hearing?"

McMaster: "I don't believe that's quite accurate."

Friedrich: "At one time I know that was true and I didn't .."

McMaster: "At one time it was true, but I believe several years



ago that approval was taken from the electors of the town meeting and given to the town Board to approve themselves."

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

Skinner: "I think I can tell you why the town Board is now the one that approves the road commissioner's budget. The reason is that some of my constituency.. constituents got uppity in about 1970 and put in to replace what.. replace the budget, the line items in the budget, that were presented with \$2.00 per line item. Now, that's the reason the town meeting no longer has that authority. I would ask Repr... This is an infinitely better Amendment than the original Bill, but I would ask Representative McMaster why the town electors should be trusted to deal with the road commissioner's budget, but not with the budgets of the other township officials?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Well, you gave the reason why they no longer have that responsibility of the electors Cal. <sup>Quite,</sup> Frankly, I'm inclined to agree that it should be in the hands of the electors. I realize of course what happened back in 1970 and I recall when the legislation was passed that took it from the electors and gave it to the township Board. I was not in complete agreement with that. But nevertheless, what is done is in the past. I think this makes a good Bill out of House Bill (sic) 330 to give back to the electors."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ceratinly support the Amendment. If anybody is interested in the details theymight ask Representative Vitek because he lives in the.. excuse me. His summer home is in the subdivision in McHenry County that engineered the revolution and I hope that next Session we'll give the town electors all the power back so the township government can again be known as the form of local government which is totally Democratic."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Chairman of the Counties and Townships Committee, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 330. And to suggest to one of the Gentleman that referred to the situation that he believes to exist that the electors at the annual township meeting or at a special town meeting cannot do anything about any part of the budget with the exception with the passage of this Bill now, the highway commissioner's budget. They can amend any part of that budget, any time they want during the annual town meeting. The fact of the matter is it's done all the time. They can detract from the budget line items; They can add to it; They can do whatever they want. The full force of the electors is still present in the township form of government and any time that he wants to go to a town meeting and propose an Amendment, all he has to do is to do so and if it's voted on by a Majority of the town electors at the annual town meeting or the special town meeting that budget can be amended in any part of it."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the Amendment cause I've had some experience in this field some years back. You know, philisophically this sounds great, that each and every elector has the right to appear at a public meeting, an annual meeting, and to have his vote counted. It doesn't work out that way. Most people aren't interested. Those who are interested are politically influenced or it's a partisanmatter and there comes a question of who can.. who can stuff the most people into the hall to vote their way. And it's really chaos when you see it work. It does not work. It's.. it's probably the poorest form of government that we could conceive because whatever political party is able to get the most





people at that meeting and to prevail, that is what's going to happen with the budget. I've seen budgets that were substituted on election day. That's usually when the annual meeting is held, one in the event we win and one in the event we lose and get enough heads there to vote on election day and we will prevail. I think it's a horrible way to run government and I think the Amendment ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous question prevails. To close, the Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quite frankly, I don't think this Bill has any chance for passage without this Amendment. I think it's a good Amendment. We'll make a good Bill out of it and I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McMaster has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 330. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "All I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, is to ask Tom what eventually happens to the budget once the town meeting is all over with? Does the township highway commissioner have control over his own budget irrespective of the Board? Just shake your head, Tom."

Speaker Matijevich: "Tom thinks he's got enough votes without answering that. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 'aye', 36 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"



Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Third Reading. Back to the Order of Priority of Call. Senate Bill 36.. 334 is out of the record. Senate Bill 363."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 363, a Bill for an Act in relation to investigative operations of the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevidich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Senate Bill 363 is a legislation to place the investigators in the Secretary of State's Office under the same type of pension formula as the State police now enjoy in Illinois, the hazardous duty pension formula that requires retirement at age 60. The Bill would also require contributions by the various state investigators in the Secretary's Office at the same levels of the people who are covered by the alternate formula for the state police. This is supported by .. it comes out of Secretary Dixon's Office who testified in the House Pension Committee for the Bill. It passed the Senate Committee and the Senate unanimously.. it was approved unanimously by the Pension Laws Commission. Representative Ebbesen is a principle Joint Sponsor with me on this. What we are doing here is bringing into the alternate formula the investigators that are working in the chop-shops in Chicago and elsewhere throughout the State.. I can guarantee you this is indeed, as Secretary Dixon pointed out in Committee, extremely hazardous duty. People's lives have been threatened who work in these particular jobs. People have had attempts made on their lives. Cars have been blown up, various things. The Secretary himself and certain of his investigators have had their lives threatened in fact in the last few months since they have undertaken various efforts to end the chop-shop operation in the State of Illinois. As I said,



the pension formula, the benefits would be the same as the state police formula as would be the contribution for..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Minority Leader, Assistant Minority Leader, Elmer Conti."

Conti: "Representative Stuffle, would you mind taking this Bill out of the record for just a few minutes? I'd like to work something out with you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Might do you some good. There's about ten lights on. Alright. Leave to take the Bill out of the record. Leave. Senate Bill 366."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 366, a Bill for an Act to amend the downstate fireman's pension fund Article of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 366 amends the downstate fireman's pension fund Article to remove age restrictions for fireman with previous fire Department experience, where military service was rendered during the pension period. This Bill is a companion Bill to Senate Bill 365 which passed the House two weeks ago with a vote 132 to 3 and it also passed the Senate with 44 'yeah' and 4 'nay'. I urge the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Frederick has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 366. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 366 pass?' I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt. I didn't see your light on.."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to call your attention that this Bill has not been approved by the Pension Laws Commission and I believe it should be defeated."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Alright. If there are no further questions the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 366 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'."



Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye', 20 'nay', 8 'present' and Senate Bill 366, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 375."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 409."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 409, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the law in relationship to township organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom"

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is permissive legislation. There is no tax increase. It merely gives township Board of trustees the authority to establish regional shelter care facilities for juveniles. The Board may provide for planning, development construction, and use of a regional juvenile shelter care facility or they may enter into a contractual or cooperative agreement with other governmental or private entities. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It passed unanimously in Counties and Townships and I would really appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Hallstrom has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 409. There's no questions. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 409 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'aye', no 'nay' and no 'present' and Senate Bill 409, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 447."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 447. A Bill for an Act creating the Retail Food Establishment Sanitation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, on Senate Bill 447."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that is jointly sponsored by myself and Representative McClain that would provide a procedure within the Department of Public Health for licensure and inspection of retail food establishments. It is one whereby there is the ability for the department to enter into agreements to local enforcing agencies, whether <sup>they</sup> be municipalities, townships or counties or local boards of health, to do the inspecting. There is provided for this a 50 dollar annual license fee, 80% of which will go to the agency doing the inspecting, the remainder would go to the state. For...this fee is exempted in 'Ma and Pa' cases. There's a threshold of having to gross one hundred and fifty thousand dollars per year before the fee goes into effect. There is no opposition from the industry involved. They have worked very closely with the industry and have satisfied the industry's problems and I would urge your support for Senate Bill 447."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 447. On that the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I know this is...I would like to ask the Sponsor if he would yield for a question."

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

Mautino: "Bill, concerning 24 hours spots, let's say a truck stop that operates off an interstate highway, according to this existing statute would it have to be that some person who has passed the examination proposed in this



legislation be on duty at all times."

Kempiners: "No.

Mautino: "...on this 24 hour basis?"

Kempiners: "This does not affect that at all. There has been other legislation that would affect that but this does not deal with that at all."

Mautino: "Okay, second part of it then. Since the Department of Public Health has now decided not to fund that area of...I think one hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars in that budget for inspection by departmental agencies you're transferring that total program to a local agency."

Kempiners: "No. We're making it possible for a local agency who wishes to be the enforcing agency to enter in an agreement with the department."

Mautino: "And if in fact there's no agency that wants to do it will not be then accepted on a basis of notification to the department that something should be checked, is that it?"

Kempiners: "No. No, because the Bill calls for annual licensure and at the time that the renewal application is submitted there must be an inspection and if a local inspecting agency is not available to do it then the department will do it."

Mautino: "Okay, who does it on the annual licensure? Is that the examination that's done by the Chicago and Illinois Restaurant Association and they receive the money rather than the State of Illinois?"

Kempiners: "No, the state gets the money not the Chicago... well, are you talking about under this Bill?"

Mautino: "Yes and also why is Chicago exempt from this Bill and downstate is in it, I don't understand that?"

Kempiners: Okay. I'm glad you asked that question. Let me answer the first one first. There is a fifty dollar licensure fee. If the state does the inspecting, the state keeps the fifty dollars. If there is an agreement



with a local enforcement agency...for example, if you... your county, whether it has a public health department or not, your county may be interested in doing this. And if they enter into an agreement with the state they would keep 80% of the fee for the inspection purposes with 20% then going to the state for the administration of the program."

Mautino: "And is that why Chicago is exempt from this..."

Kempiners: "No.

Mautino: "...and downstate is in it?"

Kempiners: "The answer to your second question is it's not Chicago, it's Cook County. And that's basically...they were interested in their home rule prerogatives. However, this does not mean that units of local government in Cook County cannot enter into an agreement and there a number of Cook County municipalities that are interested in entering into these agreements as is, I understand, the Cook County Board of Health is interested in entering into agreements with the department to perform this function."

Mautino: "Well basically what we're doing with this is mandating to the downstate counties that they become involved in a program and making it optional to Cook County, isn't that what you just said?"

Kempiners: "No. No, we are not mandating this to the counties. If a downstate county does not want to participate they don't have to. It is not a mandate."

Mautino: "Well then why is the legislation needed?"

Kempiners: "Okay, the reason the legislation is needed is that currently there are between one hundred and one hundred and fifty <sup>different</sup> sets of standards that have to be enforced. For example, if you wanted to open up a restaurant in your hometown and then come to Joliet and open one, you might have two different sets of standards. This is trying to promote a uniformity of standards among the



various enforcing agencies throughout the state."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. would...Speaker, would you tell Senator Geo-Karis to stop harassing our House Members?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She...is she at it again? That was Buz Yourell. Alright. Are you concluded, Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "One...one final question. What's the total cost on Senate Bill 447...basically to the industry and also to the State of Illinois? Do you have any figures on that?"

Kempiners: "The cost to the State of Illinois will not be increased because of the 50 dollar licensure fee...that it is anticipated this is will raise all of the revenue that will be necessary to implement the program. The cost to the industry would be six hundred and...an estimated six hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. Representative Mautino, as I indicated, the industry... the groups that represent the industry are not opposed to this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that Senate Bill 447 is a good Bill. What it does basically in terms of the downstate counties, the fact is, for better or for worse, the Department of Public Health does not have adequate funds and does not have an adequate number of inspectors to do the job. Basically what this says to downstate counties is if they want to they can do the inspection themselves and many of them want to. I have counties in my own district who have asked, who want to do the inspection themselves, but they naturally want to be





reimbursed for part of the cost of doing that or all of the cost of doing that. In this case, as I recall, 80% of the fee goes to the county that agree to do that. It seems to me that this is a reasonable situation and we will have statewide standards so that on on statewide basis we will be guarding the health of the people of the state. At the same time those counties, which is a practical matter, are going to have to more and more take on the jobs themselves. And those cities and towns in downstate Illinois are going to be reimbursed at least most if not all of the cost of doing so. It seems to me it's a good deal for them. I would reiterate what Representative Kempiners said, the industry did not come into the hearing and testify against this. They are not opposed to this. It seems to me they understand their interests very well and they did not oppose. The 'Ma and Pa' organizations are exempted from the fee and it seems to me this is a good Bill and I hope it receives a favorable Roll Call."

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

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to have one thing clarified here. In the analysis it says after January 1st, 1981, the Illinois Department of Public Health must review and approve all construction or remodeling projects of retail food establishments. Does this preempt them...the local municipalities..."

Kempiners: "No. For example, if your municipality, Jack, entered into an agreement to be the local enforcement agency for this, your agency would be the one doing the reviewing not the state department."

Williams: "Okay, I just wanted...I think it's a good Bill but I just wanted that to be clear. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative



Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Now are you saying that every restaurant in the State of Illinois would be paying a 50 dollar fee to the State of Illinois? I thought that's what you said."

Kempiners: "No. I indicated, and I think Representative Reilly also did, that the 'Ma and Pa' places would not be..."

Friedrich: "How do you define 'Ma and Pa'?"

Kempiners: "Any establishment that grosses less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. And that... it started out at fifty thousand but then in response to the industry it was raised to one hundred and fifty thousand."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is getting the camel's head into the tent. This is just another beginning harassment of small businesses, another darn license to pay, another inspector, another set of forms to fill out. You won't even be able to remodel a restaurant or build one unless some bureaucrat tells you how you can build it. Now there's more to this than meets the eye. This is really the fast food chain Bill, if you want to label it that, because they want uniformity. They want one plan to build a building and they want that...go to Springfield and they can prove that they can build that building in any town in the state. And you know that's what it is and you didn't even mention it. That's what this is, it's an appeasement to the fast food chain. It's for..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let the record show...let the record show that Adeline Geo-Karis and Ron Griesheimer are at it again."

Friedrich: "Well tell Geo-Karis to go back to the Senate and we'll talk about this Bill some more."



Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the state Department of Public Health tried to do what they're trying to do with this Bill. They're trying to take away from the home rule units and the non-home rule units the right to regulate and supervise the eating facilities throughout the state. And there was illusion and mentioned made of the Illinois Restaurant Association, which I was a member of for a number of years, is in support of this Bill. Well let me say that they are not necessarily representative of the entire State of Illinois. Many of the downstate restaurant owners of which I was one, I am not now, was a member of the Illinois Restaurant Association and they do not represent most downstate eating establishments, in fact, very few. And let me say this, what the state department couldn't do with the past legislation a few years ago, they're now trying hoist on us saying we're taking care of everybody but we letting out the <sup>mom</sup> and <sup>pop</sup> organization. Well it is not true. Let the counties do what they must do to protect the public health and keep the State of Illinois out. Now you're talking about fees, 50 dollars is the initial start. But let me tell you this, the County Health Department don't charge that kind of a fee now. They do it with a minimal standard based upon seating capacity for the most part. This Bill is an attempt by the State Department of Public Health to do what they haven't been able to do before and that's come into the county. And it's got to be resoundly defeated."

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

Leinenweber: "I'm rising for two purposes. One, to move the previous question but the second one to make the announcement that that Senator has concluded her



harassments for the morning."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's hope so. The Gentleman from Will has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed...by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, to close."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that there has been some things said on the floor that demonstrate a little misunderstanding of the history of this Bill. It's true that this Bill has been presented to this Legislature in the past but not in the condition that it is now. In the past the associations that represent the...the industry have been opposed to it. And for Representative Schraeder's information, I did not say that they supported it, I said they do not oppose it. And that is the case. Neither of the associations representing retail food establishments oppose this Bill in the shape it is in now. I'd just like to point out that for those of you who are concerned about more regulation that this actually provides a mechanism for less regulation. Now you might have more than one different agency coming in and inspecting on more than one occasion at retail food establishments. If there is a contract with a local enforcing agency there will be one inspection per year. In addition, there are very liberal provisions in this Bill. If there are any deficiencies found, a provisional license can be issued for up to three years, which is not the case now. Those of you who are interested in local government ought to be in support of this Bill because it gives local government a more powerful role in inspecting these types of establishments and protecting the health of the people which you represent and I would urge a 'yes' vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kempiners has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 447. The question is, shall Senate Bill 447 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote. One minute."

Deuster: "Well the people from Chicago and Cook County have very wisely taken themselves out of this twelve page Bill full of regulations. This is one more load on small business establishments. I've gotten letters in the past year because we passed a Bill that is written very similar to this that's already law. I think it's redundant and not needed. I heard from day care centers where they're babysitting little children, serving them a peanut butter sandwich at noontime with a glass of milk and they've had to send, out of the already existing law, some person to go to learn how to be a food service processor. This...this is not needed, we already have adequate law, I haven't gotten a letter on this..."

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

Deuster: "...I urge more 'no' votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Clerk will  
^ Take the record. On this question there are 53 'ayes', 62 'nays'...and the Gentleman from Will Representative Kempiners is trying his best. What do your want...explain your vote?"

Kempiners: "You're right, Mr. Speaker, I am trying my best because I think that there have been some people standing on the floor getting hysterical that if they knew anything about this Bill they would be supporting it. Those of you who said you haven't gotten letters, I'll tell you right now, there are a lot of public health agencies, counties and municipals throughout this state who are very much in support of this Bill. Because they know there is going to be some uniformity,that somebody is



to sit down with them from the industry and develop rules and regulations that everybody can live with. And also that they will have some say in the enforcement of these rules and regulations. I think that if you who are interested in local, and I said this before, will look at this Bill and you will find a greater role for local government and you ought to be supporting it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk has taken the record. There are 53 'ayes', 62 'nays'. 4 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 447 having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby lost. Jones 'aye' and Oblinger 'aye' ...you're a long way from 70...hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 450. Is Katz here? Out of the record.

Senate Bill 459, Von Boeckman. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill eliminates the decals issued by the Illinois Commerce Commission and replaces them with identification stamps that are presently issued free of charge. This Bill requires fees for these stamps. The Bill was amended in the Senate to include legislative intent which says in the event that this Bill, fee schedule, does not generate the same amount of revenue as the old fee schedule. The Motor Vehicles engaged solely in Interstate Commerce Commission will be required to adjust their fee upwards to make care of the loss. This passed the Senate 50 to nothing and I ask your favorable support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazewell has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 459. On that, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"



Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "In the Digest, Representative, there's a line which says that the Bill authorizes intercorporate hauling between parent companies and subsidiaries. Could you explain what that does and how it changes current law?"

Von Boeckman: "This has been amended out."

Vinson: "That's out?"

Von Boeckman: "It's not in there."

Vinson: "Thank you."

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

Balanoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House I just want to call to your attention that the Illinois Commerce Commission is opposed to this Bill because their figures indicate that there will be a loss in revenue of \$400,000 with this Bill. The Bill contains a clause which says that if there is a loss in revenue, the General Assembly will pass another law to fill up this gap. I just wanted to bring this to your attention, with all due respect to the Sponsor of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "What was that? Yes, he yields."

Getty: "The point Representative Balanoff raised is the point to which I would like to address to Representative Von Boeckman. Will there be a \$400,000 loss in state revenue?"

Von Boeckman: "Well, it's not for sure. They don't know what they.. what the loss would be or whether there would be a loss. However, I'd like to bring it to the House attention there's a 3 million dollar surplus in this fund."

Getty: "But they did estimate a \$400,000 loss in revenue?"

Von Boeckman: "No. No. At first there was no estimated loss between the ICC .. before the Committee. And then one fellow came and said there's a possibility of being a \$400,000 loss. However, that's why the Amendment was



placed on in the Senate that says if there is a loss at the end of one year then the adjustment will be made. And that's why I wanted to bring it to the House's attention that we do have a 3 million dollar surplus in this fund and it will not hurt the operations of the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing, are you seeking attention? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just checking my light. It's been on through the entire last Bill, the debate and the explanation of vote, and I didn't know whether it was working or not."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's working beautifully now."

Ewing: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Keep it on. The Gentleman from Peoria... the Lady from Peoria, Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor take a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Sumner: "Yes. What happens to the smaller trucking firms in this situation?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'What happens to the smaller trucking firms?'"

Sumner: "Will they pick up the tab and the difference or how will that affect the smaller trucks?"

Von Boeckman: "No. The interstate haulers will pick up the tab, not the local haulers."

Sumner: "The little guy doesn't."

Von Boeckman: "Intrastate.. there are two types of haulers, interstate and intrastate."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Von Boeckman: "And we're talking about interstate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazwell, Representative Von Boeckman, to close."





Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask a favorable Roll Call on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Von Boeckman has asked for the... moved for the passage of Senate Bill 459. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 459 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just add some things that were not covered. This legislation would put Illinois in compliance with the federal law. There are a number of law suits pending as to the truckers contesting the way we do it currently. If we pas this, we will put it the shape that it has to be to conform with the federal law. We will ~~eliminate the suits and the expenses from~~ the trucking company for those suits currently. Should there be any reduction to the Motor Vehicle fund there is a provision where we would have to come back and adjust it. The amount of money sitting in this fund currently is more than it has been collecting in any given year. We could probably go a year without getting the money. So I ask for your favorable support for the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'aye', 25 'nay', 10 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 459, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared .. 459 hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 506. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 506, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazwell, Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill (sic) 506 is a permissive Bill which



permits the optional installation of strobe lamps on school buses. Pursuant to the House Resolution of the last Session the Department of Transportation was authorized to issue permits for over hanging equipment and was to accumulate the data to ascertain whether auto carriers with over hang were safe upon the Illinois highways. As of Feb. 15th, 1979, the accumulated totals indicate that there were 4,205 trips in Illinois with over hang permits for the total mileage of 909,000 and this further report indicated there were no accidents related to.. involving auto carriers over hangs during this period. The Motor Vehicle Laws Committee, the Illinois Office of Education, Department of Transportation, approves of this measure. It passed the Senate 54 to nothing. I ask .. your favorable vote."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Tazwell has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 506. On that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just wanted to call your attention a little bit to the Amendment to this Bill. While it's true the primary Bill has to do with lights on the top of a vehicle; the Amendment permits a truck to have an over haul length of 7 feet. That means the truck.. the materials on the truck can be 7 feet longer than our.. than is presently permitted, taller than anyone is this House. I just wanted to bring this to your attention, with all dues respect to the Chairman... to the Sponsor of this Bill."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman to close.. just one moment. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Does the Amendment strike everything after the enactment clause, or does the Bill still allow the use of strobe lights on school buses under certain conditions?"



Von Boeckman: "It still allows the use of lights, strobe lights, permissively. It's optional."

Winchester: "Your Amendment #1, that's also premissive for the State of Illinois. Is that correct?.."

Von Boeckman: "It is being done now and a permit is required every time there is a trip with an overhang for the auto carriers and it strikly applies only to auto carriers, no one else, no other type of equipment."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Representative Von Boeckman to close."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, again, I think this is a good piece of legislation. It's in force now in the State of Illinois and I think it's a saving to the consumer and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Matijeivich: "Before we go to... McCourt, turn your light on because you've been waving but your light's not on. It's not on here. We're going to have to.. we're going to have to fix your light up here. Alright. The Gentleman has.. Representative.. Let's give leave for McCourt, cause his light is on and it doesn't work up on the Board. Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the present time the length for an auto carrier, permitted length is 65 feet. Now, I know this is late on a Friday afternoon and everyone would like to get home, but this is a very significant piece of legislation. If we pass this Bill as it has now been amended, we are saying that all trucks in Illinois carrying automobiles can be 72 feet in length and once we do that, next year or next fall or soon, there'll be another piece of legislation coming here that will say that front carriers can be 72 feet. Let's raise the length to all trucks to 72 feet. So if you want to vote the right way on this last day in the week for this Session, the right way is a 'no' vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazwell has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 506. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 506 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'."

Von Boeckman: "We need an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I was in the Rev.. in the Motor Vehicles Committee when this Bill was heard. And I questioned some of the things that were being questioned here on the House floor. I specifically ask one question; 'What does this do for the consumer?' This will allow an extra car, as I understand it, to be on one of those trailers which will if not reduce the fee for the cost of transportation, it will not.. it will keep it from increasing. So it's got to be a consumer saving. There's nothing wrong with this Bill at all."

Speaker Matijevich: "The.. We've already taken the record. I'm sorry, Gentlemen. No, it's still open. I'm sorry. Representative Leverenz, from Cook."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote and perhaps clear up a few questions that have come up on the floor. The Amendment does not strike it from the enacting clause. It covers both the strobe lamps for school buses on a permissive basis and the second part is the Amendment in the House. The Amendment that was put on the House was really pursuant to a House Resolution that passed <sup>in</sup> here last year to have the Department of Transportation study this matter. The Department of Transportation has done this. It has allowed these vehicles and we have a number of different ways the truck can operate in an over side fashion. They found that out of 4200 actual trips made and 909,000 miles done on those trips by those trucks with this easy variance, that there was no



accidents reported..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm helping to support Senate Bill 506. It's kind of ridiculous here and as one of the speakers just recently spoke out, this is a consumer Bill. By increasing the length on these, the consumer pays the cost of every car that he buys in a dealership and this will decrease his cost by <sup>adding</sup> one more car and so we're helping the consumer. We're certainly not hurting the consumer. We're helping the consumer by this legislation."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there

~~are 60 'aye', 168 'nay', 18 voting 'present', and Senate~~  
Bill 506, having failed to received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 511 out of the record. Senate Bill 540 out of the record. Senate Bill 566, is Representative Broom (sic) here? Out of the record. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I think I'm a hyphenated Co-Sponsor on 566, I'd like to move it on."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Alright. Senate Bill 566. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 566, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 566 amends the School Code by extending teacher tenure from age 65 to 70 years of age and also by changing the retirement age from 65 to 74, teachers, principals, District Superintendents and other Superintendents. What we've done is we're conforming to the Federal Age Discrimination and Employment Act as amended in 1978 and that Act stipulates an employment



must not be terminated prior to age 70. So Senate Bill 566 is designed to comply with federal requirements which prohibit discrimination based on age and I move for the .. or ask for the passage in the support of Senate Bill 566."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative from McLean has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 566. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it has been intimated that this Bill extending teacher tenure from age 65 to age 70 would conform the law to federal law or that it might be required by federal law. That's not so at all. There is.. The mere fact that we end teacher tenure at 65 does not mean that a teacher must be dismissed. I'm confident that all good teachers and all teachers that are performing well will be continued on annually after they reach 65. But there's no reason that we should guarantee that the protection of tenure or the guaranteed job status should be continued on another five years. I think you all know that the school administrators and I understand, the school boards and I feel the public too, would be against this. Good teachers will be cut from a classroom with the children teaching them. Those who might not merit being renewed just as when we stand for election, the folks back home might decide that maybe we shouldn't have another two years for whatever reasons, I think that once teachers reach 65 it's appropriate to allow the school Board who is elected by the people to determine whether the individual teacher merits being renewed for an annual contract or not. And so I would express opposition to this Bill. It is not needed. I do not think that it's good policy and I think that we should evaluate all school Bills from the point of view of the children... are the best possible teachers in the classroom. That should be the standard, not



guaranteeing jobs or job security for anybody, whether it be janitors or school teachers and I would respectfully urge that you vote 'no' on Senate Bill 566. Thank you."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker . If Illinios were not a part of the United States, I would certainly think that Representative Deuster's remarks would be appropriate. However, we are a part of the United States and we do have to respond to federal law. And there is just no question that .. that we could not manditorily retire teachers at the age of 65 under the new federal Act. There's just no question about it. Now, that's whether Mr. Deuster likes it or not, that's what the law is. But, and so you can say reasonably, well, if that's the case, then what do we need this Bill? What difference does it make then if we have this Bill or not? Federal law sort of pre-empts it. And it is the last part of this Bill that is crucial to teachers. Otherwise, teachers who are over 65 want to retire, want to retire, will have to work till 70 to get all thir benefits. Many teachers have planned their retirement on a base of 65. Both contracts and law provide for certain advantages if you stay till retirment date. Now what we have is 70 as the retirement date. That means a teacher who is 67 years old, for example, in Chicago, and wants to retire, doesn't want to continue teaching, has planned to retire would have to blow all of her or his accumulated sick pay that she would normally get if she waited till retirement. Because she is now retiring before the retirement date. This Bill insures that she gets or he gets their rights on retirement. And that's what the Bill basically does. It's an important Bill for that reason. It gives people the option at least to retire early with all their benefits. If you listen to Mr. Deuster, you will find teachers who will be stuck be-



cause they will not want to give up their benefits and they will say, 'I'd like to get out of 67, but I can't because Mr. Deuster says.. has made it so that I've got to stay till 70.' Therefore, this Bill has to be passed."

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

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. I find myself in an unusual position of agreeing with Representative Greiman and I wonder if I could possibly be right, but I guess he's right and I'm right, for a change. I think it's wrong to make second class citizens out of people just because they reach a certain age, whether it's 65 or 70. I don't think it's fair to force teachers to feel that they're second class citizens just because they've reached the age of 65. Many of them can go on teaching usefully to age 70. I can recall when I was in high school I had a number of teachers that were over 65. And sometimes they were the best teachers. They took the most care and they were the most interested in their students. I think this is a fair Bill and a good Bill for all good teachers in Illinois."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman.. the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to make just 3 points. Number one; addressing myself to the prior speaker, you can fire people at 40 or at 50 if they aren't performing. Therefore, if they aren't capable at 65, you can ask them to retire or to resign. Number two; we are very content to have appointed Judges, elected Presidents, who are all over 65 or have been in the past who make greater decisions than teachers have to and we don't discourage them from being our President or our Judges. And number three; I resent the fact that he would think or any of you would think that I'm still in-





capable of teaching children."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, to close."

Bradley: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ceratinly agree and am very grateful for the support of Mr. Greiman, Mr. McAuliffe on this piece of legislation and I do think that possibly one of the speakers who spoke against it is not really interpreting it correctly. The law, the federal law, as amended mandates that there cannot be discrimination based on age and the teacher wants to keep teaching, I should certainly think they might as well keep their tenure at the same time and this Bill also allows them to retire as Mr. Greiman points out, over that age and keep the full benefit. So, it's something we need and I ask for the support of the House."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 566. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 566 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye', 7 'nay', 1 'present'. And Senate Bill 566, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 573."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 573, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Oh, one moment. Before we get to that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last the other night before we got to all the motions, a motion was made to adjourn and inadvertantly Senate Bill 58 was not heard. I cleared it with both the Majority Leader and the Chairman of the Township.. Counties and Township Committee and they would like to reconsider that



discharge that put it on Second on the Calendar of Second Reading. Tom McMaster's Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do we have leave that Senate Bill what? What?"

Conti: "Senate Bill 58."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 58 be placed on the Order of Second Reading and use the attendance Roll Call for that purpose? Leave and it shall be so done. Now back to Senate Bill 573, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 573 is a Bill suggested rather... submitted by the Illinois Office of Education. It changes some references to the State Board from old references... Superintendent of Public Construction, but basically it allows for the maintenance of educational materials for the deaf and the blind to be either contracted or maintained by the State itself. Those are the changes. I would ask that this Bill be passed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schneider has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 573. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 573 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye', .. 50 'aye' (150), no 'nay', 1 'present', and Senate Bill 573, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 624, Jaffe."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 624, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 624 is similar to House Bill 1576 which passed on this House with 127 votes. And basically what it requires is that



reinstated teachers shall be assigned by school Boards to positions similar to the one that they held prior to suspension or dismissal. The only difference between this and 1576 is that this adds the position to which the teachers reinstated shall be subject to the approval of a hearing officer or a court which renders a final decision. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 624. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 624 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'aye', 13 'nay', 7 'present'. Senate Bill 624, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 632, Birkinbine. Read the Bill.



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 632. Birkinbine. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 632. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act pertaining to confidentiality of certain medical evaluation records. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I can I'd like to defer to Mr. Daniels, who handled this Bill in Committee and can better explain it than I."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, the expert on this matter."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 632 provides that all information, reports, statements and other data of physician owned interinsurance exchanges in their agents is confidential. It deals with the peer review groups that we set up in legislation previously and it's absolutely essential to the State Medical Society and it's supported by them. I know of no opposition to the Bill and I move for its favorable passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 632. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Does this do anything to confidentiality of patient records if the patient wishes to see them?"

Daniels: "No...no."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 632 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye', no 'nay', no 'present' and Senate Bill 632, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 670. O'Brien. Read the Bill."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 670. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Thank you very much. Senate Bill 670 abolishes the Throw-back Rule in relation to printed material in the State of Illinois. Senate Bill 670 passed the Senate 50-2, and passed out of the Revenue Committee in the House 20-3. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call, and be happy to answer any questions that any of the Members may have in relation to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative O'Brien has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 670. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have, what appears to be, another exemption Bill, where we are exempting someone by, who has a formula now, pays income tax. The Democratic..."

Unknown: "That's not true."

Greiman: "...staff...Well, I can only read this Democratic staff analysis, says the Bill exempts some commercial printers from a three-part formula for computing Illinois tax liability. The formula is payroll, property, and sales evenly weighted. Under this Bill sales are exempted. Now, that's all right. I...you know, I don't have any objection to exemptions, but I will just point out that in the last twenty-four hours we managed to give four insurance companies an exemption. Railroad companies, fancy clubs get an exemption. We decreased the truck fees for overstate, interstate truckers, and now we have out-of-state printers, which will add to the list, and we might as well just keep going, I guess. We'll exempt them all. I'm not a great watcher of the public treasury, but let's exempt them all. Let's keep going, and we'll..."



there's nobody who we shouldn't exempt."

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

Slape: "Thank you, M...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Senate Bill 670. I represent a district that has a World Color Press plant, which this Bill would aid. World Color Press is the nation's leading printer of magazines with all of its manufacturing facilities located within the State of Illinois. World Color Press employs approximately 45 hundred people, and in 1978, generated sales of two hundred and forty-one million dollars. This income...their income tax liability to Illinois for that year is expected to be approximately seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The printing industry employs approximately fifty thousand Illinois residents, generating a payroll of six hundred and seventy-four million per year. A substantial number of these jobs would be lost if the printers in the state lost their out-of-state contracts, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the Revenue Committee, where this Bill was heard, and, really, there's no argument for this Bill other than the very general argument that this industry might be a little bit more competitive if it didn't have this tax. Now, that can be said of any industry that has competition anywhere outside of the State of Illinois, and that just about covers the entire ball park. There are no special equities for an exemption here. It's a small one. It'll only cost the state about...I think the figure is three hundred thousand dollars, but this is just a bold, brazen, little special interest rip-off that the other taxpayers of this state are going to have to pick up. As a matter of fact, in



this industry, the State of Illinois is so preeminent and so solid in doing the kind of printing that would be exempted, that I'm sure that there's no threat by virtue of the slight savings that they will have by virtue of enacting this Bill. There are...Illinois has a...is preeminent in this field. They don't need this kind of subsidy, and our taxpayers need this three hundred thousand dollars."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Doesn't the state income tax now work on a multi-state tax compact, which allocates income to all of the states on a basis of a formula?"

O'Brien: "That's correct."

Kane: "Oh, why should we treat one kind of industry different from all other kinds of industries?"

O'Brien: "Well, quite frankly, because the printed-material that we have being printed in the State of Illinois is not manufactured goods. It is published and put together in other states, primarily New York and some of the other publishing states. It is only sent here to be printed here, and that is all that's done, and it's being taxed on a manufactured scale. And, quite frankly, for Representative Greiman and Representative Mugalian, the amount of revenue that is anticipated in being lost is somewhat less than three hundred thousand dollars, and I'd like to point out to all of the Members of the House that never once has the State of Illinois collected this revenue. They are only threatening to collect the revenue. Should they do that, I think that we will probably see a lot of these printers move out of the State of Illinois and move elsewhere, and that's why I'm sponsoring the legislation."

Kane: "Under what kinds of rules or statutes are they threat-



ening to collect this? I mean, either they owe it under the formula, or they don't owe it under the formula."

O'Brien: "Well, to the best of my knowledge, there was a recent court decision, which indicated that they had the ability to collect if another state didn't have a state income tax, and it...that's why it's called the Throw-back Rule. But, on March 23rd, the Illinois Department of Revenue sent a letter to the printing industry of the Sta..of the State of Illinois stating that printing material is not considered to be manufacturing, because it is a process and a technique that does not result in the change in the form, name, use, of a tangible personal property."

Kane: "But if other states are also using the multi-state tax formula, there wouldn't be any advantage to change any business from one state to another, would there?"

O'Brien: "Well, the problem arises is that the orders are taken in New York and then shipped directly from the State of Illinois, say to California. We've got quite a few magazines that are printed in the State of Illinois, and I might point out some of them to you, Representative. Time magazines, Sports Illustrated, Money, People, Good Housekeeping, Cosmopolitan, Women's Day, The New Yorker, Family Circle, Golf Digest, Glamour, Mademoiselle, just to mention a few with over forty million copies being sent. Now, they are not sent directly back to the publisher and then sent to the State of California or Nevada, or what it may be. They are sent directly from Illinois, and for that reason, if one of those states does not have the sales tax, then the Throw-back Rule is in effect, and they will tax...the State of Illinois will tax them. However, they have not been doing it, and if they do start to do it, we're afraid that many of these publishers will just find printers in other states, and that's why we're sponsoring the legislation. As I said before, the monies





have never been collected in the State of Illinois. The printing industry in the State of Illinois is one of the largest printing industries in the country, and, quite frankly, if I can...if you'll bear with me a minute, I'll indicate some other figures that I think warrant the support of all of the Members on this Bill. The printing industry in Illinois employs approximately 50 thousand Illinois residents, generating a payroll of six hundred and seventy-five million. As Representative Slape indicated, there are four thousand, five hundred employees just in his county in...off Color Press."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think you answered the question. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Yes, Sir. The one question that I would have, is that if all states operate under the same multi-state tax compact, is that there would be no advantage for a publisher to go to a printer in another state. So, I don't see why there's the argument."

O'Brien: "Well, not all states have a state income tax. When they all do, then there would be no need for this legislation."

Kane: "I think that there's only one state that does not."

O'Brien: "There are about five."

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

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Those opposed by saying 'no'. And the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien, to close."

O'Brien: "Well, just in further answering Representative Keane's questions...Kane's questions, other states that surround Illinois, that do not have the Throw-back Rule



in effect, are Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and that's why we're pushing this legislation. It's a good Bill. The printing industry in the State of Illinois is one of the largest industries. We print some of the major magazines, and, as I said before, I think it's good legislation, and I think it would be short-sighted for us to vote this measure down seeing how large the printing industry in Illinois is, and the amount of people that it employs, and the amount of taxes that are derived from it. I'd ask and encourage everybody to support the measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative O'Brien has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 670. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 670 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Skinner wishes to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Obviously this Bill's going to pass, but it shouldn't. It shouldn't, because there are four states without an income tax. They are Nevada, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. Under the Throw-back Rule, as I understand it, we will get whatever would have been collected in those states from the corporations in question, if those states had an income tax. Now, Texas is a fairly large state. In fact, it's larger than Illinois and will have more congressional delegates next...in the next decade than does Illinois. I don't think we ought to be throwing money away like this, if we really believe in tax relief for those people who deserve it. I would wish that the Sponsor of this Bill would be as compassionate about Illinois industry, which is highly profitable, such as John Deere and Caterpillar company. Caterpillar, I understand, announced yesterday they were building no new plants in Illinois until the business situation improved markedly, and the way to improve the business situation is not to do nothing about Workmen's Comp, or Unemployment Comp, or about the Corporate Personal Property Tax..."



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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 30...28 'nays', 10 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 670 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We'll have a short change of pace now. Representative Dave Jones, Jones from Sangamon County wishes to introduce a good friend of ours, Doc 'Helms', who is receiving an award. Dave Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we want to present to you Doc Helm.. Doc Helm who has worked for the state for 45 years as a photographer and he's going to be honored tomorrow by his Masonic Lodge for his 45 years of service to his lodge and his community. And you know, Doc is actually a political miracle and we might can learn a lot from Doc because he has served under nine Secretary's of State of both parties. And so, at this time, I would like to present Doc Helm and will the Clerk read the Resolution?"

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 371; Whereas, E. Winfred Doc Helms is a man dedicated to improving the lives of his fellow men; Whereas, in honor of his commitment to his community and the Masons, a reception is being held in his honor on June 16th, 1979 at the Forum 30 Hotel in Springfield and whereas, Doc Helm, a native of Mt. Vernon Illinois, embarked on his mason career at the forest of Lebonon Lodge '71, becoming a Mason at the age of 21, and Whereas, Doc Helm, has endeared himself to the Masons of this state as the official photographer for the Grand Lodge of Illinois and whereas, in addition to his civic involvment and as a Mason, Doc Helm has spent 45 years of service to the State, presently working under the Secretary of State, and Whereas, over the years through his expertise in photography artistry, Doc Helm has immortalized many of the faces of the General Assembly. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, of the Eighty-



First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we join with the Illinois Masons in honoring E. Winfred Doc Helm; for his tireless commitment to the Masons and the people of this state and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to E. Winfred Doc Helm as a token of the great esteem in which he is held."

Speaker Matijevich: "I present to you Doc Helm. You know, he said to me just a moment ago, he said, 'You know if my photographer doesn't show up on time, we're going to run through this again.' But his photographer showed up on time. Doc Helm."

Doc Helm: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Representative Jones, Members of the House of Representatives, I'm indeed honored today to receive this accolade from the Members of the House of Representatives. I've been around a long time and seen many of you. I've <sup>ve</sup> tried to serve you and it certainly has been a pleasure for me to work with all of the Representatives. It's one of those things I really like and today I feel humble standing before the House of Representatives, which is one the things I thought I'd never have the opportunity of doing and I appreciate it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "We all congratulate Doc and he has been most helpful to all of us and we appreciate that. The next Bill is Senate Bill 725, Daniels. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 725, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you want leave to return this back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Does he have leave? He does have leave. The Bill is on Second Reading. The Clerk, read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Getty, amends Senate Bill 725 on page one. line 17 and so forth."



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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #1 would just clearly delineate that no single claim could be for more than \$100."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 725. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 762. Van Duynes Read the Bill. Is Leroy back there? I don't see him. Take.. take it out of the record. He's here, somebody said. Take it out... Representative... 793."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 793, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and Representative Walsh, I'm not taking it back. For those of you looking at Senate Bill 9.. 793 in the synopsis it is incorrect. What is really the proposal is, I believe, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 793. That amounts to a considerable dilution of the kinds of Bills that related to the reduction in forces in the past. I've always been the Sponsor of the Bill and they have required individual hearings by teachers who have been removed from their positions or given an honorable dismissal for economic necessity. We have always asked that there be a hearing officer involved. That, however, has been all deleted and we have come up with, I think, a very modern proposal that very simply states that if a .. if a number of teachers dismissed for economic necessity exceeds five or 150% of the average number of teachers dismissed honorably in the preceding three years, then the Board is requested



to hold public hearings. That is all it is and amounts to basically possibly ... Can I finish? Oh, there I... allows basically to a sun shine approach and diminishes some of the shadows of doubt, I think, in the minds of a teacher who may feel that he or she has been dismissed for reasons other than economic necessity. So it is a considerably watered down proposal. It seems to me that Boards, although they presently are under no legal compulsion to show cause for dismissal related to economic necessity, good public relation practices would dictate such an action. However, in the absence of that, I am submitting this legislation, again, very modest, very much reduced from original conceptions that I've offered before and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

Schneider, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 793.

On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to begin with, at the Committee hearing it was determined and I thought agreed upon between the Sponsor of the Bill and the Sponsors of the Sponsor of the Bill, the Illinois Education Association, that there was an error because the Bill would leave in doubt whether it is necessary for a Majority of those Board Members elected to approve the action taken at this special meeting, or whether a Majority of those present and voting, was necessary. Now, in all other matters concerning the operation of the Board a Majority of those present and voting, assuming a quorum is present, will take care of the business. That will apparently not take care of the business here and I offered an Amendment which the Sponsor chose to disregard because he went right over the... right over the Bill on Second Reading irrespective of my Amendment. Now I suggest to you that regardless of that Amendment and I think I should have been afforded the courtesy of offering it and



letting you people decide whether it belonged or not, but aside from all that, the Bill was just terrible. It imposes more restrictions on the school Board elected by the people in the school District. It provides, not in the case of a dismissal for cause, but in the case of a reduction of staff in a school District for economic necessity, an economic necessity can mean that they've got the shorts, or that there aren't enough kids there to use the staff that they have. It seems to me that the Board has to have some control, Mr. Speaker, without us poking our big noses in their matters. This is absolutely unnecessary. We have no business at all telling that Board that they have to have a meeting and show cause why the staff is being reduced. It's obvious why the staff is being reduced. The Board ought to have the discretion to dismiss those people that they have to dismiss. And of course, this doesn't.. that takes into consideration tenure and other things. Tenure teachers are protected other places and where it's necessary to reduce... to dismiss tenure teachers, it's on the basis of the time that they have served. This interferes unnecessarily in the Board's activities and for those of you who have been busy voting on tax limitations and voting on reductions in taxes and voting to prohibit local school bodies to increase their taxes, let me point out to you that it would be extremely inconsistent and sometime those people up in the front there, the press, are going to wake up and see that you're voting for this kind of legislation as well as voting for tax limitation and they're maybe going to call you a phony. This is a bad Bill. It should not pass. It serves no one and I urge your 'no' vote."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schnieder to close."

Schnieder: "Think my nose was used in debate, but it's not the



kind of Bill that Representative Walsh has portrayed. Very clearly the statute does provide in another Section, I happened to take the time to look it up, that a Majority vote of the Board is required. For example, in delineating under Section 10-22-4, the Board must first approve a motion containing specific charges by a Majority vote of all its Members. So I'm not introducing anything new, in that respect. And the other aspect of it, it does not seem to me to be very onerous that a Board have a public hearing. They do that regularly in the course of their business. They do not automatically require that because they have the hearing that the reduction in forces provision is going to be reversed. It may be modified by them, not by the group involved. It's actually an action by the Board in two cases. Historically what we've noticed is that just cause for dismissal is still the service employees, whether they be teachers or others, have always required an analysis of just cause. I don't think that this is going very far. In fact, in the past I've preferred a lot stronger Bills. We know that under undue economic and trying circumstances such as in the depression, the courts have held that group reductions or group reductions in salaries are certainly within the purview of the Board. All we're asking in this very simple proposition is if there is that kind of reduction necessary that it be made public, that it be discussed. It does not have any impact in terms of finality on a second Board hearing. The Board can just very well say that is our reason. We support and maintain that reason. If you have any questions, we'll be glad to answer them. It's a very simple Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 793 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and all those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."





Borchers: "In explaining my vote, I just want to point out that up and down the State of Illinois there are many school Boards. There'll probably be different financial situations in each school District that we know nothing about. And all we're doing is sticking our nose, as Representative Walsh said, in the very business. I feel that we should defeat this because I, for one, would not like to have us stick our.. your nose into our school Board's business, or we may be in trouble because of the loss of a factor, or whatever. And so, let's vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think that.. well, I think that House Amendment #1, which is really the Bill right now, makes the field, you know, fairly innocuous and I think that it does not do many of the things that Representative Walsh really indicated and referred to. I think he's looking at the Bill in its original form and I think if you look at House Amendment #1 you'll find out that the Bill as it is now, with the Amendment, just talks about when the economic necessity exceeds 150% of the average number of teachers honorably discharged in the preceding three years and more than exceeds five and then the Board holds a public hearing on the question of dismissal. I think it's a reasonable Bill and I think it should be voted on and should be passed."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Jaffe has hit the nail on the head. What the Amendment does is look to a situation where there may be or appears to be an arbitrary situation on the number of dismissals and dismissal notices involved. I think this should get a green light for the reasons he indicated and now there is a blanket hearing on all of the dismissals, not one by one



that would be greatly costly to the District. But a blanket hearing on the whole issue where certain factors are involved that would indicate a potentially arbitrary action by the Board. And I would urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye' and 46 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 801. 798, I'm sorry. 798."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 798, a Bill for an Act to allocate a portion of inheritance and transfer tax to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 798 amends the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law to create an inheritance tax collection distributive fund for distribution of revenues to counties. It requires 4% of revenues collected from the inheritance tax to be placed in a new fund for distribution in the counties on a monthly basis. The State Treasurer would allocate this distribution. The Comptroller would pay the 4% pursuant to the appropriation. As you know, the Constitution prohibits local governments from basing fees on funds collected and this was affirmed by a 1976 Illinois Supreme Court decision. This effectively blocked counties from retaining the 4% fee on inheritance collection which had previously been in effect. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 798."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 798 pass?' 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. DiPrima 'aye'. On this question there are 126 'aye', 12 'no', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate



Bill 801."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 801, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Comptroller Merit Employment Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 807."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 807, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 807 would to provide for an increase in the post retirement increment from 2% to 3% for a year which would be off-set by an increase in the employee contribution by one half of one percent and I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Hudson: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Getty, I may be under a misapprehension here, but this is the Bill that raises the automatic annual increase in pensions, legislative and judicial, by one percent automatically effective Jan. 1, 1980. Is that correct?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty. Turn Getty on."

Getty: "That's correct."

Hudson: "Okay. Was there a Senate Amendment #1 which included the one percent participation on behalf of the employees?"

Getty: "You're referring to a Senate Amendment?"

Hudson: "Yes. My understanding was that there was a Senate Amendment that included the half percent contribution on behalf of the employees. That you have mentioned. And then (there was) (sic) a House Amendment #1, which removed the one half percent Member contribution which left the Bill in the posture that it



started out in which was a posture disapproved of by the Pension Laws Commission. I may be misinformed on all of this, but I want to be sure that that one half percent contribution has not been stricken by House Amendment #1. My analysis indicates that it was stricken. The Bill is now <sup>is</sup> in its original form which is, as I say, one that was not approved by the Pension Laws Commission."

Getty: "It appears that you are correct in that, Sir. Representative Terzich did offer an Amendment in the House and I note that Representative Terzich is the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission and it appears that you are correct. My reference in explaining the Bill was to the manner in which it came over here."

Hudson: "Yes, I understand that. May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Chairman?"

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Hudson: "I think it would be well for our Members to note what this Bill does in its present form. Senate Bill 807. It started out in a posture not approved by the Pension Laws Commission because it included no provision for a contribution by the Members for this automatic increase in pensions from 2% to 3%. Generally speaking, what the Pension Laws Commission has required and advises and has accepted is a compensatory contribution for every raise by one percent. The employees will come in with  $\frac{1}{2}$ %. Well, the Senate put an Amendment on it and the House took it off. So the Bill now is in its original form. It is.. My understanding is that it is in the form that it's going to cost.. well, the increase in accrued liability and unfunded liability would be 1 million, 387 dollars to the Pension funds. This gives, of course, the Judges a rather handsome increase in their pensions and I can understand that they want it. I can even understand the Members of the General Assembly might want the same. But I think it's something that we should give serious consid-



eration to and it might be a suggestion in as much as the Sponsor, the House Sponsor, and Representative Getty's doing the best job he can, but it might be a thought to hold this or not move it. Perhaps the Sponsor would be willing to take it back to Second Reading, if he can, and see to it that there is some contribution made here on behalf of the Members. Otherwise, it looks to me like another pension rip off proposition which I don't think we can go back to our taxpayers and explain too readily. So, I would make that suggestion perhaps that it be held and maybe the Sponsor would want to consider pulling it back to Second for an Amendment so we could put that half percent on. If not, then I certainly have to stand in opposition to the Bill, as it now stands, for the reasons that I've stated."

Getty: "Representative Hudson, in response to that question, I have been advised that very recently, during the 80th General Assembly, in House Bill 1803, a precedent was set for this when there was passed and signed into law legislation which did exactly the same thing, raised it from 2% to 3% with no additional employees contribution for retirees of the State Employees Retirement System, the Downstate Teachers Retirement System, the State Universities Retirement System, Chicago Teachers Retirement System. So what this does is merely do for this system what has already been done and made precedent. It is following in that footsteps and therefore, I would suggest to you that we have already made this the law in the other cases and there is some justification for Representative Terzich's action here with the House Amendment."

Speaker Flynn: "The.. Representative Hudson, were you finished?"

Hudson: "Well, I just.. one other question of the Sponsor: If I may as long as..."



Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Hudson: "You persist Mr. Chairman. Representative Getty, does the Pension Laws Commission approve of this Bill then, as it now stands? I understand it does not."

Getty: "Well, it was the Amendment of the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission. I.. if he's within the sound of my voice, I would hope that he might appear and answer the question, but I can't say for sure. Maybe some other Member can advise us."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman.. Were you finished, Representative Hudson? I've not been paying as much attention..."

Hudson: "Yes. I'm simply going to close it. Unless there's some adjustment made here, my recommendation to the Body would be vote 'no' if it comes to a vote today."

Speaker Flinn: "The.. the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, your light's on."

Peters: "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. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Sponsor to close. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, I think the Membership understands. This would merely put the General Assembly Retirement Fund in the same posture, increasing from 2% to 3% the increment and the question raised by Representative Hudson, which I think was a good one, I think is amply answered by the fact that the other retirement systems which I enumerated, the State Employees, Downstate Teachers, State Universities, Chicago Teachers, have all done exactly the same thing, was passed out of this Body, passed out of the Senate and signed into law by the Governor. And this would merely put this system on a par with those. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 807 pass?'



All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt. One minute to explain his vote."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gantlemen of the House, if this Bill passes this means this year the General Assembly has raised their salary twice. This is a pay increase Bill no matter how you want to call it. This is a pay increase Bill. We're increasing the post retirement increment from 2% to 3%. It's going to cost the taxpayers 151 thousand dollars a year. The only way this Bill could be made actuarially sound is if we agreed to raise the active employees contribution from 10% to 13%. Without increasing the contributions by 3% this Bill is a rip-off. Now, just because we might have done this to the State Universities System and the State Employees System, that doesn't mean that necessarily we should do it to this system. Because our system, you get 80% of your final salary. The other systems is a much different formula. In many it's just 50% of the average salary of the last ten years. So, I definitely think this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jake Wolf, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me correct one thing that was said. First of all, Mr. Terzich is not the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission. Senator Egan is., just for the record. What I find is the worst part about this Bill is that the Judges have been included. Now if somebody can explain the rationale to me why somebody who is going to retire on 35 or 40 thousand dollars a year needs another one percent increment. I'd sure like to know that and I think that's the worst part of this Bill. But let me say a few things with regard to leap-frogging for some of the Members who might be interested, especially some of our new Members. A common



practice is always to get a foot in the door with one particular system and then you come back with another Bill and the rationale is, 'Well, we're only in the interests of equity and justice, doing what we've done for the other system.' Now, a few years back we did this for, I believe, the downstate firemen and they paid for it. And I believe the policemen, and they paid for it. And then, all of a sudden, in the last Session, somebody came up with a Bill to give it to the State Employees and the teachers and now we've set the precedent and I suppose, in equity, we should be coming back and doing the same thing for everybody else without requiring that the participants in the Retirement System contribute. But, I think the worst part of this is that as you put the Judges in who have the highest Pension System in the State, they can retire at 85% of salary and if you know what the salary of a Judge is, they can go out with about 40 thousand a year and I fail to understand why they need an additional increment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I've cast my vote in favor of this legislation and do support it and for the life of me, I cannot understand how this House continues to beat its breasts, so to speak, in terms of righteousness. We pass all kinds of legislation getting everybody in the world a pay raise. A court recorder got a pay raise. The Superintendent of Schools got a pay raise. The State Attorney's got a pay raise. Every pension system under the sun got a pay raise. And those Bills fly out of here 110, 120, 130, 140, to one or two. But when it comes down to the Legislature there is something in our psyche or something in our being that tells us that somehow we cannot be voting for this because, I'm not sure what it means. I just can not for the life of me, understand





the thinking of the people in this General Assembly when it comes down to measures of this nature. For those individuals again, who don't want to end up taking the pension, there's nothing in the law that says you've got to take it. Return it. You don't even have to participate in the pension fund."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite, one minute to explain her.. Oh, she's... Representative Getty, one minute to explain your vote. Timer's on."

Getty: "I'm going to suggest Representative Hudson, if I could have consent, to take it out of the record. It is Representative Beatty's Bill. I'm trying to accommodate him by handling it at this time. I would suggest to him that he make that adjustment in the Bill. As you know, when I first read it, I read out what I thought was the proposal and I think in fairness to Representative Beatty, we ought to take it out of the record and do that."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to take the Bill out of the record? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill is out of the record. If there is no objection, we'll back up to Senate Bill 801. The Sponsor was temporarily off the floor. So, will the Clerk read Senate Bill 801?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 801, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comptroller's Merit Employment Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, is recognized."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, Senate Bill 801 addresses a technical Amendment to the Comptroller Merit Employment Code. This Bill provides that the Director of Personnel shall have a two year term and shall have need be advice and consent in the Senate requires the Senate to confirm also the appointment of merit Commission Members. It passed the Senate unanimously.

4



It passed House Committee unanimously and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "Why do you want to do this?"

Bullock: "Well, Representative Totten, we wanted to be consistent with other Co-Departments. The Comptroller supports this. The Secretary of State supports this measure. And we just felt for the sake of uniformity we should have the Director of the Department of Personnel also confirmed."

Totten: "This is the Director of the Personnel Division."

Bullock: "That's correct."

Totten: "Of the Comptroller's Office, right?"

Bullock: "That's correct."

Totten: "Okay. Are all other personnel Directors under... the same way?"

Bullock: "Yes. They are."

Totten: "And require the confirmation.."

Bullock: "Consent. Yes, Sir."

Totten: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 801 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 142 voting 'aye', and one voting 'no', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next three Bills were asked to be taken out of the record by the Sponsors. Senate Bill 854, Senate Bill 870, and Senate Bill 873. Next Bill is Senate Bill 893. Representative Deuster's on deck."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 893, a Bill for an Act to amend the



the Waukegan and Joliet Metropolitan Exposition Auditorium Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "Why do we... Why do we need to lower those significant quorum requirements that.. that hinge the operation of this authority? It would seem to me..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, Representative Johnson. For what purpose do you arise, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Well, I want to say this, normally when we call a Bill we call on the Sponsor to explain it..."

Speaker Flinn: "State the purpose for which you arose. You interrupted the Speaker."

Deuster: "And.. Oh, I don't know. I think there's a certain amount of compassion and understanding of the part of this Membership. Some are saying that while we knocked down one of Geo-Karris's Bills, we can hardly wait to jump on another one. But I'm confident that the Members of this House will look at the merits maybe this time.."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Johnson: "I just want to be recognized after he's done introducing the Bill and I apologize, Representative Deuster, for introducing.. or interrupting. Go ahead. This is an important Bill and I want to have a chance to talk to it when he's done."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, if I understand the background, the Democratic Mayor of Waukegan.. asked the Republican Senator from Waukegan to introduce a good government by partisan Bill. This amends the Waukegan and Joliet Metropolitan Exposition and Auditorium Authority Act..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Griesheimer: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. My home



town was mentioned in debate and I assure the Sponsor that the Senator is not from Waukegan."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I'm just falling one foot over the other here in a series of blunders, but I hope you'll overlook that and I hope you overlook the House Sponsor as well as the Senate Sponsor. It's poor and trying to help out Waukegan and Joliet.."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Van Dwyne, for what purpose do you arise?"

Van Dwyne: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to let you know that I wanted to speak because I want to support the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster proceed."

Deuster: "Well, with all this help I hardly need to explain the Bill..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment please. Representative Friedland, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedland: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't think we can interrupt the Sponsor for that kind of motion. Proceed, Mr. Sponsor."

Deuster: "In addition to everything else that's gone wrong, the Reference Bureau in copying the existing law made a mistake. And I would ask leave of the House, this is a real test of your compassion, I guess, but leave of the House not for Geo-Karris and not for me, but for the Reference Bureau, on line 15 to amend this Bill on the face to change 5 to 4. It makes no substantive difference in the Bill. It does not increase as a chance for passage at all, I'm sure. I would ask leave of the House that the court..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment please. Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you arise?"

Leinenweber: "Having blown a Bill for the same Sponsor I would certainly urge us to give him leave."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."



Deuster: "Thanks. Everybody. There are 7 Members of this Board in Waukegan and in Joliet. The quorum is 6. It's a little high. Our quorum is nowhere near that high. All this Bill does is change the quorum from 6 to 5 and.. "

Speaker Flinn: "One moment. Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Adeline Geo-Karris was standing here just about an hour ago and she told me this is a real good Bill and if I'd help her with it..."

Speaker Flinn: "That ought to be enough. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If you can think of.. search your heart and think of no other reason than to vote for this Bill than the fact that it will save us from having Adeline come into this Chamber and berate me and jump on Elmer Conti and anyone else who might even have been absent, gone home, I think it's a meritorious Bill and I plead for your favorable vote, your green light and then we can all go home to our Districts and our families with cheer and a feeling that we've done something for a deserving person. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson."

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

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

Johnson: "Does the Waukegan...."

Speaker Flinn: "No, Sir. He indicates he won't now. I'm sorry."

Johnson: "Don, does this metropolitan exposition and auditorium authority extend public money?"

Deuster: "I don't have the foggiest idea."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative..."

Johnson: "We're reducing the number of Members of this Board from .. a quorum from 6 to 5 and I think everybody ought to think about what we're doing when we're lowering a percentage requirement for a quorum on an important Body that's spending public money to this degree. I just.. I think this is the kind of Bill we ought to have a full



Membership here on because I'm sure there's going to be a verified Roll Call and I would certainly urge everyone to look at this Bill carefully in light of the Sponsorship, what it's trying to do, the use of public money, and use your own judgement. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this morning at 8:00 o'clock on CBS national radio there was a report that at 4:45 yesterday bananas were passed out on the House floor and I think it's time for bananas to be passed out again."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can't help recalling when Representative Deuster got very distressed on this House floor when we wanted to lower the number of Members required for a quorum on a meeting of the Commission of the Status of Women. Now, I noticed that this is a woman Sponsor and I wonder what sort of thing he's trying to cover up here and what he's getting in return for sponsoring this kind of legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the ecumenical spirit noted to exist in the 31st Legislative District, I would like to stand up to urge my colleagues to support this very, very fine Bill. I would like to clarify one comment made by the House Sponsor. I know of no one who wishes to jump on the Senator from the 31st District."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Mr. Speaker,  
Griesheimer: "I haven't concluded my remarks..."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I thought you had. It sounded like you had."

Griesheimer: "Well, I would just point out to this august Body that we try to keep our House in order and that one of the ways to keep our House in order is to keep Senators out of our House. The way to keep Senators out of our House is to vote for this Bill and since I'm the closest to the door, and Elmer Conti won't protect me any longer,



certainly  
I would urge your adoption and the passage of this wonderful Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Margulas."

Margulas: "I move the previous question, please."

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.. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Deuster to close."

Deuster: "Well, this Bill has nothing to do with sex education, not withstanding the comments of the Sena... from the Representative from Waukegan" and I urge your support for it and I appreciate the time and the attention that you've given to this rather earth shaking and comprehensive change in the Illinois law. And I think you'll all get re-elected if you vote for it, too. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "I'd like to point out. There was some confusion about the Bill. Now before we vote, <sup>that</sup> this Bill was not amended on its face. There was no leave granted. I never called for so. It would be against the rules. It would have to taken back to Second to do that. So, we're voting on the Bill as it is. Representative Totten."

Totten: "That's the point I wanted to make. The Sponsot had requested that the Bill be brought back to Second to amend this on its face and we haven't done that. If he wants to do that, we ought to do it cause the Bill isn't correct. I don't see any problem with doing it."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I didn't understand that as his request. He tried to amend it on its face on Third Reading and that cannot be done. So the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 893 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' and all 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 114 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', and this Bill, having re-



ceived the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Emil Jones wants to change from 'no' to 'aye'. Come down a fill out a slip, Emil. Representative Jones, come down front and fill out a slip. Senate Bill 923. It's out of the record. The Sponsor's not present. Senate Bill 950, is Representative Taylor on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 957, Representative Deuster, are you still here?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 957, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I thought I saw the Majority Leader rising for a motion to adjourn, but that not being the case, I'll present Senate Bill 957. Senate Bill 957 very simply makes clear in response to an opinion by the Attorney General that throughout Illinois traffic tickets that are issued by sheriffs may include the provision that we're all familiar with, I suppose, that you can avoid a multiple court appearance by indicating that you want to plead not guilty and then ask for another date. That's all that it does. This is.. has.. Is already being done most places that I know of, but there is some doubt cast upon the practice. It is being done in Cook County and this will clarify the law <sup>and</sup> make sure that it can be done all over the State of Illinois by the sheriffs and this will relieve court congestion, make it possible for those who want to plead not guilty to send in their name and their address, say they're pleading not guilty and ask for another court date. I would urge your support for the Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Representative Deuster, what's the additional cost to the county for printing up these notices?"





Deuster: "Well, I don't think there's any cost, Representative Peters, cause they print up the ticket anyway. All they do is in typesetting have the extra copy. There's a copy for the violator and a copy.. a court communicator copy and if anything, it saves money because it saves the person coming into court saying I plead not guilty and then having the court.. the police officer come in on that <sup>there</sup> date and then have to come back on another date. It saves the time of the policemen. It saves the time of the Judges. I'm inclined to think that the effect will certainly be saving.. saving money and the printing of this, I believe it's done in Cook County, isn't it, Pete?"

Peters: "Well, I think we print it all on one thing. But what you're saying here is that when a ticket is issued, there is also issued a written notice along with the ticket that's an extra printing. If the sheriff in your county or your County Board wants to do that, why don't they just print it on the ticket and inform the alleged violator of his rights on one ticket, rather than printing another piece of paper?"

Deuster: "Well, this just gives them the authority to print what you do in Cook County and as I remember, in Lake County they may be doing it but some doubt has been cast on it and this Bill was introduced by Senator Berning at the request of our Judges and in response to the Attorney General's opinion. You know, it's a very simple thing. You've seen these blue tickets. That's all it is."

Peters: "All I'm saying, I think you can do it without coming here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Why is Cook County excluded from this Bill?"

Deuster: "Well, it's my understanding they already have the authority in some other Section for..."

Johnson: "What other Section do they authority in? Our analysis



says that it applies to sheriffs in all counties except Cook County. I wondered why there was a distinction."

Deuster: "Well, it maybe some Cook County Members can tell you, but I believe, that they already have the authority to do this in Cook County and what we're doing is extending that good idea to other parts of the State to make it clear."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 963, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. 964, out of the record. 977, Representative McCourt in the chamber? Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I thought I'd rise on a point of personal privilege. As we get stuff passed around here, we have an invitation which might be thrown away. I'm bringing a very good group to the prayer supper which will be held June the 21st. So, don't throw the invitation away. Come. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. 1019, Beatty, out of the record. 1034, Steczo."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act to amend the law in relation to township organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1034 amends ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Not 1110.. Proceed."

Steczko: "Senate Bill 1034 amends the Act in relation to townships and it was amended in the House to permit the development in each township county of a plan for changing the township boundry so that the assessed evalua-



tion in those townships is ten million dollars. What this Bill amends is the law that we passed in 1972 to provide that township boudries should be redone in that manner. This Bill is permissive and no change could be made unless approved by referendum of the people affected in those townships. It passed the Senate with a good vote. It passed the Counties and Townships Committee by a good vote. Again, it is permissive and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Is there any sanction for not holding a referendum?"

Steczo: "Cal, in this Bill, no. I understand in '72 we had the situation where it was mandatory upon all townships to have the referendum. In this case, if the county should decide to consolidate, then the referendum would be held. In terms of the sanction for not holding, referendum, no, I'm not aware."

Skinner: "Why.. Why should we be voting on something that does as little as that?"

Steczo: "That what?"

Skinner: "Why is this Bill needed?"

Steczo: "It's a feeling on behalf of some people that the townships.. some townships are so small that necessary services aren't provided and that counties should be given the option to consolidate and you know, provide for townships for at least that ten million dollars assessed evaluation based on the referendum."

Skinner: "Well, this certainly is one of the most permissive Bills that I've ever seen."

Steczo: "Thank you. Is that good?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only reason that I would support this Bill to come out of Committee was because it is permissive. But let me point out to you, as Represent-



tative Steczko said, back in, I believe, 1972 or whenever it was, the counties were all mandated to redraw township boundries so that each township would reflect six million dollars evaluation. This was done at a very great deal of work and expense in every county. Referendums were held as this Bill would require and I believe, perhaps, there was one instance that I know of that two townships consolidated. I think Representative Rigney pointed that out to me. I didn't realize there were any. But I think to pass this Bill is just going to put more language in the statutes that I don't think are going to be of any use to anyone, but nevertheless, it is permissive. I don't suppose it can hurt anything, but you're just going to make more garbage in the statutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "Let's assume that two townships, one with 30 thousand population and one next to it with 1 thousand. When you're going to have a referendum would the vote be taken over the two townships and would the Majority of those in the two townships prevail? What I'm getting at, would this let the big ones eat up the little ones?"

Steczko: "Dwight, #1, the consolidation has to be done by the County Board and my analysis says that the referendum has to be approved in each township of each of the townships affected."

Friedrich: "So a small township would have to carry it as well as the large one."

Steczko: "Right. Right."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Pullen: "Does this Bill apply to Cook County?"



Steczo: "No, it does not. There are no townships that would fall into that category in Cook County."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker, 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. Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. To address one of the points made by a previous speaker, this Bill will not clutter up the statutes with further language because the language is already there. We're just trying to allow another opportunity on a permissive basis to try to consolidate areas to provide for better township services downstate. I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 'aye', and 13 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1099."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1099 does two things. First, it provides that the Secretary of Transportation may appoint hearing officers to hear complaints against testing stations and second, it provides that if federal funds become available that by Jan. 1, 1981, school bus seat backs in Illinois must be equipped with seat back crash pads. I ask for your support in this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this



Bill..' Representative White... The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'aye', and 5 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

1190... no 1114. Representative Vinson, out of the record.

1123. Vinson. Out of the record. We'll take two more Bills. 1195, Representative Macdonald."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1195, a Bill for an Act to amend the Structural Pest Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1195 amends the Structural Pest Control Act and increases licenses fees and makes them nonrefundable. The reason for this is to defray the cost which will now be with the new fees, it will bring in 93,350 a year, which is an increase of 44 thousand dollars. The cost of this program is 80,200 a year and I would ask for your approval of this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye', and 11 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1196."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1196, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Plumbing and License Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, because Representative DiPrima does not seem to be here, nor is Representative Lechowicz on the floor, I would prefer to pass this Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "You want to pass it? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'.. Take the Bill out of the record..."



Macdonald: "No... pass by the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Now Representative Leinenweber, do you want to handle 1202? "

Leinenweber: "I move to table." <sup>it</sup>

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Call your attention to the fact that the schedule calls for us to begin Saturday and Sunday of this coming week. We're going to make a change in the program for Monday. We'll be in at 1:00 o'clock instead of 10:00 o'clock. Representative Giorgi on the agreed Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 373, J.J. Wolf. Senate Joint Resolution 33 and Senate Joint Resolution 60."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 373 by Wolf calls... talks about freedom. Senate Joint Resolution #33 by Graham memorializes Congress to mandate some programs and Senate Joint Resolution #60 by Conti honors Peter Miller on his birthday and I move for the adoption of the agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 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 carries. The agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "Death Resolution 370, Dave Jones, in memory of John 'Duke' Wayne."

Speaker Redmond: "J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Resolution to the memory of John Wayne. I had the opportunity meeting John Wayne on two occasions, once at a movie function and more recently, as a Member of the State Board of the American Cancer Society. In fact; his promos for cancer were running at the time of his death. The creed of his life as stated in a special Sec-



tion of today's Chicago Tribune should be a creed for all of us in the Legislature to follow and I'll read it. 'I'd like to be remembered as the guy who learned how to get along with the average person, to be a little tolerant understanding and forgiving.' That's the statement of John Wayne's wife.. life and it's in the special edition of the Tribune today and I suggest that you read the edition which outlines his life with an example to all of us to repair. I move the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. Any further Resolutions?"

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 372, Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Anything else?"

Mr. Madigan, the Clerk advises me he needs about ten minutes perfunctory. Mr. Madigan, on the adjournment."

Madigan: "Providing ten minutes for a perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn to 1:00 p.m. Monday afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The House now stands adjourned till 1:00 o'clock Monday."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title; to wit; Senate Bill 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 374, 375, 376, 377, 627, 632, 634, 635, 636, and 637, passed by the Senate June 15th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 44, Breslin."





Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 7 of Article V of the Constitution to read as follows; <sup>in the office...</sup>vacancies in other elected office If the Attorney General, Secretary of State, Comptroller or Treasurer fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. An appointee to fill <sup>the</sup> vacancy shall be a Member of the same political party as the person he succeeds. The appointee shall hold office until ~~the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is~~ elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. If the Lieutenant Governor fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term. This Amendment takes effect upon the approval by the electors of this State..... House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 45. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the eighty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows; (a) Except <sup>taxation</sup>revenue, real property as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law. (b) Subject to such limitation as the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law, counties may classify or continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable



and assessments shall be uniform within each class. The level of assessment or rate of tax of the highest class in a county shall not exceed 2 and  $\frac{1}{2}$  times the level of assessment or rate of tax of the lowest class of that county. Real property used in farming in a county shall now be assessed at a higher level of assessment than single family residential real property in that county.

(c) Any depreciation in the value of real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property. (d) The rehabilitation/growth incentive option. Any home rule municipality may designate certain specific areas within its boundaries in which the real property is to be taxed on the basis of site value, without regard to the value of improvements thereon. The tax rates of taxing districts applicable to such designated areas shall be adjusted annually to prevent loss of revenue by such taxing districts from such designated areas. Taxation of designated areas under this option shall continue for 12 years, but may be extended without limit as long as any such extensions are for no less than 12 year periods. First Reading of these Constitutional Amendments... Having no further business, the House now stands adjourned.



## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 15, 1979

PAGE 1

SB-0041	2ND READING	PAGE	15
SB-0048	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0058	MOTIONS	PAGE	129
SB-0082	3RD READING	PAGE	84
SB-0100	2ND READING	PAGE	15
SB-0101	2ND READING	PAGE	15
SB-0107	2ND READING	PAGE	1
SB-0122	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-0123	2ND READING	PAGE	67
	2ND READING	PAGE	81
SB-0133	2ND READING	PAGE	48
SB-0198	2ND READING	PAGE	16
	2ND READING	PAGE	32
SB-0216	3RD READING	PAGE	85
SB-0219	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0228	2ND READING	PAGE	21
SB-0235	2ND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0244	2ND READING	PAGE	33
SB-0257	3RD READING	PAGE	87
SB-0263	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-0287	2ND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0298	3RD READING	PAGE	89
SB-0302	3RD READING	PAGE	90
SB-0304	3RD READING	PAGE	101
SB-0309	3RD READING	PAGE	98
SB-0310	3RD READING	PAGE	99
SB-0316	3RD READING	PAGE	99
SB-0324	2ND READING	PAGE	2
SB-0330	2ND READING	PAGE	101
SB-0362	2ND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0363	3RD READING	PAGE	106
SB-0366	3RD READING	PAGE	107
SB-0384	2ND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0404	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0409	3RD READING	PAGE	108
SB-0432	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0447	3RD READING	PAGE	109
SB-0455	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0459	3RD READING	PAGE	118
SB-0482	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0486	3RD READING	PAGE	86
SB-0492	2ND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0494	2ND READING	PAGE	3

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 15, 1979

SB-0495	2ND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0501	2ND READING	PAGE	24
SB-0506	3RD READING	PAGE	121
SB-0509	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0514	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0533	2ND READING	PAGE	25
SB-0553	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0560	2ND READING	PAGE	25
SB-0566	3RD READING	PAGE	125
SB-0567	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0573	3RD READING	PAGE	130
SB-0617	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0624	3RD READING	PAGE	130
SB-0626	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0627	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0632	3RD READING	PAGE	132
SB-0636	2ND READING	PAGE	25
SB-0659	2ND READING	PAGE	33
SB-0670	3RD READING	PAGE	133
SB-0674	2ND READING	PAGE	34
SB-0687	2ND READING	PAGE	34
SB-0688	2ND READING	PAGE	34
SB-0715	2ND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0722	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0725	2ND READING	PAGE	140
SB-0752	2ND READING	PAGE	42
SB-0756	2ND READING	PAGE	34
SB-0760	2ND READING	PAGE	49
SB-0765	2ND READING	PAGE	49
SB-0767	2ND READING	PAGE	50
SB-0775	2ND READING	PAGE	51
SB-0788	2ND READING	PAGE	51
SB-0793	3RD READING	PAGE	141
SB-0798	3RD READING	PAGE	146
SB-0799	2ND READING	PAGE	52
SB-0800	2ND READING	PAGE	52
SB-0801	3RD READING	PAGE	153
SB-0807	3RD READING	PAGE	147
SB-0824	2ND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0828	2ND READING	PAGE	52
SB-0844	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0861	2ND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0875	MOTIONS	PAGE	52

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 15, 1979

SB-0889	2ND READING	PAGE	53
SB-0893	2ND READING	PAGE	155
SB-0918	2ND READING	PAGE	53
SB-0927	2ND READING	PAGE	53
SB-0939	2ND READING	PAGE	53
SB-0942	2ND READING	PAGE	69
SB-0955	2ND READING	PAGE	69
SB-0957	3RD READING	PAGE	160
SB-0973	2ND READING	PAGE	70
SB-0983	2ND READING	PAGE	7
SB-1002	2ND READING	PAGE	71
SB-1034	3RD READING	PAGE	162
SB-1038	2ND READING	PAGE	7
SB-1047	2ND READING	PAGE	7
SB-1053	2ND READING	PAGE	72
SB-1072	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-1099	3RD READING	PAGE	165
SB-1100	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1101	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1102	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1116	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-1117	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1140	2ND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1150	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1162	2ND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1171	2ND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1172	2ND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1178	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-1183	2ND READING	PAGE	74
SB-1195	3RD READING	PAGE	166
SB-1201	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-1203	2ND READING	PAGE	74
SB-1205	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-1217	2ND READING	PAGE	74
SB-1227	2ND READING	PAGE	74
SB-1232	2ND READING	PAGE	12
	MOTIONS	PAGE	14
SB-1238	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-1247	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-1271	2ND READING	PAGE	75
SB-1277	2ND READING	PAGE	76
SE-1281	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-1287	2ND READING	PAGE	83

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 15, 1979

PAGE 4

SB-1316	2ND READING	PAGE	79
SB-1325	2ND READING	PAGE	79
SB-1328	2ND READING	PAGE	84
SB-1347	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-1360	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-1375	2ND READING	PAGE	84
SB-1386	2ND READING	PAGE	79
SB-1406	2ND READING	PAGE	80
SB-1412	2ND READING	PAGE	80
SB-1423	2ND READING	PAGE	14
SB-1425	2ND READING	PAGE	80
SB-1433	2ND READING	PAGE	84
HR-0370	3RD READING	PAGE	167
HR-0371	3RD READING	PAGE	139
HR-0372	1ST READING	PAGE	168
*HJR-0044	1ST READING	PAGE	168
*HJR-0045	1ST READING	PAGE	169

## SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. MCCOY - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. FREDERICK - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	167
PERPUNCT SESSION	PAGE	168
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	168
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	170