

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. We will be lead in prayer today by the Reverend Harold Webber, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church in Mt. Pulaski."

Webber: "Let us pray. Oh, God, Creator of life, who recreates each day, we ask Your blessing and wisdom upon this State Assembly. May Your spirit work to bring these affairs of state before us today to useful and helpful results, for the promotion of the lives and the cultures of the people of Illinois. Oh, God, in Your rule, we ask Your gracious regard to all these persons with the Assembly that they may be in high purpose wise in counsel and unwavering in duty. May they be helped to uphold the honor of this State. May their work promote the opportunity of productive liberty among the people of this land. May the councils, speeches, debates and negotiations about to proceed be blessed to the edification of Your Divine nature and the quality of life in this State. Amen."

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

Leon: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for All."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Leon was a Member of that vintage class of 1959. Now that Representative Simms is in his place why we can leave it open a little bit. Have all voted who are present? Take the Roll Call. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 62nd Legislative Day, Friday, June 8th, 1979; the House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker in the Chair. Prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain. Representative Polk lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance. By direction of the Speaker,



Roll Call was taken to ascertain attendance of Members as follows;..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal, Journals #62, of June the 8th, Journal #63 of June 11th, Journal 64 of June the 12th, Journal #65 of June the 13th, 1979, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The reading of the Journal is dispensed with and the Journals are approved as if read. ..Calendar, Third Reading. On page 15."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 15 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 48, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 219, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 482, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 514, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention in the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 626, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 722, a Bill for an Act to amend the Space Needs Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act redesignating references to game as wild life. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1178, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Hearing Test Act.



Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1287, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mobile Home Local Services Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act to amend the Anti Pollution Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act relating to fireworks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'... You got it? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye' and one 'no'. The Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. Representative Woodyard has an emergency. He has to leave. So, we'll call Senate Bill 1268. Representative Woodyard."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1268..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard, any discussion on..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would ask leave to move Senate Bill 1268 to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "You desire to return it. Is that correct?"

Woodyard: "That's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he... Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, 1268 will return to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Brummer, amends Senate Bill 1268 on page 1, line 21 and so forth."

Woodyard: "Mr. Speaker?"



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Woodyard: "I wish to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Who's Amendment was that, Representative Woodyard?"

Woodyard: "Senator Berning's. There was objection to that Amendment and we.. there is another.. "

Speaker Redmond: "It's a Committee Amendment, is that correct?"

Okay. Representative Woodyard has moved to table Amendment #1 which was a Committee Amendment. Any discussion?

The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it.

The motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendment?"

Cleik O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Brummer, amends Senate Bill 1268 on page one, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, this Amendment has been agreed to by the Sponsor and myself. The Bill requires... or provides that the notice of assessment in a drainage district may be sent to the individual land owners at the option of the Commissioners. I have some concern about that with regard to individuals. Apparently the Bill arose as a result of the cost of doing so in municipalities where the assessment is relatively little, but there are many individual tracts of land. What the Amendment does is requires that the assessment notice shall be sent to the land owners outside of an incorporated area and the Amendment makes it permissive with regard to the sending of notice to land owners within a municipality. I would ask for a favorable vote."

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 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 966. Let me look to see what to do. 966? What is that? Representative Woodyard, where is that on the Calendar? Page 3, Third Reading, Short Debate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 966, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Senate Bill 966 amends the School Code by requiring an appointed official of local school Board to respond within 60 days from the receipt of correspondence by the President or District Superintendent from a resident of the district. The response must include a meeting before the Board or a listing of the reasons denying the request. So, basically what this Bill does, if an individual writes to the School Board requesting a meeting with the Board, they must be answered within 60 days. There are Amendments to this Bill and if there are any questions, I would yield to Representative Stuffle on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative... The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... Yeah, you moved the adoption. Is that right, Representative Woodyard?"

Woodyard: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm having a little... Is there any discussion? Representative Birkinbine. "

Birkinbine: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Did you say there were Amendments to this?"

Woodyard: "That's right."

Birkinbine: "I don't see.. I don't see them in the Digest."

Woodyard: "Amendment #1 takes care of a particular unit District problem in our District. This Amendment was offered by Representative Stuffle."

Birkinbine: "Can you tell me what your Amendment does?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Representative, all the Amendment does is clarify the legality in the existence of a unit school district in Edgar County in Representative Woodyard, Campbell, in my district. That particular unit school district does not have a high school. It feeds its students into the adjoining district 95 and they've had a joint agreement there to provide services and to pay tuition for 29 years. All the Amendment does is say that that is a legal entity and they can continue to do so and continue to make an agreement between the two Boards to pay for tuition. This is needed because there's been an effort to force consolidation of the two school districts and no one wants it. So, we're legalizing the effort between the two districts. It's agreed to by both the school districts. It was presented in Committee and supported without opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you. One more question. Do I understand now that this simply requires that an individual requesting a meeting receive at least a reply... that an individual who contacts a school Board requesting to appear before it, receives at least a reply? It doesn't necessarily force a meeting within 60 days."

Stuffle: "That's correct."

Birkinbine: "Okay. Thank you."

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 120... 130 'aye' and 1 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Short Debate. We will only take those that were not... Well, we'll eliminate those that have been taken out of the



record consistently. 203. Representative Bowman:"

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had an excused absence yesterday which resulted in a couple of these being taken out of the record. I wondered if your ruling that you just made applied to 1146 and 1395?"

Speaker Redmond: "What ones?"

Bowman: "1146 and 1395."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had an excused absence as a result of attending a funeral yesterday. It's only my second absence since I've been elected in ...'76."

Speaker Redmond: "What one... 11 what?"

Bowman: "1146 and 1395."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Steczo and Kempiners appear as the Sponsors."

Bowman: "Well, that's correct. But I asked him to have it taken out of the record because I have the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "And on 1395, Yourell appears as the Sponsor."

Bowman: "Same problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "203."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 203, a Bill for an Act in relation to a study of the damage caused by use of salt on highways and alternatives to such use. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 455."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Surface Mine Land Conservation Reclamation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1072."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1072, a BILL for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

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 Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Representative Bowman, amends Senate Bill 1146 on page one in line one and ten and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is identical to House Bill 2738 which was reported favorably by the House Elections Committee, but because of the crush of business at the deadline time it was put over to the Spring Session. However, I believe it's appropriate to consider this as an Amendment at this time because if it were approved it would be.. the mechanism would be in place in time for the March primaries. What Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1146 does is to provide a formal process, a supervised process, by which residents of nursing homes may cast absentee ballots. They are eligible to do so at the present time, and do, in fact, vote quite heavily. However, in some cases unscrupulous persons will vote the ballots for these individuals and the individuals' franchise is not being properly protected. This Amendment would provide that the two Judges of election, one from each party, would supervise the casting of absentee ballots in nursing homes



in this State. I think this is legislation which is long overdue. We have considered a number of nursing home reform measures in this Session. I believe this is compatible with those measures. Lastly, I would just point out that there is a Section in the current Election Code which requires the County Board in those counties that have soldiers and sailors homes to put polling places in those locations for the convenience of the residents. We have no provisions for... to protect the franchise of the people who are not residents of soldiers and sailors homes., but nevertheless live in similar facilities and I believe this kind of legislation is consistent with the present statutes and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this might be a controversial matter and I notice that Representative Laurino is not on the floor. I just wonder if we might take this out of the record until he got here."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to this, I would like to say I think it is a little unusual that a Bill is held when both the Sponsor and the Amendment are present."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, as Representative Bowman stated, I understand that this Amendment was heard in the Elections Committee. I recall we did hear it. It was determined by the Committee at that time that this either be placed on the Spring Calendar. I know it didn't come out. And I would think that to add this type of an Amendment that did not come out of the Elections Committee on a Short Debate Calendar is very inappropriate and against the Committee system, and especially since the Chairman of that Committee is not also present. So, if there is a vote on this Amendment, I would suggest a 'no' vote because, again it did get heard in Committee and it's still in there and therefore, I would urge a 'no'



vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. "

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to speak on the Amendment right now, but I'd like to correct the impression that was just given. This Bill did come out of Committee. It was never... We never got to it on Third Reading on the House floor, but it did come out with a 'Do pass' recommendation out of Committee. So, Representative Terzich, if you're listening, you are in error. The Bill was voted on favorably out of Committee and then we never got to it because of our.. of our time squeeze on the House floor and that's the reason for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo. Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Amend... Senate ... Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1146 would attempt to provide that nursing home procedure for persons in nursing homes and it amends a Bill which I feel is important to us, a Bill which makes us conform to federal voting law for absentees and for overseas voting. I would prefer it if it would be okay with the Sponsor of the Amendment to have the Bill taken out of the record for now. And then come back to it just a little bit later, if we could."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wondered if the Sponsor of this Bill and perhaps the Chair could enlighten us as to whether we would be able to return this... to this item today? It seems to me it is a matter which is timely brought that in spite of the fact that the Chairman of the Elections Committee took a walk, I see no reason why action on this measure should be delayed just because the Chairman of the Elections Committee decided to take a walk on it. I think this is .. that would be



highly inappropriate and can we get back to it today?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's been the policy of the Chair to honor the request of the Speaker.. of the Sponsor and he's requested the Bill be taken out of the record."

Bowman: "Well, I'm asking for the Sponsor to clarify for the benefit of the Chair and for that Membership whether it be his intention that we could return to this today."

Steczo: "Yes it is."

Bowman: "I believe he said it is. Mr. Speaker, so would we be able to do that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I can't make any promises of what we're going to do. We're going to go to Priority of Call. We've got a lot of work to do. I'll do the best I can to get back to it. Does the Sponsor ask to take it out? 1342."

Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1395, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2, and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions 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 five and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1395 would add language to that Bill which would be identical to the



language contained in House Bill 932 as amended on the floor and is now resting on the Spring Calendar. The language which would be added would do two things. First of all, in any case, it would only affect the city of Chicago. The .. in particular in the city of Chicago we would be able to use all of the possible election dates provided for the new consolidated election code for the purpose of filling vacancies in the office of Alderman. The second thing which it would do would be to delete the new power which had been granted to the Mayor of Chicago to fill vacancies by appointment. It would restore in that respect, it would restore the contemplated consolidated election code to the same posture as the election code prior to passage of the consolidated Act. So, I think it's perfectly consistent with past state policy and it makes eminently good sense. The House has considered this matter once before favorably and I urge once again favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Once again, this is something that we discussed on previous occasions. This Amendment was put to another Bill. The Bill then subsequently failed. I would oppose the Amendment and if the Sponsor of the Amendment persists, I'm taking this out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record."

Bowman: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Did he ask to have it taken out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he did. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 19th, 1979. Record the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass as amended' Senate Bill 576."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. First would be the appropriations Bills. 318 on page 12."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the State Pension Fund for the University Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 379."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 379, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 381."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 381, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for expense of Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Younge, amends Senate Bill 381..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Richmond on the floor? Take this out of the record. 382."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 382, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for expense of the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 884."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 884, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 940."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 940, a Bill for an Act making appro-



priations for the Capital Development Board. 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. 1396."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1396, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly, for what purpose do you arise?"

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, why did you take... Why did you skip 1377?"

Speaker Redmond: "1377?"

Reilly: "Yes, Sir. Didn't you just call..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not an appropriation Bill as I see it."

Reilly: "I thought you were on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Appropriation Bills. You weren't listening Representative Reilly. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Third Reading, Priority of Call. Senate Bill 320, Representative Kornowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 320 amends the Minimum Wage Law. It excludes the colleges or university students who are employed by the school which they are attending. Currently the college students who work for the school they're attending are covered under the Federal Fair Labor Standard Act of 1938 which is the federal minimum wage Act. For those students at noncovered institutions, primarily private institutions, the effect of this Bill would receive the minimum wage



from the state's \$2.30 per hour to 85% of the federal minimum wage of 2.90 or 2.46 per hour. This would be a sixteen raise... 16¢ raise for those institutions. These.. This Bill is endorsed by the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities. Very simple Bill, I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, this is Third Reading, I believe. Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a couple of questions of the Sponsor. First, Representative Kornowicz, is there any Amendment put on on the floor?"

Kornowicz: "None."

Leinenweber: "Alright, and does this make it easier for college students to get jobs or more difficult? In other words, does it allow colleges to employ more students at lower wages or does it intend to increase the wages of college students?"

Kornowicz: "No, we believe that it will be easier for the college student. We checked with the Federation of Independent Colleges and this is the Bill that they are very much interested in."

Leinenweber: "Alright. In other words, this would exclude the college students from coverage of the minimum wage. Is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

Leinenweber: "And so it's the intention of you and the Senate Sponsor was to make it more possible for young people to get jobs? Is that right?"

Kornowicz: "That's right, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Then, it sounds like a pretty good Bill."

Kornowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I've had numerous calls from the small colleges in my district in relation to this and recognizing the fact that it's



caused some problems for some. They pointed out that not only would this help them in hiring more people to do the minimum wage jobs around the campus, but if this does not pass, it caused them problems with coming up with money that they owe some of the students from last year and then many of those students had already departed. They have no way of knowing where they were. Some students have dropped out. They indicated there was a real need for this legislation and I am with Representative Kornowicz and I would certainly recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minority Spokeman on the Labor Committee, I commend Representative Kornowicz for a good Bill. This was passed out with a unanimous Republican support. It is a Bill that does serve a problem and I hope it helps Representative Kornowicz in his Presidential quest."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bullock, to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say in debate I think it's a great Bill. Representative Kornowicz is sincere in his efforts to get this Bill passed and I am certainly proud to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'aye', and 7 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 399, Representative Grossi."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 399, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grossi."

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



House, Senate Bill 399 is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prisoner Review Board. The amount of the appropriation is 5 hundred and 99 thousand and one hundred dollars, which reflects a 6.7 % decrease from the previous year. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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 139 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 438."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 438, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley. Representative Farley on the floor? Out of the record. 585."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. Representative Anderson on deck."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the Department of Veteran's Affairs. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 590."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 590..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record at the request of the



Sponsor. 636."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 636, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois State Fair. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've already dealt with the issue of the State fair previously in the House. This Bill transfers control of the State fair to the Department of Agriculture. It's supported by all the agricultural groups in the state. Other than the fact that it has Representative Kane's goofy Amendment on it, it's not a bad Bill at all and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye' and one 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 717. Representative Mautino."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 717, a Bill for an Act to restore access rights to property adjacent to SBI route 7 in Bureau County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation is exactly as it appears in the synopsis. It restores the access rights on Route 6 in Bureau County. The State of Illinois bought it for \$319 in 1955. Now the property owner has put a drive into his residence and he is willing to pay \$3500 for the same property and we have to have it because the driveway has already been put in. It's restoring the access right and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Polk: "Representative Mautino, does this clarify that Section 42-sub-B-3 that we talked about that had to do with the separate parcel that might happen to be ..."

Mautino: "No..."

Polk: "It doesn't touch it at all.."

Mautino: "No. It doesn't touch it at all."

Polk: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "I'd like to have Representative Polk explain Section 47-b-2130. Other than that, it's a neat device."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that was subSection b. Apparently Schneider did not do his homework."

Schneider: "Oh, I thought it was... "

Polk: "It's quite alright."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Griesheimer: "With regard to this Bill I note that you use your county designation of Route 7. Isn't it true that this accessway is really a private accessway that will allow you to enter Interstate 80 for a faster trip down here for a Legislative Session?"

Mautino: "No, that's not true. This is Route 6, not Route 80."

Griesheimer: "Isn't there some way that we could take the \$3500 out of your travel allowance and cover the same situation so we don't have to burden the State with this?"

Mautino: "Not really, no."

Griesheimer: "Alright."

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 158 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared



passed. 746."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 746, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to State finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill (sic) 746 would prohibit expenditure of any State money in violation of the rules and regulations of the SEPC, the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or Title 9 of the Education Amendments. I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question ... Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will. She will."

Totten: "Representative Catania, how could you expend money or has there been expenditures of money in violation?"

Catania: "We have not had a problem of having to bring this up in particular Departments because we haven't been able to keep it in the Statutes except for the DOT appropriation. As you may recall in the 79th General Assembly we left this Amendment to do this kind of thing on that DOT appropriation and it did not have any kind of adverse effect. However, when we were adding this kind of language to all those appropriations in the 79th General Assembly the Senators objected and they removed all the other Amendments and they said that this was the appropriate way to do it, in the State Finance Act. So, last Session Corneal Davis was the principle Sponsor and we passed it in the House, but they killed it in the Senate. So this year they started the Bill in the Senate where it was approved and now we're asking for approval in the House."

Totten: "What expenditures do you think.. Have there been any



specifically that have been in violation that would..."

Catania: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear your question."

Totten: "Have there been any expenditures that have specifically been in violation?"

Catania: "The problem is that the agencies in some cases don't seem to take seriously the requirement for offering equal opportunities to all the people of the State of Illinois so this would simply put some teeth in that request."

Totten: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield? What do you include in fair employment under Title 9? Are you speaking of the sex issue here along with the Minority issue?"

Catania: "Well, the language about Title 9 was added in an Amendment that was offered by Representatives Steczko and Anderson. Perhaps they would be better equipped to answer that question."

Waddell: "Who?"

Catania: "Representatives Steczko and John Anderson."

Waddell: "Well, would they want to answer it?"

Catania: "I think Representative Steczko is indicating that he would be willing to answer your question, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczko."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, the Amendment to Senate Bill 746 was, in fact, added by myself and Representative Anderson. We felt that it was important to put the State in compliance with the provisions of Title 9 of the federal Act and the House concurred by adopting the Amendment. We feel it was very, very important for us to do so to gain that compliance."

Waddell: "Are you aware, Sir, that if this goes on as far as we're concerned that you may disrupt because of Califano's insistence on going ahead with something as idiotic as



tying up funds of the State of Illinois for programs that aren't even on the Board and yet, under that ruling, you're supposed to put dollar for dollar on the programs. For example, in the athletic program at the University of Illinois, the.. Dr. Gurbiting and everybody else that went there and tried to put some common sense into it, came back with a big zero. If this goes on then I'm positive that we're going to be in court from one end to the other and we don't even have the people to participate in the program. Then what?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer the Gentleman, Title 9 is the law of the land and it's important that Illinois comply with the provisions of the federal Act. So we felt it was important to add that and the House concurred by adopting the Amendment to Title 9."

Waddell: "Well, all I can say is we'd better defeat the Bill then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. To answer Representative Waddell's question, Title 9 requirements to the Education Amendment were passed by the Congress in 1972. Illinois followed in Congress' footsteps by adopting in the School Code 3 Sections which were very clear; 244 of Chapter 122, 247 and 271. Now the IOE has developed implementing guidelines which encouraged the elimination of sex discrimination and here it is, Representative Waddell. Now most school districts have tried to implement this but there are a few who have not and this re-enforces this particular Amendment that we put on, re-enforces our position that the guidelines should be adopted. Now, most of them have and that's all this does."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."



Waddell: "I don't think that there's any mystery about the fact that Congress in its wisdom, or lack of it, has passed a lot of things that are going to be of great detriment. If they had been willing to modify their stand to one of reasonableness, then I think that's one thing. But for us to go ahead on this kind of a basis, I can tell you right now that 4 and 5 years down the road a lot of the good programs are going to collapse and they're going to fail. And therefore, I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will. "

Getty: "Representative Catania, if one of the contractors receiving an award from the Department of Transportation we'll say would be in violation of some rule or regulation, would the entire part of the appropriation under your language be held back as a result of that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "As I read the language in the Bill the contractor if it were established that the rule or regulation were being violated would not have that part of the appropriation available to spend until the rule or regulation was coming into compliance with, until the contractor came into compliance."

Getty: "Who would make that decision?"

Catania: "I would assume that the Director of DOT would be very careful about not seeing that any part of the appropriation would be spent in violation of those rules and regulations."

Getty: "Well, I'm just curious as to whether this would require a court decision, whether the, for example, if we used the Department of Transportation, whether the secretary of the Department of Transportation would make that



determination himself or whether it would be made by a third party. I'm just not quite clear on how that would be made. Would you have to go into court to determine that?"

Catania: "I'm certain that it would first be brought to the attention of the Director of the Department of Transportation, who, as I said, I would expect to be very careful to be sure that his Department was not in violation of these rules and regulations. And as I further pointed out earlier in this discussion, DOT did have this kind of language in their appropriation when we were in 79th General Assembly and I must point out to you that there was no problem with DOT as far as bringing any kind of action against them was concerned."

Getty: "Alright, the Bill as amended, if say downstate school district did not have the same facilities for the female students as they did for the male students, would that result in the Department of Education withholding all of their funds, all of the state aid funds? What would be the.. What would be the extent of it? The language seems to say no part of any appropriation. Now, ..."

Catania: "Again, I think that perhaps Representatives Steczo and Anderson could address that since that was their Amendment that's part of this Bill now."

Getty: "Are you yielding to Representative Steczo?"

Catania: "Yes."

Getty: "Representative Catania yielded to Representative Steczo. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative who?"

Catania: "Steczco."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could Representative Getty repeat the question, please?"

Getty: "Yes. If.. Let's say a downstate school district did not have the same facilities for the female students as they



had for the male students. Would the entire appropriation as regards that downstate school district be in jeopardy and if so, who would make the determination? Would it be made by the Superintendent of Education, or would it be made by a court?"

Steczo: "Representative Getty, from my discussions with people from the Illinois Office of Education, they suggested to me that if there were lack of proper facilities that they would look at that and they would provide that, you know, the funds could remain. They would make exceptions for certain instances. However, what's happened in many cases..."

Getty: "Well. Representative Steczo, on what basis would they, do it? The proposed language of your Amendment does not, nor does the Bill itself, does not provide for any exceptions. It does not provide for the exercise of any discretion, as I can see it, what-so-ever."

Steczo: "I had a similar proposal that still is in the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee and after having the discussions with the Representative from the IOE they said that they would allow more leverage in terms of compliance. Compliance would have to come. However, there would be..."

Getty: "Well, I'm not disagreeing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with what the Bill would like to do. I think however, we're trying to embark upon something that's very laudable without building into it sufficient safeguards for 1; who will make the determination, whether it's to be made and withheld by the head of the Department whether it's to be made and held by someone at a lesser level, or whether it's to be made by a court. And Secondly, we are not building into it sufficient safeguards for the exercise of discretion, as Representative Steczo has suggested. Accordingly, it is my intention to vote 'present'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, 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 'aye's have it. Representative Catania to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I pointed out earlier in the discussion this Bill originated in the 79th General Assembly when this House amended most of the major appropriations Bills to require that no funds be expended in violation of the rules and regulations of the FEPC or the EEOC. The Senators removed most of those Amendments saying that the proper way to approach this problem was to amend the State Finance Act. That is all that this Bill set out to do. It was amended on Second Reading to say furthermore that we could not spend money in violation of Title 9 of the Education Amendments of 1972. And I must point out to you that whenever people who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment talk about what it will do and what it will not do, they talk about how they have succeeded in amending those Education Amendments in Congress to be quite reasonable and satisfactory now. They say that those Education Amendments give good protection of people's rights. They can't have it both ways. Now, what we're hearing here is that there might be some problem in enforcement. I suggest to you that all this does is to signal to Department heads all over the State of Illinois that we are serious about equal rights for all people in this state. That's all that this Bill does and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Membership was paying attention to what this Bill actually does. This is



probably one of the most dangerous Bills to come before this House since I've been a Member of the Legislature. This Bill turns over to federal bureaucrats virtual absolute control over state expenditure of funds. Now we have attempted in various Bills put forth by Representative Lechowicz and Totten and others to get a handle on the appropriations process of the State of Illinois. But I would ask you to look at this Bill. This Bill prohibits any ...makes a provision to the Finance Act to prohibit the expenditure of any funds that we appropriate which are in violation of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and I would like to emphasize as determined by that Commission. Now that Commission I would suggest to you does not necessarily follow either the customs or perhaps even the Constitution of the United States as determined by the Supreme Court in the recent Bachee decision. What we're going to be doing here is turning over to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission some bureaucrats, whether or not we can spend money in various fields, including education and corrections, and many others. There are no provisions in here for appeals or for anything else. And I suggest that a 'no' vote is an absolute necessity."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted? Representative Chapman.

Representative Eugenia Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are making something very complicated from a very simple matter and a very simple Bill. All the Bill says is that the Executive Branch is not going to spend money that is in violation of the law. Isn't that simple? How do you enforce equal opportunity? If we are going to permit the Executive Branch to continue to spend money in violation of the law, they have no reason to believe that we are serious, that we will not tolerate lawbreakers



in this matter of equal opportunity. Now, a few years ago Representative Dyer and I were involved in a Subcommittee to study equal opportunity in employment in state government. And discovered that we had a remarkable record in this area and discovered there was a need to improve and so, with the cooperation of other Legislators we were successful in putting Amendments on almost every single appropriation Bill that went over to the Senate saying that funds within that appropriation, dollars appropriated in that Bill, could not be used in violation of equal opportunity laws in state and federal government. But the Senate told us that this wasn't the way to do it, that attaching Amendments to every single appropriation Bill which is what this House did, was not the way to do it, that we needed to amend the Finance Act. So, we believed them. And we introduced legislation and Representative Corneal Davis was the Sponsor of that legislation, to do it the right way. So what you have here is a Bill which does it the right way. If you believe that we should not permit state dollars to be spent in violation of the law, vote 'yes' on this simple Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I just feel the rules should be obeyed. One minute is one minute. This has now been going on two and a half."

Speaker Redmond: "You're absolutely correct. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I sat here on the floor of the House when we last debated ERA and a number of people got up and said, 'I'm voting 'no' on ERA because we don't need it because we have all of these wonderful Bills.. I've always... This wonderful legislation on the books that protects women. And I think that this vote, this Roll Call, gives the lie to that argument. Because if you don't vote for this, we've got... we've



got legislation on the books. We've got rules and regulations that have no teeth and if you really... if you really believe that we have protective legislation on the books, I think you want to give it some teeth and vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie to explain her vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. My 'yes' vote, very much like Representative Bowman's, is a way of saying that since we have these regulations already on our state statute books the issue is whether we're prepared to give them some teeth. I think of this as a splendid piece of preventive legislation. What it says to our agency Directors, to the people who are in charge of signing contracts with private people, with other people for state government services, that they ought to be concerned about the substantive laws we've already passed that say that they should be abiding by fair employment practices by equal opportunity employment issues. So, I urge your 'yes' vote on the grounds that what we're really doing is protecting our state agencies from making the kinds of mistakes that will get them into substantive trouble with other parts of our state statute books. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, one minute to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Deuster: "If there is any controversial federal regulation that has caused consternation to our local people, it is Title 9. All the Members of this House need to do is to talk to a physical education teacher and I'd suggest you talk to some female physical education teachers. The federal bureaucrats have gone so 'gung ho' in trying to bring about their style of equality, they've forced boys and girls to have to play volleyball together even when the boys and girls and their female coaches



and trainers don't want that sort of thing. President Jimmy Carter is trying to extricate us from federal red tape. We can solve problems on the State of Illinois level. The most serious reason that, in my opinion, there's so many red votes and this Bill should not pass is we are trying.. it's one thing to incorporate state law ... or state regulation, but to go and incorporate not only..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun. One minute to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Braun: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly urge a 'yes' vote on this excellent Bill. For those of you who are concerned about intervention of the feds in all of our state affairs, I want to point out to you that it's votes like this one that has encouraged the federal government to get more and more involved in local and state affairs. Indeed, if this Legislature, if this State is really concerned about equal rights, about affirmative action, then we will take the ... take the initiative and pass legislation like this that actually gives our efforts some teeth, that actually gives us the ability to affect equal opportunity on the level at which it's most effective and that is, with the dollars. And I strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

There are still 29 people not voting and I know that a couple aren't here but if all those who are here would please put on their green lights, we could pass this Bill. Which simply says that we are serious about what our state Constitution guarantees which is that we will not discriminate against any of our citizens here in the State of Illinois on the basis of sex or race or anything else that happens to be a matter of something that you were born with. Please vote 'yes' to put your



green light where we all say our intentions are."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk.. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker.. Well, I'm going to point out that some of the boys choirs under this kind of a law.. they will no longer be able to sing as a boys choir. You all remember about them. It's a little ridiculous."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 'aye' and 64 'no'. Representative Catania."

Catania: " Please place this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed, is that what you asked? Postponed Consideration. Representative Polk, for what purpose do you arise?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen , for the purposes of an introduction. Representative Darrow and Representative Bell and myself in the 36th District are very honored today to have in the gallery behind the Speaker's stadium Members from the Illinois Nursing Association from our District. I'd appreciate it if they would stand so they can be recognized by the Members of the Illinois General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm rising on a point of personal privilege which I very rarely, if ever, do. But, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I come at an era in my time when for example, a Democrat never read the Chicago Tribune. You just didn't read the Chicago Tribune. And I'm happy to say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I've looked at both the Sun Times and the Chicago Tribune within a week...within one week we've had 3 favorable editorials. Now, I point to you today, for example, that the Chicago Tribune has an editorial, 'Government by Task Force' and I rise, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House as a Member



who very...for very long has said that we ought to be an issue oriented Legislature and I want to compliment the Speaker of the House, Bill Redmond, the Majority Leader, Mike Madigan, for this is the first time in my terms in the Legislature where I've seen that we are issue oriented and these task forces have really done a super job. Now somebody said they wouldn't worked because Members of the Legislature would have to be here at 7:30 in the morning. Now, I was appointed to one of those task forces and, believe me, we had a lot of Members up early in the morning. The task forces have worked. Now today... today's editorial did take a shot at the Governor in saying that we created this task force by a void of the Executive Department. Now, whether that's true or not, I really don't care because I think that the Legislature ought to run on its own, that we ought to be as strong in the Legislature and the Executive ought to be as strong executive. But in complimenting you and the Majority Leader, Mr. Speaker, I also say to the Republicans because I want them to be strong too, that you ought to use this tact in the future because they are going to be issues that will always be major issues. And, believe me, this has worked beyond anybody's hopes, I believe, and whatever the result may be in the end Members have had a part in the process and that's why I love it so much that you have allowed Members in our Democratic side of the aisle to be a part of it. We've found that we have diverse interests. The Leaders have found out that everybody has these diverse interests and therefore, you listen to everybody and I think that the end product has been magnificent and I hope that we can put some of it into effect. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much, Representative Matijevich.

I think that the editorial today was well done and well merited and I think that the credit really belongs to the



Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

I have always said that the Members of the House are devoted, dedicated and hard working. We've never set our schedule around the thought that we would not have enough attendance. We've done it on the basis that we expect people are going to be here and I would say that on both sides of the aisle that they have responded and I think, so far, that this without a question of a doubt is the finest Session that I have served in and I thank you very much. 857, Representative Kempiners."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 857, a Bill for an Act to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In cooperation of the bipartisanism that you just evidenced, Senate Bill 857 would add to the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation the State Comptroller, the State Treasurer, and the Minority Leaders of both the House and the Senate. This does not change the partisan balance of that particular Body and I would ask your support for Senate Bill 857."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 872."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 872, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical and health manpower impact notes for certain Bills. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."



Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 872, is identical Bill, to House Bill 2224, sponsored by me which was reported out of the Human Resource Committee on 13-2 on May 3 and is now on the 1980 Spring Calendar. Senate Bill 872 was reported out the Executive Committee on 13-4. This is part of a series of Bills aimed at relieving the physical problem of the Commission that is now faced by the Governor's Commission, at least 37 million dollars deficit. This Commission sites the Alcoholism and the Intoxication Treatment Act, effective July of 1976, as an example of a measure which increased the overrate operation called unresponsibilities in which most hospitals would not poorly prefer to respond to which appropriates staff and resources. The impact note would at least insure hospital assessments and a preview of impending duties. Amendment #1 will incorporate details and procedure to make it more parallel to the existing statute and governmental impact note and physical pension and judicial. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 872."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "This Bill is identical to House Bill 2224 which has been placed on the Spring Calendar and it's part of the Cook County Hosptial package which has been introduced. Basically what the Bill is calling for is a medical manpower impact note that would be filed on Second Reading before the Bill would be advanced. Obviously this Bill is related or at least has a genesis in the physical impact note which has to be filed. The problem with this type of a note being filed however, is



a lot of times it would be totally impossible to determine what the medical manpower impact would be on this type of legislation. I believe that the motivation behind it is sincere. I think it's an intent on the part of the Cook County Hospital to make us aware that many of the decisions we make here in Springfield do have an impact in units of local government. But I don't think that this is a very practical Bill when you look at its ramifications here in the General Assembly. And I feel we ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the House of Representatives and the Senators can by a Majority vote can change the operation. This has posed a problem. I move for the adoption for the passage of Senate Bill 872."

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? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye' and 52 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 930. Representative Mahar."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 930, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 930 amends the Election Code and permits registered voters who have moved from one election district to another within 30 days to return to their old precinct and vote. The Bill... The people are caught in a kind of a Catch-22 situation here. If they move within the 30 days of the time of the election be-



cause they can't... they're no longer legal residents of their old district and they haven't been in the new one 30 days in order to vote, so this allows them to go back to their old precinct and vote. Now there were two Amendments added on to correct some of the flaws. One was that they couldn't return from out of state. That was sponsored by Representative Friedrich, and the other was to clarify the affidavit. Now they have to sign an affidavit and they have to be recognized by somebody at the polling place, either an election Judge or a citizen. I think it's a good Bill and should be supported. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, he ought to stand on his chair. Las Murphy did what I had to do once. One day I had to go to the Senate and I didn't have my coat on. And the Doorman, who you know, is about ten feet tall said, 'Here, you can have my coat.' Well, Las Murphy's got his coat on. You can see how tight it fits on Las."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1084."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1084, a Bill for an Act in relation to nuclear safety preparedness amending certain Acts in connection herewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate Bill 1084 creates the basis for development of emergency response plans for fixed nuclear facilities and for expanding the state's environmental monitoring program for fixed nuclear facilities. And it amends the Illinois State Radiation Protection Act by



adding a new Section to that Act to require that the Illinois Department of Public Health to develop a comprehensive contingency plan for protection of public health welfare and safety during the radiation... any radiation emergency. I would be glad to attempt to answer any questions on this Act. The Act is called...the new Act is called the Illinois Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. I'd be glad to answer any questions, or ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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 160 'aye' and 1 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1251, Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to return Senate Bill 1251 back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 2 , Taylor, amends Senate Bill 1251 on page 2, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #2 is just a self destruction clause and the terminate date is September '81 and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 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 Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1314. Representative Cullerton."



Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1314 transfers the Division of Services for Crippled Children from the University of Illinois to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has a long history of rehabilitative services for handicapping conditions and directly provides medical care and rehabilitation to people in need in Illinois. It is equipped to run a quality, fair program. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation will soon be made into the Department of Rehabilitative Services. Services will have greater visibility and priority in a cabinet level department. It is a rehabilitation agency, rather than an educational institution. There's also another argument in favor of this Bill which is very important. There will be a consolidation of services under this new department. When a child is born crippled, through his entire life up to the time that that person dies, he will be cared for...and provided by services that will come ...in one department. It makes no sense to have all these services spread out throughout the government. The medical community is in favor of this transfer since it will transfer a service that is now an educational institution to a medically oriented rehabilitation agency such as DVR. All previous rights and pension rights of employees are protected under this Bill. There's no problem getting continued federal funding. The effective date has been changed through an Amendment to July of 1980, with the exception of the Advisory Board for services to crippled children, will go into effect January 1st, to see if there is any problems with the transfer. The University of Illinois is not opposed to this Bill and to this transfer. The Medical Society is in favor of it, the Illinois Hospital Association is in



favor of it and the Governor has indicated his...support. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you read the Bill? I guess we got too fast on this thing."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1314. A Bill for an Act to transfer the Administration Division of services for crippled children from the University of Illinois to the Illinois Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Representative Slape. Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield? Representative Cullerton, does the DVR presently have any programs aimed at children or children care?"

Cullerton: "The...DVR does. Yes, it recently, through legislation enacted this year, we have transferred functions that were...were in the Department of...the Division of Services for DCFS, Department of Children and Family Services, from their jurisdiction to DVR."

Slape: "Just this year, though?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Slape: "Alright."

Cullerton: "This...this is in line with the desire to consolidate the services in one department. We have voted on and we're awaiting the Governor to sign a Bill that forms the Department of Rehabilitated Services that DVR will merge into."

Slape: "Alright. Isn't the real problem though with...the program as it stands right now...or the problem that you're trying to address is that you feel the City of Chicago was being denied certain services under this program?"

Cullerton: "That's not the main reason for the transfer, however, that is true that...that the level of services have been uneven throughout the state. And we did vote



for a supplemental appropriation for this year to correct that deficiency for the next month."

Slape: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, the attacks that have been made on this Bill, the reason...or the present program and the reason for this Bill, is that the Division of Crippled Services has lopsided protection or lopsided programs for the people of the State of Illinois. But the inception of the Bill was to provide just exactly these services and so the actual tax on it point out to the...the success of the Bill...the program. I think to take a federal and nationally known program and place it under DVR which has no experience with children care or children services would be a mistake for this Body to do today. I think the problem really lies in the lack of appropriations. In 1967 when the Security Act was changed and said that the appropriations should be equal all the way across the state and people in Urban areas should not be denied this service. The State of Illinois did not pick up on its appropriation and it's created this problem. But I would urge a 'no' vote on this. I think it would be a mistake at this time to take this program and put it in the DVR. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also oppose this Bill. If there's any agency in this state that has a long record of good service, it's the University of Illinois Division of Crippled Children Services. Now I know that some people like to fiddle around with organization charts. They look so pretty when you have them all pyramid fashion with somebody at the top and all flowered out down towards the bottoms. But we're dealing with crippled children here who need



this service and why on earth you want to meddle with something that's working and doing a good job, I'll never know. I'm going to vote against this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. And please understand, it has nothing to do with my feelings about DVR. I think they're doing a very good job. I think they have a very good director. Each one of you comes down here with some kind of background or expertise, if I have one thing it's been in the area of handicapped children. I have worked in this field over twenty-five years. I know this program. Believe me, it's the best one of its kind in the country. We're talking about severely involved, many of them infants, DVR is not ready to take over this program. If it's money that we're worried about, then let's go along with the appropriation, the added appropriation, for the Medical Center of University of Illinois for two and a-half million dollars. Then we can make sure that this program is equitable all over the state. There is absolutely no reason if you are looking for the betterment of children that this program should be moved at this point. We should know too that the federal government may not give a waiver for this transfer to DVR and this could mean losing federal funds. Before the General Assembly passes this Bill, we should be absolutely certain we will not lose those federal funds. Mostly, on behalf of my feeling and my experience with children, I ask you please, not at this time, do not put this program into DVR. Sometime in the future when they're ready to handle infants, but not now. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, here



is a letter from my area and beyond my area from the Easter Seals Society. They strongly oppose this Bill. I might mention to those of you who represent part of these counties, Christian, DeWitt, Macon, Moultrie, Pike and Shelby Counties, I...possibly you received copies of this letter yourself, but the Easter Seals Society of all those counties, strongly, oppose this Bill and recommend that the University of Illinois continue doing what there're doing. So I will certainly obey their wishes and vote against it and I think we should...you should do the same."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson.

Johnson: "Well I know very little, if anything, about the operation of either the Division of Services to Crippled Children or the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. But I do know a lot about the people who have written me and called me on this letter and their reputation and their credibility. I had letters and calls from hospitals, from doctors, from social workers, from nurses, from people who deal in the field every day who have a lot more communication and contact with either one of these areas than anybody in this General Assembly does. And I think, as Representative Flinn once said, that this is a good example of democracy at work. And to a person, to a man and to a woman, these individuals have said this is one of the...one of the best working divisions in state government. It's working very well right now and to try to transfer that division and to consolidate it simply for the purpose of consolidation with a board when it's already working very, very well, just doesn't make any sense. The DVR is...directed towards the vocational rehabilitation primarily for adults, that the Division of Services to Crippled Children for a different area as the children and a consolidation just for that purpose doesn't make any sense. So let's listen in this



area to the people who know what they're talking about, the people who deal with it and to the people who have said that while government doesn't work in a lot of areas, it works here. Let's don't fool around with a good thing and let's vote against Senate Bill 1314."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized after this Bill is completed."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, there's a relatively new book out, it's called The Official Rules by Paul Dixon. One of the rules in there is the...the rule law of mechanics. It's very simple. It says if it works, don't fix it. I think that's a good enough reason to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this legislation. It's supported by the Illinois State Medical Society, also the Illinois Hospital Association. I think what the Illinois State Medical Society has to say is worth repeating. They're talking about increase funding of 2.5 million and it also assures that all existing programs now in effect will remain at the same level, and in some cases, where needed, these programs will be increased to provide additional services for crippled children. There will be absolutely no cut-backs in services, but rather increases in the level of services and that is the opinion of the Illinois State Medical Society when they came out in support of the legislation. I see no reason why one of the state departments of the State of Illinois should not be in charge of this particular program. It's time, and the time is now, and the time is here and I urge a 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 1314."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. Representative Barnes, will you please sit down?"



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I followed the eloquent testimony presented by Representative Bradley on this. Those of us that served on the Committee at least heard some of the testimony on this Bill came to the conclusion that this particular service is the step-child of higher education. Certainly the University does not come in to the Appropriations Committee and fight for this particular service. I think if you look at where we're putting it in DVR, I think those who argue that it should not be here because it deals with children, certainly have a point in their favor, but I think that DVR dealing with vocational rehabilitation and other types of rehabilitation will certainly do more for the children than this agency serves than will the University of Illinois and other units of higher education. I, too, have received mail on this. I probably received five or six letters, one may have even come from my district. Certainly there are people who are concerned about their jobs, there are people who are concerned about this provision. As far as what Representative Bradley said, the State Medical Society, the people who are the ones who have to deal with this particular agency, did come in to Committee and testify in support of Senate Bill 1314. I think that when you look at the job that is being provided, the service that is being provided to the people whom you represent, that certainly they will be represented better with a combination of this service in DVR than they would be with this service at the University of Illinois level. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "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, the motion carried. Representative Cullerton to close."



Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, the Division of Services for Crippled Children program is both medical and rehabilitative, not simply medical. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is a result of both state and federal initiatives and provides general rehabilitative services for handicapped people of all ages. The eminent elevation of the division for the Code Department of Rehabilitative Services underscores this broad focus. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, itself, has extensive experience in providing needed care. Six thousand positions currently have an association with that division. The only...the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Hospital Association support the transfer of this program. And to allay any fears, I have just received a telegram from Frank Ellis, Regional Health Administrator, Region 5, and he says, 'In regards to requests relating to the transfer of Title 5 Crippled Children's program from one non-state agency to another, we have reviewed the applicable statutes and regulations and find no statutory or regulatory impediments to such a move.' The funds will not be cut off, if anything, the funds will be increased. The Division of Services for Crippled Children has been buried in the University of Illinois for 38 years. Moving the program to DVR will increase its visibility and accountability to the General Assembly. The University of Illinois does not even object to the transfer. The concerns of the employees are fully addressed, attorneys with the University of Illinois, the DVR, the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor's Office and Senator Daley have worked closely to assure the continuation of pension rights and personnel status. The opponents...who are the opponents you've received letters from? Doctors who have contracts with the Division of Services for Crippled Children or services provided to people who did happen



to qualify, what about the people that didn't qualify? The services might be provided well and in some parts of the state, but its only to relatively few people. If it's working so well, why are there uneven services for last twenty years? Why is the University of Illinois not opposed? Why is the Medical Society in favor of it? Why is the Governor in favor it? Because it is only working well for a few. I strongly urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass?.

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Daniels to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House...Senate Bill 1314. It's interesting to look at the background of the various divisions that we're dealing with for the focus of the Division of Services for Crippled Children and DVR are not really so different. The focus of the University of Illinois and the Division of Services for Crippled Children are in fact very different. Where the University is an educational institution for young adults, the Division of Services for Crippled Children is a medical rehabilitative program for crippled children. Now this certainly ties in with DVR, for that is a program for rehabilitation and associated medical services. We look at the various legislation that we're dealing with and we ask ourselves, should we in fact support this, and we could find easily that the support should be given by the groups that have lended their support and their encouragement on...on the legislation. When the Illinois Medical Society and the Illinois Hospital Association tell us that this is good legislation and we should favor it, that tells us a great deal on whether or not we in fact should give our support to it. And Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had verbal assurance that HEW will in fact transfer the federal funds over to this agency. Now



if this doesn't come about, we can assure you that remedial legislation will be sponsored immediately. I think it's a good piece of legislation, I think it's one that warrants our support. I'm proud to offer my support along with the Governor, the Medical Society and the Hospital Association. Thank you for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Cullerton in this piece of legislation. In my estimation, I think it's an excellent piece of legislation. The people working on this did everything that they possibly could to insure that the people working for the hospital would have their tenure, they won't be fired, in fact they have gone even so far because the pension systems are different that they are...even though they will be working for the state and receiving their salary from the state, their pension will still be coming from the University of Illinois so that no one is...is put in jeopardy of their pension at all. We have passed legislation here which gave to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation the home for the deaf children and the blind children in Jacksonville. The Department...or the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation will be made a cabinet post, a cabinet department, with a lot of influence and a...a lot of extra mandates and I'm sure this Legislature will give it when it gets into the area of rehabilitative services. In my view, this is a move in the right direction. There is absolutely no danger, no danger at all that the services to the downstates areas will be lessened, in fact, what this Legislature has already done is that it has increased the appropriation for the Crippled Children's Hospital by 2 and a-half million dollars and by another half a million dollars for 1979 to insure that the services for crippled children will be



...in all counties of the state, from one of the state to another state and that significant help will be given as a part of a new department which this General Assembly has voted on and which I am confident will be signed by the Governor. The Department of Vocational Rehabilitation is a department which has the expertise, which has the people that can do the job and the Members, and especially the downstate area, should not fear that the good service that is being provided now will any way...in any way be jeopardized. It's a good, solid kind of program, well presented in Committee and...and supported by many individuals and many organizations who are involved with the aid and assistance of the children and to the handicapped."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty, one minute to explain his vote. The timer is on.

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. As a Member of the Committee that heard this, I sat with some question at first and was very much impressed by the manner in which the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation looked forward to taking this under its wing. I think that they will do a very good job in administering it. I think that has to be contrasted with the University of Illinois who had no objection to the transfer. I think what we want, especially as regards our children, is to give vigorous administration of such a program. I think that will be accomplished in the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. That's where it belongs and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel. One minute to explain his vote."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can speak on this because it's quite personal to me. My older sister has been handicapped since birth. And I can tell you the problems that my parents have gone through many, many times running from one agency to



another to try to find out how to get certain things solved. With the passage of this Bill, this would definitely be a step in the right direction because it is putting everything under one umbrella, under DVR. And so I would ask, if you, the Members of the House, join me and vote for this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I repor...I rise in opposition to this Bill. This Bill would transfer a function performed exclusively for the benefit of crippled children to DVR which is really not in that field of service."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer says one minute, Representative Dunn. That's what the rules give you. Proceed."

Dunn: "Just because I went to Notre Dame it shouldn't do that to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, they learn so fast that one minute is long enough."

Dunn: "Okay. What I would like to say is we're...we're transferring this if anywhere to the wrong agency. It should not go to DVR. Everybody agrees that the function is being performed well right where it is and we have so many problems in government, why should we go in to a reorganization, why should we create more bureaucracy, why should we create red tape, why shouldn't we leave alone a program that is doing well right where it is? If there are some areas in the state which are concerned about receiving service, we can take care of that with additional funding, we can take care of that with additional programing right where it is. Let's leave...let's leave this agency, this division, to operate through the University of Illinois where it has been doing an excellent job and let's not tinker with success. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Dyer: One minute to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I stand with Dolly Hallstrom and the Members of the Commission on Children who have studied this problem. They have come to the conclusion that it isn't throwing money at a problem that solves it, it isn't an organization chart that solves it, it is the delivery of the service to the people who need it. The crippled children have been getting this service. There is no demonstration that it could be improved by putting them under one umbrella. Often when you put too many people under one umbrella, somebody gets wet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn. One minute to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I see the Bill has a hundred votes, so it's probably going to pass, but I think this will be one of the biggest mistakes we've made in this Legislative Session. I think we've made several big ones, but this would be the worst that we've made. When you transfer department...or a division of crippled children that has done an excellent job for some thirty years or more, transfer it to an agency that's be..beridden with scandle and had a lot of controversy in the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. It doesn't address itself to crippled children regardless of what others might say. I think this is a bad Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote...from those who have the courage to do that. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff. One minute to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry to see so many green votes up there because I think as it has been brought out on the floor, here nobody has said but what the University of Illinois isn't doing a good job on this, there's no one that has made that statement. I received probably fifty letters in support of leaving this...these



handicapped...where most of them of from the parents of children. I have one here laying on the desk from a four-year-old child and they can't speak too highly of the way that they've been treated. And...I...somebody else made the statement there 'why change something that we say is doing a good job,' and I think everybody agrees that the University of Illinois isn't doing a good job and I would hope we switch some more..green to red.

Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cissy Stiehl. One minute to explain her vote."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I know this Bill has 98 votes on it, but I hope some of the Members will reconsider their position. There are very few of us in this room that have not been personally touched with the services that have been rendered crippled children from the University of Illinois. They have done an excellent job and they have provided well for our crippled children. I see no need to move them from the University and I agree with the other Members that the department is functioning well, why change it, why move it. Please, put some more 'nos' on here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt. One minute to explain his vote."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the last ten minutes I've heard a lot of reasons why we should support or not support this Bill. I've heard that the Department of Vocational Education... Vocational Rehabilitation is the proper domain for this, I've heard that the Medical Society is...support this. But I've heard no one say in the last few minutes what is best for the kids. Now if you want to...want to vote for the children of Illinois that are born with birth defects and chronic diseases and need particular help that cannot be given in a program that's for vocational education, then



vote to keep this project at the University of Illinois. This is a very simple thing. So if you want to vote for the kids that are born handicapped, there's...red vote is a right vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers. One minute to explain his vote."

Borchers: "The only thing I have to say about this matter is I can't understand how anyone here would want to transfer to a...to an Illinois or any government agency, any government agency, and take away from a great university something that they are successfully doing for children. I just don't understand transferring such power or the children to government agency. My heavens, all you've got to do is remember the stories of all of our government agencies...that's surely so, that they are not to be trusted in entirety with children. Now the University of Illinois, I've never heard a thing against them in any way that would indicate that we can't trust them with children. And yet, we're getting ready to do it, to take away the power that they have and the good that they can do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines. One minute to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have the unique distinction of being both a graduate of the University of Illinois and a former crippled child, something that no one else here can say. Last year I had these same reservations that I heard expressed today about transferring the blind to DVR because they had no experience with the blind in that area. Some very strong objections came from my district about that. The merger was made and I admonished it and DVR has in fact improved some of the services to the blind that was said they couldn't do. So based on the experience that I have observed and monitored with their



ability to take a blind program which they didn't have before and improve it, I feel that I can safely give them the care of crippled children who are like myself when I was a child. So I'm asking you to vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Everett Steele. One minute to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote, I think this Bill is wrong because it is transferring from one department to another. A department that is really five times less efficient really in terms of state employees and the people they serve. The Division of Crippled Services has two hundred employees and is serving thirty-two thousand children. The Vocational Rehabilitation for every two hundred employees they are serving only six thousand people. Now this is not a move forward, this is a step backward. It is a step backward in the service to the people, it's a step backward in service to the taxpayers of this state. To take from one department and put to another, a department which is serving five times less when you consider the state employee and the constituents of people it's serving. So I think in the benefit of the people, the children, the crippled children here, we should not take a step backward and move this to a department that really is five times less efficient based upon the employees and those...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. One minute to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's been a lot of rhetoric on this issue. I think people have forgotten some of the basic facts. This isn't an isolated action. There are a number of other functions that have been recently transferred to this department. The Department of Children and Family Services has



divested itself of two very similar kinds of functions where they deal with handicapped children. This is not a single isolated function, this is an attempt to rationally organize government. There's no reason to believe this agency can't perform well. It's got one of the better directors in state government. I believe we need to pass this thing, put all the handicapped functions together so that we can make sure that everybody gets what they can. Representative Piel made a very good point. This could make government much more manageable and much more accessible for the handicapped."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Sir. If it has 89 or more votes, I'd like a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. On this question there is 93 'aye' and 75 'no'. Representative Ralph Dunn requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Mr. Dunn, would you verify me now, please?" Would that be alright?"

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, while we're waiting for the Roll Call, I'd like to have the Membership be aware of the fact that we have our fine State Treasurer, Jerry Cosentino, with us this afternoon. Jerry, welcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Cullerton has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Kozubowski. Schoeberlein and Woodyard."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."



Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Bullock. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ebbesen. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Georgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hanahan. Harris."

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

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, I feel as strongly about this as Representative Dunn does. It seems to me that while he is requesting a Roll Call verification that the very department involved should not be lobbying on the floor, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what your opinion is on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think that is correct. I don't know which department you're talking about, but...the cognizant department, please do not lobby the Members during this Roll Call. Okay. I don't know who they are but...they know who they are. Please, leave the floor. Who's that? Please. Please, leave the floor. Mr. Jeffers. Proceed. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I resent those charges of lobbying...lodged against the director. He was sitting here listening to the debate right at our desk without ever saying one word. Now this man has not lobbied, he was sitting...interested in the debate that affects his department and I...mightily resent that an attack on one of the finest directors we have in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I don't have any...any feelings about this Bill one way or another, but I resent that...also that the director...your rules say that the director is entitled to the floor. He's not a lobbyist, it's not one of his underlings, its the director himself. And he sat there for



ten, fifteen minutes while this Bill was being debated and didn't say a word, didn't utter a word."

Speaker Redmond: "In my opinion, the director referred to is one of the finest Gentleman that has ever been in this Chamber. I would not have made the request. When the Members ask me to make a request, I think it's my duty to respond to the Membership. Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've known Director Jeffers for a long time and I have...holding the same high regard that you do. I was not talking about Director Jeffers. I want to make it abundantly clear, I was referring to some of his functionaries."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, well let's proceed. I think that sometimes emotions run high here. I apologize to the director, but I felt that's what I had to do. So... proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of interrupting, I did have my light on to tell you that Director Jeffers was sitting here right by my desk. And I would like to say to you that he did not say one word to me and I think that his behavior and conduct is exemplary. He is one of the finest directors that we have in this state government. And I am voting against his position and yet, he did not say one single word to me and I think it is an affront to people of that kind of caliber to ask them to leave this floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Hallstrom, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Yes, I'm sorry to interrupt too, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since I oppose this Bill so vehemently, I just wanted to clarify that if you remember I made some remarks in the



beginning of my little presentation and one of them said what a good director we have in DVR. I wanted no one to think, in any way, that I wanted that director to leave the floor. I think he has right to be here. I don't think anyone working under him does, but I certainly feel the director should be on the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. We've got a long way to go and nobody is changing anyone else's mind."

Clerk Leone: "Huskey. Emil Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon."

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

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be verified? Hearing no objection...proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Leverenz. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McPike. Meyer. Malloy. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schuneman. Stanley. Stearney. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Totten. Van Duyn. Vinson. Vitek. Walsh. Williams. J.J. Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

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

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, may I change from vote from 'nay' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested we change him from 'nay' to 'aye'...that's Klosak. Representative Jane Barnes. Barnes. Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Lady 'aye'. Representative



Stearney, for what purpose did you rise?" Representative Stearney wants to be verified and authenticated. No objection. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I ask that I be verified."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz desires to be verified. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "...'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly desires to be verified. I think we ought to get on with this thing before we... are there any question of the Affirmative Roll Call, Representative Dunn?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. ... Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Abramson. He's in there talking to... Minority Leader."

Dunn: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Incidentally, did you give us a tally on the count, Mr. Clerk, before we started? Yeah. 95 'ayes' and we've removed Dawson, is that correct? And did you add Barnes and...I see. So it's...95 is the correct number."

Dunn: "Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "And removed Dawson...94, Okay."

Dunn: "Excuse me. Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Dunn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Right here."

Dunn: "Thank you. Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Hanahan recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Huskey. Is he back there? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Kosinski."

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

Dunn: "Thank you. Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his seat."

Dunn: "I want to tell him I voted with him once this year, too, a while ago. Representative Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Dunn: "Ewing. Representative Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Ewing...how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him." Dawson has returned, put him back on the Roll Call."

Dunn: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there."

Dunn: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe. He's there...quiet."

Dunn: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Dunn: "Representative Schuneman. Oh, excuse me, here he is."

Speaker Redmond: "Schuneman...there a minute ago."



Dunn: "I see him. Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Ewing has returned, put him back on the Roll Call."

Dunn: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler. He's way in the back very quite."

Dunn: "I see him now."

Speaker Redmond: "You've been verified. He didn't take you off. You got permission before."

Dunn: "Representative Ray Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Ray Ewell."

Dunn: "Oh, excuse me, I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "He's there...the white suit."

Dunn: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Terzich...."

Dunn: "He just came back in. Representative Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Doyle. He's there."

Dunn: "Excuse me, I see him now."

Speaker Redmond: "He making a loan...or lending money to the Treasurer, I don't which."

Dunn: "Representative...oh, I see Representative Domico... standing right there. Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Anything further?"

Dunn: "Capparelli...did he say he's..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Dunn: "...And Representative Hoxsey...I believe that's all we have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 74 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1344."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1344, a Bill for an Act relating to the operation of fire service institute by the University of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1344 is a bi-partisan Bill with the joint Chief Co-Sponsors, myself, Representative Stuffle, Representative Polk and Representative Wikoff. It passed the Senate 50 to 4 and to my knowledge, there was no opposition in Senate Committee and there was no opposition to the Bill in the House Committee. The Bill provides that the University of Illinois will, in the future, be able to operate a State Fire Academy. Now, currently the National Fire Commission... First of all, I think everyone recognizes that the crime of arson is probably been one of the fastest growing crimes in the United States, and certainly in our State. National Fire Commission determines that property losses due to fires and over 12,500 lives lost each year can be reduced with proper training and public education in fire prevention. And that's exactly what this Bill will allow. It will allow the University of Illinois Fire Institute to operate and build a State Fire Academy and provide training to some 45,000 fire fighters in the State of Illinois. In addition, we're providing extra funds for State Fire Marshall and those are to be used to hire arson investigators to investigate the crimes throughout the State. I think in the long run the Fire Academy will save not only lives, but it will save money for home owners and for the insurance industry if we are able to prevent fires and if we are able to properly investigate arson. I think that the money we investigate for this purpose will be returned at least one-fold and perhaps greater. I would urge support of this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "May I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McCourt: "What is the cost of this Bill?"

McPike: "Currently.. Currently one half percent of the... of the gross premium receipts to the insurance companies going to.. go to the State Fire Marshal. We're increasing that one half to a one percent and one-eighth... one-eighth: of the.. that will go the University of Illinois to operate this Fire Institute."

McCourt: "So, in other words, this means that everyone's insurance premium throughout the State of Illinois if this Bill is enacted will be increased by one-half percent. Is that correct?"

McPike: "Well, that's not our belief. We believe that in the long run that fire prevention and fire education will eventually decrease premiums to every home owner in Illinois. I think that's been proven over and over. It's like saying that if you pay a Fire Department that's going to increase the amount of cost that you have for fire insurance. Fire Departments do not increase the cost and neither do proper training of fire fighters and neither does proper arson investigation. All of those things I think are indeed vital to insure that we have.. the lowest possible premium. So, I don't ... I really don't think that's true to say that this will eventually increase premiums."

McCourt: "Well. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that what this Bill does is add another facility down to the University of Illinois that no one has indicated to me that's really needed. There already is a part time fire academy down at the University of Illinois plus the city of Chicago has a fire academie and throughout the State there are other facilities that various communities use to train their fire



fighting personnel. It seems to me that at this particular time this is unnecessary. It's a tax increase and it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Did the Sponsor of this Bill just stand up and suggest that the University of Illinois was incapable of handling the children's school?"

McPike: "No, the Sponsor did not. I did not speak on .. on that last Bill at all."

Skinner: "I'm told by my adviser back here in yellow that .."

McPike: "Well, your adviser's mistaken. I said I didn't speak on it."

Skinner: "That you voted for it. That's what she told me. It seemed to me that if the .. if the Sponsor doesn't think that the University of Illinois is capable of running its children's school, as evidenced by his vote, perhaps the University is not capable of running a fire training school. One never can tell."

McPike: "I'm amazed at your logic."

Skinner: "I didn't ask a question, Mr. Speaker. No one suggested my logic was logical."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hallock: "I see from the Amendment #1 that 10% of the money collected is supposed to go to the Chicago Fire Department for a training program. Could you explain the derivation and the meaning of that Amendment please?"

McPike: "Absolutely. These are.. These monies are generated statewide. The University of Chicago has approximately 4500, I believe approximately.. maybe Representative Terzich could correct me, but I believe they have about 4500 full time fire fighters which is about equal to the full time fire fighters downstate. Not only that, but the State Fire Marshall does not provide arson investiga-



tion within the city. That is a function of the city. What we are doing is taking monies for a statewide and only funding educational opportunities to part of the fire fighters and I agreed with the Sponsor of the Amendment that it was only equitable that part of these new monies go to Chicago for the same type of fire prevention and fire education procedures and training so that those fire fighters there would have the same opportunities."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Birkinbine: "Who would be the people who would go to this school?"

McPike: "Well, fire fighters throughout Illinois. We have about 45,000. Most of those are volunteers, but we probably have about 10,000 of those that are full time fire fighters. They would be eligible along with the volunteer fire fighters. I don't know if there's any in your District, but in most of rural downstate Illinois all the fire fighters are volunteers and they would be eligible not only to attend the school, but to participate in field training courses that will be offered by the school."

Birkinbine: "Do you have some indication that there's a demand for a program such as this? Do you know that x number of fire fighters are willing or desirous of going through a training program such as this?"

McPike: "No, I can't predict what the response will be. We know that this has the full support of fire fighters throughout Illinois. They are in support of the program. They think, as I do, that by providing proper educational facilities that not only will be of benefit to home owners, but we're going to benefit the fire fighters themselves by making them more qualified and eventually leading to a safer employment for them. I think that a great majority of the fire fighters would participate,



yes."

Birkinbine: "Where are they presently trained now? Do you know?
I don't."

McPike: "They have limited training facilities right now and
that's why we're instituting this. We do not have the
facilities to properly train them now."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. So the.. so the Chamber is aware,
the Speaker tells me we are going to work till.. from..
till 8 or 9 o'clock. Alright. The Gentleman from White-
side, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to
a question or two?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative McPike, I notice that the Bill indi-
cates that the tax is going to be increased from one half
of one percent of gross premiums to one percent of gross
premium. Is that correct?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Schuneman: "And what kind of revenues will be generated by that
one half percent increase in taxes?"

McPike: "Approximately 3.2 million dollars."

Schuneman: "About 3.2 million dollars."

McPike: "Correct."

Schuneman: "Does that.. And so that expands the.. the.. it doubles
actually the amount of funds available at the present
time for this kind of program?"

McPike: "There are no funds available for this kind of program
at the present time. So, it doubles the tax. You are
correct in that. But it does not double the funds avail-
able for this program. This is a new program."

Schuneman: "Okay. I thought you indicated there was some training
going on now.."

McPike: "The State Fire Marshall provides grants to local com-
munities and I think that amounts to about 700,000 a year



reimbursement grants to local communities for training."

Schuneman: "And as I understood either from you or from some other source, the insurance companies have not opposed this legislation. Am I correct in that?"

McPike: "To my knowledge, you are correct. They were aware of this and they did not appear in Executive Committee for or against."

Schuneman: "Okay. Just one other question; Can you tell me how much of the training facilities that will be created will be available to volunteer fire departments, as opposed to full time paid departments?"

McPike: "All of them."

Schuneman: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak just briefly to the Bill. I think that some Members might consider this to be a tax on the insurance industry and perhaps to some slight degree it will be that. However, I believe that this really... the cost of this program is certainly going to be passed on to the consumers of insurance. So I think we need to measure the benefits that would be received from such a program against the increase in cost to the consumer. I'm not necessarily speaking either for or against this program, but I do think that we ought to take a careful look, and try to measure whether or not increased insurance costs will be justified by virtue of this program."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge support of Senate Bill 1344. I think you have to take into consideration that #1, only one-eighth of this premium tax would go into the current operating cost which provides a service institute which is operated by the University of Illinois. What this will do, it will provide additional facilities to all of the downstate fire departments whether they're volunteer or full time



fire service. We have very many volunteer firemen that do not have the proper training nor the facilities to receive this here training and this is an extension of the service. Now, needless to say, that by having qualified firefighters up with the modern training and methods of firefighting, that it's a reflection of the insurance cost. Now the city of Chicago has one of the lowest fire rating costs in the state and the reason for it is because of the training facilities that are available to them. The Chicago Fire Department does have the Chicago Fire Academy and hopefully we do take pride in being one of the finest firefighting organizations in the United States. I would urge support of this Bill. The balance of the fund from the tax would go to the State Fire Marshal's Office. Now we have mandated the State Fire Marshal's Office to carry out many, many investigations, and particularly in the area of arson investigation. Currently they do not have sufficient funds to perform all of these requests that we have made upon the State Fire Marshal's Office and the majority of the money will go into the State Fire Marshal's Office. The monies will have to be appropriated by the General Assembly. If there are any excess funds it goes into the General Revenue Fund. So, therefore, the monies will not be unspent. Anyhow, the General Assembly would have to appropriate these funds. Any remaining monies would go directly into the General Revenue Fund which of course, would reduce the tax for the people of the entire State of Illinois. At the same time, I believe that providing a quality education firefighting training it would tend to reduce the rate for fire insurance throughout the State of Illinois. Now, there is no opposition of this Bill by the Insurance Department, nor of the insurance companies. I think it's a long time in coming



and I would certainly urge your support on this Bill and always remember a firefighter is your friend."

Speaker Matijevich: "An announcement. I've been told by one of the Leaders that one of the temporary pages almost hurt himself by running down the aisle. So would the head pages please admonish the temporary pages. They get excited sometimes in their new work. So, if any Members see them running, slow them down. 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 main question prevails. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, to close. Oh, Representative Virgil Wikoff, the Co-Chief Sponsor, to close, from Champaign."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there are a couple of things that should be brought out on this. There's been a lot of talk about the additional tax that this might entail. I think if you'll do a little mathematical figuring, it comes out a little less than 30¢ per every individual within the State of Illinois and I'm sure that this is a very nominal fee that could be considered. The monies that would be spent on this could eventually lead to savings to not only the insurance agency, but to also to insurance industry, but to the citizens of this state by providing a training academy. The Act itself will also save the State of Illinois a little over 800 thousand dollars in grant monies which are now paid to various cities through the State Fire Marshal's Office for firefighters certification program. I'll get my tongue untied in a minute. It could provide for savings in other cities."



I would like to point out that if any city has gone through the process of having either their fire rating increased or decreased by the.. I guess it's the Insurance Commission that does that, because of their firefighting ability, a decrease is going to more than save any monies that might be generated in this to all the citizens of that area. Those that might get them decre.. increased for some reason or other because of inadequate fire protection service are going to pay much more than might be generated by this. Some 15,20 years ago the Legislature, through their wisdom, did create the Police Training Institute over at the University of Illinois and today we have a much more professionalized police force as such and I think that with the adoption of this we can end up with a much more professionalized firefighting situation for all of the citizens of Illinois and I think in the long run it's going to save us all a considerable amount of money and if by doing so we can save one building or one life from being lost... Presently the National Fire Commission determines that we're losing some 12,500 lives lost in fires each year and if we can save anyone of those, that 30¢ per person is going to be money well spent. I urge adoption of this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representatives McPike- Wikoff- Polk- and Stuffle have moved for the passage of House.. Senate Bill 1344. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1344 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that it's going to pass because I didn't get a chance to ask a couple of questions. I'm still going to speak on the subject. It seems like when we've got any questions we're interested



in someone moves the previous question and in some instances that's alright, but it precludes finding out the facts of the case. First of all, it appears that expansion of the insurance companies under this program have greatly increased to all insurance companies in the State of Illinois and that may not be wise. And secondly, we're talking about a tax increase. Now don't kid anybody. The insurance companies are not going to pay the cost of this burden. It's going to be passed on to those policy holders who are trying to get protection. And thirdly and one of the things that I'm certainly interested in, is an allocation of funds. It seems to me so often that whenever a Bill is in jeopardy, an Amendment comes in exempting certain groups or giving certain groups special benefits. This is no exception. Again, the city of Chicago is getting a 10% allocation whether it's justified or not. It appears to me as just a means of insuring the vote of the Chicago Representatives and that may not be true. But I didn't get a chance to ask anybody questions. And suffice to say that this is an extra tax on my Representative District and certainly all of downstate and without these questions, I will not vote for it."

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

Wolf: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the Doorkeeper caution Jimmy DiPhili to stand up without a safety belt. I'm afraid he's going to fall out of the gallery."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk, Co-Sponsor of the Bill, to explain his vote. "

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be extremely brief. You can put your one minute timer on for anybody else. I just want to point out for those who are interested in crime and there



are many of us here who came down with that platform when we were concerned about crime. One of the biggest expenditures in this state is white collar crime and it's arson. That's exactly the purpose of this legislation, to assist us to save money in the State and I certainly appreciate all the votes we have on it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I have a long record of supporting fire-fighters because I realize the importance of well trained firefighters. However, it's always interesting to me what they don't tell you about a Bill. One of the things that's going to happen now, we're going to have a new building at the University of Illinois. That's not going to be paid for out of this money. It's going to be paid for out of general revenue. It's going to be the janitors, and the utility bills and all that are going to be paid for. So this is kind of the tip of the iceberg. And I think there are better ways to arrive at this than what we're doing. And it is a double.. doubling of an existing tax which finally goes on to the consumer."

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

Robbins: "It ain't been very many years ago that I started farming and my tax was something like \$250. Now then it's something like \$1500 a year for practically the same coverage and according to my figures, this one half of a percent will add quite a bit more and that's quite a bit more to each and every one of your taxes here. Once you start this thing and continue to expand it it's going to be more taxes and more cost and .. one of the things we came down here and promised our people also was that if we did.. if we raised their taxes that we would furnish the money to pay for it. Now we're asking them to pay for a very expanded program that we're just beginning



now and with the beginning budget I hate to think what it will look like in five years."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's fruitless giving up explaining a vote when you see 119 votes there, but I really want to point this out. What we're doing is mandating statutorily an institute that already exists and providing for its continual funding. Right now the program is very small. Alright, now there's nothing wrong with that. But say a municipality then wants to match grants for fire equipment or for police... radio equipment, or any kind of firefighting equipment. The State's going to say before you can get any matching funds, that they take this fire signs course at the University of Illinois. We'll know many only 2 out of maybe 20 of them took it. So before we can match your funds, you must have 50% of your Members go through this educational program before you get any matching funds. Alright, now we've got a small program that's not being used and taken advantage of. The minute they start mandating these programs, then you're going to find that 50, 60 and 75% of your firemen are going to have to take this course before they can receive any state grants. What happens to the State grants and the State-Federal funding? That goes up. You're chasing your shadow and we're putting on an awful lot of more expense on the State of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, according to the analysis that I have here it states that the State Fire Marshal is taking no position and I assume by the Sponsor of the Bill that he said that they did not even appear at the hearing and it would seem to me a very



vital and important issue as this is, and I certainly support the need for education, it does not seem like one ought to support a Bill where the Chief Fire Marshal of the State of Illinois would not come out and even say that he would oppose support it. And on that grounds, I'm opposing it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 45 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1344, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1411, Steczo. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1411, a BILL for an Act to amend an Act concerning state finance. Third Reading of the Bill "

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

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1411 amends the State.. the Act concerning state finance and it allows the Secretary of State to establish petty cash fund of \$2,000 for each of the 3 Chicago Motor Vehicle .. Motor Vehicle Facilities. The present cap of \$500 isn't adequate for these facilities especially since they sell license plates and have other expenses and finds the \$500 isn't enough to carry on the normal daily cash transaction. This Bill is supported by the Secretary of State. It's also received no opposition from the Comptroller and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1411. On that, the Gentleman ... No? I guess nobody.. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1411 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'aye', 4 'nay', and House...



Senate Bill 1411, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 133. Daniels."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 133, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 133 is a result of the case involving one Donald Lang and some of you may have seen the series on television called, 'The Dummy', which dealt with Donald Lang and his inability to be brought to trial in the State of Illinois because of the glaring gap in the present statutory framework of our criminal justice system as it relates to unfit defendants. Senate Bill 133 provides a comprehensive system for dealing with defendants who are found unfit to stand trial and it is my belief that it sets forth a rational system to deal with this type of defendant. The Bill provides for a preliminary fitness examination and then a full examination if he is found unfit in the preliminary exam. During the examination certain statements made by the defendant to his examiner will be inadmissible during the trial and are strictly limited. All treatment is directed towards bringing the defendant to a condition where he may be found to fit trial... to stand trial. To insure this the Bill sets up a system of consistent monitoring of the defendant. If a defendant requires special assistance during a trial the Bill has provisions which special assistants may be afforded. If a defendant cannot become fit to stand trial there are then provisions which provide for a procedure to defend... to determine the likelihood that the defendant committed the crime. And it is was found unlikely then the defen-



dant is released. The problem with the existing law is the defendant who is found incompetent to stand trial but not in need of hospitalization under the Mental Health Code goes into a procedural limbo. He must either be held in jail without treatment or released on bail which in many times the public finds unsuitable. The Bill, Senate Bill 133, has been carefully scrutinized by the Commission on Revision of the Mental Health Code and it has been intensely scrutinized by the staff of both Members of the House and the Senate. It passed the Senate overwhelmingly 55 to nothing and I think answers a dire need in our criminal justice system. I urge your support of Senate Bill 133."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 133. If there are no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 133 pass?' The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "I'm sorry, I missed part of this presentation. But would you please explain to me the mandatory supervision? I think we had a discussion on House Bill 1011 of about a month ago and I'd like to have an explanation of the supervision clause under the mandatory supervised release. Is that in here?"

Daniels: "Yeah, that deals more with probation after sentencing, Representative, and this Bill determines whether or not a defendant is fit to stand trial."

Mautino: "Okay. But the Amendment, Senate Amendment #1, addresses the amendatory supervised release. Okay? And I want somebody to explain that to me because we had the same problem in House Bill 1012.. 1011 and we tried to correct it in the Senate."



Daniels: "Maybe you could rephrase your question. I'm looking at the Amendments that were put on in the House and you mentioned something about Senate Amendment #1."

Mautino: "Senate Amendment #1, I think, addresses mandatory supervised release. Now, I'd like to have you explain to me what that means, Lee. I'm not an attorney."

Daniels: "It's another form of a type of probation that a defendant may be released under certain conditions and that he or she would have to follow the conditions set down by the court. And I..."

Mautino: "Does that mean if, in fact, a person is deemed guilty by reason of insanity then assigned to a mental health facility, they can be later released under mandatory supervision..."

Daniels: "Our problem is this has nothing to do with being found guilty by reason of insanity. This is merely the question of fitness to stand trial."

Mautino: "Okay. Now, how do we get to mandatory supervised release which is in the Synopsis and also the Amendment? I want somebody to explain that to me."

Daniels: "I don't have your Synopsis, Representative. So, I can't comment on what your Synopsis says."

Mautino: "It's in the Digest. Am I reading wrong on page 78? It says, 'provides for extension of treatment period up to a maximum 15 months for a Class 2,3, and 4 felony, adds or mandatory supervised release to phase providing for parole after determination of court when defendant has been in custody of the Department of Mental Health.' Will somebody explain that to me? Is the Digest incorrect?"

Daniels: "I'm advised by staff that that is a technical Amendment which sets forth the language to eliminate the reference to parole and really it's not a provision of this Bill as it relates to its passage and the subject we're dealing with. The language that was used in the



Amendment is within the Bill. However, it referred back to the statutory language that has been previously passed and is not really an essential part of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 133 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 130 voting 'aye', 9 'nays', 2 'present', and Senate Bill 133, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 139, Pullen."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 139, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 139 was approved by the House Judiciary Committee on a nine to one vote. It increased the penalties for the fraudulent use of food stamps because the current statute is vague and needs to be corrected in order to be sure that the people who are using food stamps fraudulently can be prosecuted. It increases the penalties so that they will match the penalties for theft of similar values and the Bill is introduced because of an increasing problem in the State of Illinois of food stamp fraud being conducted on a black market and racketeering basis. There are people who are in the business of counterfeiting food stamps and the current law is inadequate in prosecuting them. I urge a favorable vote on Senate Bill 139."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 139. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"



Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates she will."

Bullock: "Representative Pullen, what predicament would this place a senior in who allegedly transfers food stamps to a relative for purchase and this person using the food stamps goes to the supermarket and purchases the groceries for the senior that's an invalid, and at some point in time that senior would be purged from the rolls for the fact that an ineligible person purchased the commodity? Would your Bill hold this as a criminal offense?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "If that type of activity is not authorized by law then it would be a criminal offense because it's already not authorized by law."

Bullock: "One last question; Could it.. Is it conceivable that if this Bill, Senate Bill 139, were to become law that persons for even the smallest minor infraction or violation of this would be held as a Class A misdemeanor or could possibly be convicted of a felony?"

Pullen: "There would be no situation of a conviction of a felony if it were under \$150 unless it was a repeated offense. The Commission of this crime for under \$150 as a first offense would be a Class A misdemeanor just as it is for theft, which this, in fact, is."

Bullock: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to address the Bill for a moment. We have here a Bill which, in effect, will damage the already wanting federal food stamp program which was revised this year by the U.S. Congress eliminating the purchase requirement. I recommend to the Members of this House that they take a close look at this Bill for the persons who obviously will fall victim to it, both seniors and those transit college students that may from time to time have opportunity to use it. Even the smallest infraction which may not exceed \$100, my reading of the Bill, would be considered a criminal offense and a person



could be sentenced up to 2 to 5 years if it's a felony or fined the maximum of \$10,000. I submit to you that this is a very bad Bill and it certainly ought to be defeated."

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

Johnson: "Well, with all due respect to the previous speaker, I would suggest that he look at the existing criminal law in Illinois and simply realize that this Bill fits into one of those gaps that our law has overlooked. Existing law says that if you steal personal property less than \$150 in value, it's a misdemeanor. A second offense is a Class 4 felony and likewise, at any theft in excess of \$150 is a felony 'abonitia'. That's what the law is now and this simply puts this area into the existing criminal code. We're not going to try to penalize people who are legitimately using food stamps. We're not going to penalize people who are legitimately in need. In fact, our laws encourage the use of food stamps for the programs.. for the intent for which the programs were established. All this does is say like any other law that if.. that if you commit what's the equivalent of theft and the standards are actually higher than the theft provisions in the criminal code, that it ought to be treated like any other theft. And I don't think that's unreasonable. We're not penalizing people who honestly use them. We're simply penalizing those people who are using them in an unauthorized manner and in such a manner that they meet a higher standard and have committed the requisite perimeters of a theft under the Illinois criminal code. Representative Pullen got this Bill out unanimously in Committee, support from both sides of the aisle, all philosophical backgrounds and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

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



Braun: "Lady, not Gentleman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "I noticed that a long time ago. I'm sorry about that."

Braun: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with all due difference to the Sponsor of this Bill, this is a terrible Bill. It does not just go to theft of food stamps. It goes to the possession or transfer thereof. If an individual possessed or transferred food stamps under \$150 worth of value, that person could go to jail for up to one year and pay a fine of up to \$1,000. Now, that would mean of course, if my sister Pullen were to hand me her food stamps and I were arrested for some other reason, my incarceration could be aggravated by.. under the terms of this legislation. Now, in.. I appeal to all of you, it is one thing for us all to be very.. all to be concerned about the misuse of the food stamp program, but to draft legislation that is this broad and attach to it criminal penalties that would have people go to jail for possession of food purchase warrants I think is uncalled for and I respectfully urge a 'no' vote on this legislation."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates.. she indicates she will."

Beatty: "Representative, these are federal food stamps, I believe. Is there.. Are there.. At the present time are there federal laws governing these misuse of food stamps?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Yes, there are."

Beatty: "So, you already have a law governing what you're trying to do on the state level. Is that correct?"

Pullen: "Yes, I do believe that for many people state prosecution might be preferable than federal prosecution."



Beatty: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Tim Simms. Oh, you're light's on. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. The examples brought out by the opponents of the measure are not correct. The one opponent mentioned that if you were to take some food stamps on behalf of a senior citizen, would you, in fact, be violating the statute. The answer is 'no', because it provides that the unauthorized use or possession only leads to the creation of the crime. If you have the permission of the person, you are not in violation of the Act. So what we are doing is punishing the unauthorized use. It's just like being in possession of stolen property. Now that violation is a Class B misdemeanor... Class A rather. Now, however, where the Class 3 felony comes into affect is only when you knowingly alter or use, acquire, possess, or transfer, alter food stamps. And you have to knowingly do so. So, if you're knowingly trafficking in altered food stamps, then you are violating the statute and that's a Class 3 felony. But all in all, the Bill is a reasonable approach to a serious problem and that is the trafficking in stolen food stamps or the trafficking in altered food stamps. This vote... This measure here certainly deserves an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, based upon what the last Gentleman just spoken said I think that this is a bad Bill. There's no way of proving it and I solicit your 'no' vote."

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



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

Speaker Matijevidh: "Representative Waddell 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 prevails. Representative Pullen to close."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a needed Bill, not only because the black market and racketeering in food stamps is victimizing the users of those food stamps as well as those who must accept them, but also because the current law might very well subject some of those that some of the Members of this House have expressed concern about to prosecution, without any kind of discretion. This Bill inserts the word knowingly into the statute so that someone would have to actually know that he is committing a crime. He would have to be altering or transferring in an unauthorized manner food stamps for an unauthorized purpose. This is indeed a type of theft and the penalties in our law should be equivalent to those of theft and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevidh: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 139. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 139 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, many of us have been moved as we've read the story of John Val Jean in Les Miserables. This man was incarcerated for stealing a loaf of bread. It appears to me that a 'yes' vote on this Bill gives us a modern versinn of Jaan Val Jean in our laws, or the possibility of that."

Speaker Matijevidh: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, to explain his vote. One minute."



Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a 'yes' vote here is a knee jerk reaction to a problem. This area is already covered by federal legislation and by the State Criminal Statutes. Just to read to you what it says; it says, 'No person shall knowingly use federal food stamps in any manner not authorized by law or the rules and regulations of the Illinois Department of Public Aid.' Well, I wonder how many lawyers in the House of Representatives know the rules and regulations of the Illinois Department of Public Aid. This is much too broad. It's penalizing people who are already covered by federal and state statutes. It's unnecessary and we should all be voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Carol, I'm sorry, you can't... You spoke in debate. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'aye', 27 'no', 6 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 139, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 185, Davis. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 185 by Senator Grotberg was introduced as a measure that hopefully will act as a deterrent value .. have some deterrent value in the penal institutions, the maximum security penal institutions in the State. As amended it came out of the Senate a much different Bill, but as amended in the fine House Judiciary II Committee it now provides a Class 1 felony penalty for anyone who knowingly and without authority carries in his possession any knives, explosive, firearm, or firearm ammunition. That's



simply what the Bill does. It's in response to the Pontiac riot and the shakedown of a state Bill and all the other correctional institutions where weapons are such a problem and I would urgently solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Davis has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 185. There is no debate. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 185 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'aye', 4 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 185, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 40... The Minority Leader, George Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "For the purpose of an introduction, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Ryan: "In the balcony here to the right above you, is the wife of one of our colleagues, Gordan Ropp. Mrs. Ropp and Gordan have been married 24 years today and Mrs. Ropp is here to see how he's behaving. Congratulations."

Speaker Matijevich: "She has our sincere condolences. The.. I believe I declared that Bill passed, Senate Bill 185. The next Bill, Senate Bill 406, Ewing."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 406, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tom Ewing, the Gentleman.. Proceed, Tom.... from Livingston."

Ewing: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill makes an appropriation of one million dollars for the purpose of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority Act. And it's effective in January of 1980. This is one agency in which we have invested state funds which has never lost a dime. In fact, all the money that we have



put into this agency in the past is still intact. It's a revolving fund which is used to promote industrial development in the State of Illinois. Last year we expanded this agency so it now operates in 90 some counties in the State of Illinois. These funds will help us to carry on its work and encourage the location of new industry in this state, the expansion of present industry and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 406. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "Representative Ewing, how are these funds used in this industrial development fund?"

Ewing: "They're loaned out to private business for the construction of plant and equipment."

Griesheimer: "And what is the interest rates on this particular loan?"

Ewing: "It depends on the market. It's not set by statute, Ron."

Griesheimer: "Alright. Are they below market rate to encourage business to develop here in Illinois?"

Ewing: "It's my understanding they are."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Griesheimer: "First of all, I'd like to say that I'm very much in favor of this Bill, but I would like to bring to the attention of this House, as I attempted to do through Resolution, a Resolution which was not called, that was placed on the Speaker's table, the State of Wisconsin has invaded the State of Illinois economically. And to those of you that aren't aware of it, we should be aware of it from every four corner of this state because every state surrounding us is taking advantage of our economic



plight. State of Wisconsin in the counties of DuPage and Lake have physically gone into those counties and went... gone to business that intended to expand or businesses that intended to locate and literally have bribed them into moving to Wisconsin in pointing out to them our rather bad unemployment compensation rates, our bad workmen's compensation rates, our terrible situation on our tax situation, and when one business said it had established in Illinois for 50 years and didn't think it should leave its home base, and pointed out further that it felt the Legislature had realized it... the error of its ways, the people from Wisconsin went one step further and said, 'You don't know what you're talking about. The Illinois Legislature is trying to impose a new tax in place of the corporate personal property tax to further increase your taxes.' This particular industrial development fund is one of the few areas where the State of Illinois really makes an attempt to do something for business. I suggested to the Governor that he declare war on the State of Wisconsin for economic purposes, to show Wisconsin that they cannot get away with this, taking advantage of our bad situation economically here in the State of Illinois. Although this was probably a tongue in cheek effort in my part, I wanted to see the Governor make some effort to do something about this very serious problem. Further support for this particular Bill may be indicated in a situation that Wisconsin has at the present time, whereby the city of Kenosha is actually buying up industrial 'developable' property, developing it completely and selling it for 8 thousand dollars an acre. In the State of Illinois, similarly developed property goes for 60 thousand dollars an acre. If you were in business in Illinois and had the opportunity to buy property at about 1/10th of what you could buy for in Illinois you would certainly leave the State of Illinois.



As we lose business we lose jobs. The labor is hurt. Business is hurt. The economy is hurt. We lose workers. We lose taxpayers. And the more tax money we lose, the worse the shape is in economically. I think this Bill is one of the few efforts in the State to do something affirmative for business. We must support this type of legislation. It's good legislation. And hopefully next year we will see that it's expanded."

Speaker Matijevich: "I was afraid we'd get into this. The Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Griesheimer has been flailing it at the stories put out by the Illinois Association of Manufacturing and the State Chamber of Commerce which have been erroneous and they've been riding that way for a long time, putting out erroneous information. I talk about the latest editorial about the corporate taxes, 40 states have corporate income taxes higher than Illinois. Thirty nine states have personal income taxes that are greater than Illinois...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook... , Representative J.J. Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: " I would appreciate it if the Gentleman would confine his remarks to Senate Bill 406 which is the matter before this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think he has a point, although the same point could have been made on Representative Griesheimer's remarks, so.."

Giorgi: "And yesterday, we were very kind and we didn't... we acted like we didn't catch the Minority Leader putting out a.. a new story that was in abrogation of House rules, Representative Ryan. We let you get away with it yesterday, but in as much as some of your henchmen are flailing at the same trough, we want to talk about it a little bit. Caterpillar was in here talking to



Governor Thompson, the Democratic Leaders about the corporate tax rate replacement. Now..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, we're getting some more Members I think you touched a nerve. Let's stick to the Bill. I've got about ten lights that you turned on..."

Giorgi: "Yes, but Mr. Speaker, someone should have called Representative Grieman to order because he was climbing all over...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, did someone raise the point of order when Representative Griesheimer was speaking?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, but they should have."

Schlickman: "I raise a point of order now, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're late. And I couldn't do it. He's my colleague. Proceed, Representative Giorgi."

Unknown: "Stick to the Bill."

Giorgi: "Alright, Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to.. a couple of things I'd like to say, in spite of the doomsayers on the other side of the aisle, there have been 293 thousand jobs increase in Illinois since 1970, 293 thousand jobs. It has kept pace with all the industrial states. We've lost manufacturing jobs like all the industrial states have lost manufacturing jobs because of the droppings... from Japan and West Germany. Our per capita income ... we're the third in per capita income. We're the fifth in population. We're the first in sending food stuffs abroad from the Chicago ports and we're the first in the .. in the per capita income expendable after state and federal taxes. Things don't... we've created more corporations in Illinois in the.. since the '69 than any industrial state in the nation. And we've created more jobs. All I'd like to say is that from now on any.. any statement put forth by the other side of the aisle will be challenged on this side of the aisle if we have to get



up on personal privilege."

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

Skinner: "Yes, would the Sponsor of the Bill yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Skinner: "Could you tell me where the agency is located.. the office is?"

Ewing: "Marion, Illinois."

Skinner: "That's what I was afraid of. Why did this agency... Do you think it's the purpose of this agency to provide money to create jobs in sheltered workshops for retarded people?"

Ewing: "I wouldn't have any idea."

Skinner: "Well, I didn't think that that was the purpose, but I was notified because I happen to have such an agency in my District. That's ... the agency was very proudly announcing that that's what these funds have been used from.. for. And it seems to me that this is not really the creation of the type of jobs which are likely to improve the Illinois's economy measurably. They are primarily.. well, extremely low level jobs. They don't... What they do is generate work, a sense of accomplishment for the people who are in them. I really wish that you would put some legislative intent in here that we're trying to create honest to God productive jobs which are going to pay at least the minimum wage. As you know, in sheltered workshops, they are not required to pay the minimum wage. I just don't think that that's what money like this should go for."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, Representative Skinner, on the list of industries which they have helped finance, I see nothing that would resemble this sheltered workshop. You may have some other agency. But I would also say that those handicapped people



also need jobs. We do a great deal to help them when they do have work and possibly we even help take them off the Public Aid rolls. So, if we are financing them, it might not be all bad, but my list doesn't show that we are."

Skinner: "Well, my letter came from Marion and that's why I asked where the agency was located. I do object to the use of this money for that. I do not object to the use of public money for that, but I think it should come from some type of a welfare budget or mental health budget, rather than a budget which purports to improve the economy. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Polk has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'... saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The main question is put. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "I think that the issue here is very simple. This is a million dollar appropriation for revolving fund. To date not one cent of the money the General Assembly has put into this revolving fund has been lost. We do not anticipate that this will be handled any differently. We have only a three Member staff which handles this work throughout the state. It's been good for labor. It should be good for business and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 406. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 406 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative McClain from Adams to explain his vote."



McClain: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the things I wanted to ask Mr. Ewing was the authority, as far as we can gather, keeps all its money in one bank, a local revolving account in the bank of Egypt in Marion, Illinois and I think that's improper. I think the state's attitude of investing money in all kinds of banks so that it help.. they help local communities in investing their local communities is a good idea and I hope that the authority reconsiders that position."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 5 'nays', 12 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 406, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 513, Wikoff. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 513, a Bill for an Act to revise the distributive.. distribution of expenses of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, has asked leave that Senate Bill 511, a companion substantive Bill to be heard as a package. Does he have leave? Leave. Would you read the Bill 511?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 511, a Bill for an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, on Senate Bills 511 and 513."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With your indulgence I'll explain 513 and Senate Bill 511 is the substantive Bill which permits the appropriation on Senate Bill 513. Senate Bill 513 appropriates 39 thousand 170 dollars from general funds to the State Comptroller's for distribution to reimbursement to employees in groups that were eligible for retroactive sum lump payment in Fiscal Year 1978 who retired that



year and did not receive reimbursement. Due to the ASFME contract those union employees who were in the same situation did get this money. This covers about 390 nonunion employees. It's a one time situation. They just got left at the starting gate and that's basically what the Bill does."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, has moved for the passage of Senate Bills 511 and 513. The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are 147 'aye', no 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. And these Bills, Senate Bill 511 and 513, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 764. Getty. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 764, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich; "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, has asked leave to return Senate Bill 764 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave. The Bill is now on Second Reading. Clerk will read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Stearney, amends Senate Bill 764 on page two, line 28 and so forth."

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

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 would merely change the words, 'three years' to 'two years', before a person could make a motion for expungement of his records."

Speaker Matijevich: "The T.V. has permission for a few minutes to film. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."



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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "What.. How do you become entitled for expungment in theory? What's necessary, Representative?"

Stearney: "Well, assuming you're found, 'not guilty', or you're placed on supervision, the present Act merely provides that upon termination of the period of supervision you may move at that moment for an expungment of the record. This Bill would change that and require a person to wait three years. My Amendment would just change it three to two before a person could move for an expungment."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stearney has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further Amendments. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Amendment was such a very simple one, changing merely the word 'three' to 'two', I wonder if I could have leave to suspend the appropriate rule and proceed with the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has asked leave to consider the Bill on Third Reading. Does he have leave? Leave. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative... The Bill is now on Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, several years ago this House, the Senate, met a problem that we had in the State of Illinois due to the fact that supervision had been declared an invalid order by the Supreme Court since there was no statutory authority for it. An order of supervision has been given for many years in the State of Illinois, principally in the area of giving first



offenders, young people, a second chance. It is a very useful tool in this regard. As a result of that legislation, there has been a proper law which has been utilized very well within this state, to properly give in the appropriate case persons who have committed an offense an order of supervision that gives them the opportunity to not have a permanent criminal record if they follow the orders of the court during the period of supervision. There has been one problem however, that has been uncovered. We have existing law that permits expungment where there is no guilty finding. As a result of this, we have had cases where the lawyer has gone in and obtained an expungment of the order of supervision so that there is no record. Our Judges therefore on a subsequent hearing a different matter would not know that as regards the same offender, supervision had already been given. I suggest to you that this Bill is a very fair and equitable Bill that would permit for a period of two years that record of supervision not to be expunged to prevent a revolving door sort of situation where there would be supervision on supervision. I suggest to you that by passing this we would have a supervision order which was fair and reasonable that could not be expunged for that two year period. After that, and without damage to possible future career, livelihood, the individual could go into court and ask that the records be expunged. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 76 (sic). On that, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, may the Sponsor answer one question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Polk: "I maybe way off base here, so we're clarify it very quickly. What concerns me in expungment, what if you have



a child molester and.. and he applies for a job elsewhere, is it possible for a person who's been a child molester in a home, in a supervised home, in the past, to have his records cleared and then he may re-apply into another agency?"

Getty: "Well, I don't know that this would be exactly what you're talking about. What we are referring to is in those type of cases where supervision would be an appropriate penalty, and I don't know that that would be the case with a child molester, for example. I'd rather doubt it cause the penalties are very severe and usually carry mandatory incarceration..."

Polk: "You see what my point is. I'm just concerned about a certain.. There are certain crimes that I.. that it concerns me when we remove it from their record."

Getty: "That is the law now as regards supervision, that you can get it expunged immediately. This would prohibit expungment until two years after the supervision has been satisfied. So that if your concern was a proper one, I think that you would support this. But the example that you've given is probably not an appropriate example since supervision is almost universally reserved to first offenders and most of the time, to young people."

Polk: "Fine, thank you."

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

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Getty, what is the legal effect of a successfully completed period of supervision?"

Getty: "The individual is discharged."

Cullerton: "It therefore is a find of 'not guilty!'"

Getty: "No, the individual is discharged."

Cullerton: "Well, is is a finding of 'guilty' or 'not guilty'?"

Getty: "It is neither. The individual is discharged."



Cullerton: "Well, when somebody's found 'not guilty', they're discharged too, correct?"

Getty: "That's correct, but that is not the case with supervision."

Cullerton: "Well, do you have a legal.. Do you have a record of a finding of 'guilty' after you've successfully completed supervision?"

Getty: "No, you don't, but you do not have a finding of 'not guilty' either."

Cullerton: "I would like to speak in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Cullerton: "The purpose of the supervision is to give someone a chance to see if they can stay within the law for a certain period of months. Once they have done that, that case is dismissed. It has the legal effect, in my opinion, of a 'not guilty'. The purpose of the Bill then is to allow a Judge to use a finding of 'not guilty' against someone in a subsequent case. I think it defeats the presumption of innocence, the purpose of supervision. Therefore, I'm opposed to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe very deeply in the concept of supervision, to give a young person a second chance, to give a first offender a second chance. I believe that the one loop hole that we have had in the supervision order is that through expungment, through the misuse of expungment, that record is not preserved for any significant period of time. I think a two year period is a fair period so that if that same individual commits another crime, and would be in front of a court, the court would have available to it the record of that prior crime, for a period of two years. That is not unreasonable. I feel that the alternative will be such pressure brought to bear because of misuse, because of supervision on supervision on supervision, that



we will be faced with a Bill to repeal supervision if this is not passed. I think this is a fair and useful middle ground. I believe in order to keep the order of supervision a viable one that this should be passed and I would earnestly solicit your wholehearted support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 764. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 764 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 119 'aye', 26 'nay', 4 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 764, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 790, Jack Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 790, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Davis: "... defender Act which would indeed set up a mechanism in the State of Illinois so that repeat or recidivism juvenile defenders who commit crimes that would be tried as felonies in adult court after the third one of commission or more could be petitioned to have a trial as a habitual juvenile defender and if adjudicated on that particular offense would be incarcerated in a juvenile.. juvenile detention facility in the Department of Corrections for the difference between his age at the time of adjudication and his 21st birthday."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 79. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. There is a way to deal with the young people who commit crimes if they are



so seriously delinquent that you believe that they are beyond the pale, then the law already provides that the State's Attorney may prosecute that young person as an adult. If that happens the fact that you are 13, or 14, or 15 makes no difference. You are treated as an adult and that's..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. For what purpose.. Oh, I'm sorry. Proceed, Representative Katz." I thought he wanted to interrupt. Proceed."

Katz: "That's alright. And if that happens then that's the way to treat a young person who is beyond the pale, who ought to be treated as an adult who is not really a juvenile in the real sense. But if there are young people who can be saved then that's something we ought to pay attention to because every young person, every thirteen-year-old who has committed a crime who can be saved from a life time of crime, you are saving that person and this society from 50 or 60 or perhaps 70 years of incarceration. Now that's what the Juvenile Court Act is all about. The Juvenile Court is designed to try, if possible, to find young people and to find ways of saving them and to not throw them in the adult correction system. If it can't be done the way to do it is to prosecute that young person as an adult. But this Bill proposes to take young people and not prosecute them as an adult, simply to leave them in the juvenile court system and still handle them by putting them in the Department of Corrections for compulsory incarceration. Well, we ought to do one or the other. If the kid we feel is beyond the pale, if he is a tough hardened criminal at 13 or 14 or 15, they can already be taken of. All they have to do is just proceed to prosecute that young person as an adult and that takes care of them and age doesn't make a bit of difference whether they are 14 or 24 or 44. But if they are not that kind of young person, if the people dealing



with them believe that there are family problems, for example, which are being worked out that has resulted in this kind of behaviour, then it certainly makes good sense for us to treat young people of that kind within the juvenile court system having been handled as individuals, trying to save them from the permanent life of crime, and so, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge opposition to Senate Bill 790."

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

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. If I may say, one of the most serious problems confronting our society today is anarchy in the streets, anarchy. You come into various areas of Chicago, and my District is one of them, and you find that these teenagers are terrorists. What is driving the people from the city is not the schools, but the terrorist, the young gangs, and the young thugs on the street. Now, mind you, this Bill here has a cap on it. When we talk about the habitual criminal Act for juveniles, we say until the age of 21. The more so, it provides a day off for every day in, so theoretically an individual can do 3 years in the custody of the Department of Corrections. This is not a habitual criminal Act in which an individual be incarcerated for the rest of his natural life. That is 30 or 40 years. But it has a cap and for that reason. It has a restriction. It's reasonable. I can support it. And I think because it addresses itself to one of the most serious problems in Chicago, this Bill should be passed. It's a needed, vital measure. I don't know if the State will proceed by it. Maybe they'll continue to utilize the present method that is the charge an individual and seek to prosecute them as an adult. But if they don't, maybe this alternative will allow the State to prosecute juveniles and hold them



in custody for some period of time, hoping, hoping, at least to deter crime and to impose on them the sanctions of this society. Thank you. Vote 'yes.'."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I warn you that we have only seen the tip of the iceberg in juvenile offenses. I'm in accord with this Bill and recommend it 'pass'."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield here? "

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "I'm not too sure how I feel about this, but I have a question about why you consider 19 ... 18, 19, and 20 year olds as juveniles."

Davis: "Well, Representative Bluthardt, I don't consider them as juveniles. But the Juvenile Court Act does until they are 21."

Bluthardt: "Well, it seems to me that by law, the person's an adult at 18 in Illinois and while we do have some problems, especially those involving the drinking age, if a juvenile, say 13 or 14 years old, was picked up and convicted as a habitual juvenile, then conceivably he could serve about 8 years in a correction facility. To me that's a heck of a long time for a juvenile at 14, 15, 16 years old to be serving and I could much better accept this Bill if the cap was at 18 rather than 21. Right now I don't think I can support your Bill."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this Bill. I want to point out to the Members of this Body that years ago it was pointed out to them that the



rising edge of crime is juvenile crime. Juveniles under 18 committ 50% of all the crimes in the State of Illinois and perhaps the nation, with one exception, and that is murder, and that is because there are no age limitations to murder, or simply because it's a crime of passion and involves in many cases and in most cases, people who are related. If we ever expect to treat the problem of crime, you have to treat it on the beginning edge and not the fading edge. I do not believe that any number of third or fourth term Bills which might apply to people roughly numbering 100, are going to be effective. This is good legislation and it's the only way you're going to begin to approach the problem. And I would say to those who have a bleeding heart perhaps they have not been hit in the head three times by a young thug with a gun on the street hollering, 'I'm a juvenile,' when he gets caught. This is a good Bill and it deserves to be supported if we want to make inroads on crime at all in the State of Illinois."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "You hold that. We only have one more to speak. So why don't we let him go ahead.. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian.. He's the last one with the light on. Proceed, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would provide for a minimum mandatory sentences.. In some circumstances a minor to be sentenced to a term in a corrections facility for more time than a Class X offender. Now the question of minimum mandatory sentences for adults is a questionable concept. But we have adopted it in certain cases in Illinois. But we are, in this Bill, dealing with minors. As I recall, and I'm not an expert on this, I think Illinois was the first State in the Union to pass



a Juvenile Court Act. We were... We were lauded throughout the country for being so progressive and understanding that children are not adults and that they need the kind of discretionary care that.. that children are entitled to. This Bill would put Illinois probably in the rear of the ranks of states who understand human behaviour and especially how to treat juveniles and I think this is one of the most backward steps this Legislature could ever take and I hope you vote a resounding 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to close ."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to address the last Speaker first, who rose in opposition, I can only say to you that I view this Bill as a step forward in this country with juvenile crime being the largest single segment of crime, and yes, even in rural and small towns all over America. And I think Illinois will become a leader in this particular area and this Bill will be modelled in all of the other 49 states. Now let me address the questions and comments of Representative Bluthardt. Representative Bluthardt, just to allay your fears of the 12 or 13 year old who might be adjudicated an habitual juvenile defender and be incarcerated in a juvenile detention facility, for say, 7 or 8 years, there are good time provisions in the Bill. A day off for a good day served because the Department of Corrections needs that even in juvenile detention facilities. Let me point out to you that the third or multiple adjudication in which this mechanism would work, the third offense or the other offense beyond the third offense, would have to be based on the commission or attempted commission of a murder, voluntary or involuntary manslaughter, rape, or deviate sexual assault, aggravated or heinous battery involving permanent disability or disfigurement, or great bodily harm to the



victim, home invasion, robbery or armed robbery, or aggravated arson. Now if you don't think that there are 13 and 14 and 15 year old kids running around with guns in their hands that are being picked up in a adjudicated felon, being sent to the Department of Corrections, right now, by sentencing Judges in adjudication proceedings in the State of Illinois Juvenile Court, and then being turned loose without going back to that juvenile court by the Department of Corrections to go right back to the neighborhoods, and terrorize the very people that put them in juvenile court in the first place, then you're absolutely wrong. As far as the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary II Committee's opposition, let me say to you, that he would have you have juveniles transferred to adult court to be tried. This Bill addresses juveniles in a juvenile manner and would put the juvenile habitual offender, that kid with 12 or 14 felonies to his string, who goes out and commits aggravated rape or goes out and commits armed robbery, or yes, even murder, would put him in the Department of Corrections with no chance of payroll in a juvenile detention facility until his 21st birthday. Rehabilitation has not worked and society deserves to be protected from this repeat felon even if he's 15, or 16 or, yes, even 14. I urge you to vote for the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Davis has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 790. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 790 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Alexander, to explain her vote."

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition and am going to vote 'no' on this Bill until I can learn whether or not our glorious state has some means of rehabilitation programs or agendas for these juveniles which we're trying to commit now at some time at a minimum of 8



years into their custody. Or will they come back upon the scene of the society at the age 21 and 22 mad with the world and really be a problem to the State of Illinois. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 37 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 790, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I've been now instructed to go to the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate on page 2. Page 2, Senate Bills, Short Debate. First Bill is Senate Bill 107, Friedland."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "This is it, huh, Jack?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This is it."

Speaker Matijevich: "This is that word that Jack has trouble with."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act in relation to chymopapain."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're getting closer every time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 107 would authorize the use by neurosurgeons and orthopedic surgeons and neurosurgeons the use of the enzyme chymopapain in Illinois. As you know this was used from '63 until 1975 in over 15,000 cases with huge success rate. It's manufactured in our State and this measure passed the Senate overwhelmingly and had an excellent hearing in the House Committee and was reported out of the Committee on a vote of 15 to 2 and I'd urge your favorable consideration on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Friedland has moved for the



passage of Senate Bill 107. Nobody stands in debate, the question is.. Alright. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 107 pass?' On that, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, in opposition."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe not so much in opposition but more as a rhetorical question..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, just a minute. We do have somebody in opposition. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to take this off of Short Debate because I think there are a number of people so we if we could get nine other people to raise their hand, we will take it off of Short Debate."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. We do have nine people. It's off Short Debate. Representative Bradley, in opposition."

Bradley: "No, not right now. Go ahead and let Mr. Simms finish."

"
Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Chapman, are you in opposition?"

Chapman: "I surely am, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Chapman: "I was taken unawares because we went apparently from Priority of Call to Short Debate. And I didn't realize we were going to take up this Bill. I think that this Legislature must act with caution and reluctantly in adding upon the approval of a drug which comes under the Federal FDA . For those of you who have heard from the sufferers, I think you need to know that the Bill is probable unnecessary. Because early this year the manufacturer of the drug made up a application to the FDA and the FDA, by the way, does not approve a drug until the manufacturee has asked them to approve it. And this year the 'Baxter Laboratories' made application for approval and a study is taking place right now and probably by the end of the year, if this is a safe and



effective drug, the FDA will have approved it. Now, we won't have done much for the people in approving this Bill since the Governor isn't likely to act on it before September and it wouldn't become effective until October. People ask why hasn't this drug been approved because some, but not all nations, have already approved it. One of the reasons is that at a previous time when there was an application on file, there was a study made and the study showed that the placebo was as effective in treating back pains as the medication chymopapain. So under these circumstances, 'Baxter Laboratories' withdrew their application. Now it seems that this may be a very effective drug and I think we should find out, and give the FDA a chance to look at the scientific evidence. We don't have scientific evidence before us. The Committee 's heard some very fine doctors speak in behalf of chymopapain. But it represents a testimonial on the part of these doctors rather than any kind of scientific evidence. I believe we are acting in haste if this Legislature approves this... the use of this drug in Illinois. This is very similar, by the way, in terms of the issue to the.. this Legislature's approval of laetrile. Now laetrile did not have any medical doctors come out in support of it. And chymopapain has had support from doctors. However, the U.S. Supreme Court has just upheld the laetrileband by the FDA which would prohibit the distribution of the drug. So in voting today on this measure we really are once again calling for law suits that are going to be expensive for the taxpayer and will be fruitless in terms of any results."

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

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think to a certain degree Representative Chapman has indicated some of the reservations that I have dealing with the



passage of this legislation. I think that her parallel drawing with the recent Supreme Court decision dealing with the topic and the use of the drug laetrile, is a very closely and a very similar type of situation where the Federal Food and Drug Administration had not approved this drug. I think that by the passage of this legislation, once again we are setting ourselves up as a different type of entity without the approval of the Federal government. The United States Supreme Court reasserted the power of the FDA over a medical applications and I think to pass House.. Senate Bill 107 at this time would be extremely premature and I think the most appropriate thing might be to place this on the Spring Calendar or hold it until fall until after the FDA has had the opportunity to review the application that was filed by the appropriate laboratory. Until that time, I think to pass this Bill might border on the area of being somewhat irresponsible. "

Speaker Matijevich : "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems very odd when people are opposed to a measure they keep quoting, 'the federal government, the FDA,' and those agencies that want to stop something. But here we have a situation where it's been proven, not having taken any treatments, but I thought if I ever had a back injury of that consequence, I certainly would look into it. But here we have a situation where ten to 20 thousand people have been treated successfully with this medication and if you've ever seen those who have gone through the 'limanectomy' or 'hydrorectomy' or a fusion, you know that they have continuing pain even after they've gone through those medical treatments. And here we have a pain reliever that's been administered by medical men who are licensed to practice medicine in all fields



in the State of Illinois, who are qualified to make a judgement and to do this treatment without surgery, and the patients who have had it have shown remarkable if not complete cures by it. It seems to me the people in the State of Illinois ought to make the determination themselves if they want this kind of medical treatment. And I say the federal government ought to let our physicians in Illinois treat the patients who are having back trouble and this is one means of doing it. If the people want it, we should let them have the treatment. And I favor the vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "As I understand it, the Department of Public Health in the Illinois State Medical Society opposed this Bill. Could you enlighten me as to why they oppose it?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. They did testify against the measure in Committee. However, the Medical Society did have good words about it, but they were just against the measure. They stated that they thought it was more effective than Laetrile and the Department brought a Gentleman from the FDA who.. who's Department has had over 13 years to investigate this and the reason for the delay in that is that the laboratory withdrew its application for approval of this drug. But what the Lady from Cook neglected to tell you was they continue to manufacture it for sales to other countries, including Canada. As you know, our former colleague, Representative LaFleur, has had this treatment successfully and we can always have back surgery and operations, but this would be one step... extremely less costly and provides for less hospitalization time too."



Tuerk: "Well, is this .. This drug is manufactured as I understand it, in Canada."

Friedland: "No, it's in Illinois.... manufactured."

Tuerk: "Manufactured in Illinois?"

Friedland: "Correct."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

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

Bradley: "I'd just like to follow up on the point that Mr. Tuerk was making, I think, on the place that it's manufactured. It is manufactured in Illinois. However, even if we would pass this Bill, which I am opposing, the .. we do not have the federal regulations approving the manufacturing even though it is in Illinois and we would pass this law in Illinois because of the interstate commerce situation involving the other states and the federal government simply has not approved this legislation.. this medicine at this time. So we have some real problems in preempting the FDA. So it's a Bill I think that's been many of the points I was going to make have been made by Representative Chapman. I think there's something to look at here regarding the possibility of malpractice suits. It seems to me, if I am reading it correctly, that we are saying to the hospitals... and positions that just by using this.. you're not completely exempt from malpractice. But they're almost saying you cannot be sued for malpractice simply by the use of this drug. But I think we have by preempting the federal government, we are certainly losing statewide some of the protection that we receive through the FDA and so I think that we might be a step ahead of ourselves in passing this Bill in spite of the good Sponsor that is handling the Bill."

Friedland: "Well, thank you for the question, Representative Bradley. I would point out to you that Indiana recently passed this legislation and it was signed by Indiana's



Governor who is a physician, an M.D., and is going to take effect August 15th and I can assure if this is enacted in Illinois and a few other states, there will be other companies wanting to make this enzyme and drug too."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Epton 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 Kane, Representative Friedland, to close."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd urge a favorable consideration of this important measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Friedland has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 107. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 107 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this legislation and encourage others to do it. There are many people in this state and in this country that use this drug who's effectiveness have been indicated even to be much better than the issue of laetrille we considered last year. By not approving it we are going to force patients who want to use it to go out of the country for health care. It just seems a crime that in this country, the one that prides itself on the greatest health care system in the world, that we have to force patients to go out of the country to find a means to cure their pain. The FDA's history has been one to prevent more good medicine to



to come on the market in this country than it has for safety of drugs. And I see that we have enough votes, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Members of the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz to explain his vote. One minute."

Marovitz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have enough votes.

I think we've heard a lot of testimony . Thousands of people have been helped by this drug. It's a good piece of legislation and..."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye's, 22 'nay's, 3 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 107, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 122. Kornowicz."



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 122. Kornowicz."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act relating to garnishment. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kornowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 122 repeals an Act relating to the wage deductions for benefit of creditors. This Bill affects only garnishments on the employees wages rather than a wage assignment. The garnishment will require a court order to be enforced..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed. I'm sorry. Proceed Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Assignment requires an employee's prior approval to process a securing loan. This Bill would include.. exclude pensions benefits, refunds and deductions from garnishment by court order only. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 122. In opposition, Representative Leinenwber, from Will. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have one question. I would still be in opposition, but I would like to know whether or not the synopsis is accurate. I don't think it is. And I'm looking at the Bill and it says, 'repeals an Act relating to wage deductions for benefit of creditors.' Is that still the Bill or is the Bill... the paragraph regarding benefits and refunds by pension or retirement funds?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "That's the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's the Bill."

Leinenweber: "The Amendment.. Alright, in other words, it no longer repeals the Wage Deduction Act. Is that correct?"



Kornowicz: "That's right."

Leinenweber: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly in opposition to the Bill; Many people.. their only asset which they can pledge in order to get credit is their retirement benefit. Now, we're going to prohibit a creditor from being able to reach these benefits. We're going to prohibit the retiree from having an asset. with which to pledge in order to get credit. In other words, we're going to prohibit a retiree from getting credit. I don't think we want to do this. It will prevent a retiree often who are people who are better able to repay their loans and younger people who are working. There's just absolutely no reason at all to prohibit the retiree from being able to get credit in order to buy merchandise from the retail market. Now, I just don't see why in the world we should do this and I would urge the Membership to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz to close."

Kornowicz: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 122. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 122 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Giorgi is raising his hand,,but he's not voting my switch. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, what this Bill does, it's intended to protect workers' monies paid into the Pension Fund from garnishment. For this Amendment credit is made to attempt to garnish a person's wages, but not that portion put into the Pension Fund. I think it's a good Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Freidrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are lot of well intentioned things which actually have a reverse effect. When you make it more difficult for someone to



collect, you all so make it more difficult for someone to lend because unless they have some reasonable chance of collecting, they're not going to lend. So every time you do this, you are depriving somebody of credit that they could have and I don't know why you don't understand that."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 votes 'aye', 46 'no', 3 'present'. Senate Bill 122, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 263. Griesheimer."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 263, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to adoption of persons and to repeal the Act herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to return this to Second Reading."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does he have leave to return the Bill back to Second Reading? He has leave. The Bill is on Second Reading. The Clerk will read the Amendment."

Griesheimer: "This is a motion, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Griesheimer: "The motion is to table House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 263."

Speaker Matijevich: "The motion is to table House Amendment #... Committee Amendment or House Amendment?"

Griesheimer: "Committee Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Committee Amendment #1. Who's the Chairman of the Committee?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe.. Have you worked it out with him?"

Griesheimer: "No, I have not. This is at the request of the



Senate Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "I wonder if in fairness to the Spons... the Chairman of the Committee, if you could hold this for a while?"

Griesheimer: "Alright, I'll be glad to."

Speaker Matijevich: "Because he's not here. We'll hold that for a moment. Alright. Senate Bill 300. Taylor. I don't see Taylor on the floor. Senate Bill 313. Deuster. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 313, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 313 is a Bill that was requested by the Illinois Commission on Children and what it does is to allow children to receive the services that they would if they were found to be dependent in those instances where the parents are not necessarily neglectful. What the Bill provides is a new condition under which a child may be found to be dependent and give them the services of the Department of Children and Family Services and that is where the child is without proper medical or other remedial care through no fault, neglect, or lack of concern on the part of his parents. Sometimes the parents need help for the children and it's necessary under existing law for the parent either to concede or have the court records show that the parent was neglectful. This, Senate Bill 313 would avoid that necessity and allow the children to receive the care where the parents were really not neglectful, but just not capable of helping the child. There is an Amendment that was adopted to make sure that none of the orders that would be entered in any way would limit parental rights or take away the rights of the parents. As I say this was recommended by



the Department of Children and Family Services and I urge adoption of Senate Bill 313."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 313. There's no opposition. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 313 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 136 'aye', 1 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 313, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 324. Al Ronan."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 324, a Bill for an Act to add a Section to the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, big Al."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's a very simple Bill. What it does, it amends the Criminal Code to create a Section to find the offense of criminal trespass to restricted areas and restricted landing areas at airports. I put this Bill in to protect all of us. We all fly on airplanes and we don't want people going around and sabotaging them. I move for favorable consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ronan has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 324. In opposition, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure that this Bill is everything it appears to be. I think it's a lot more. First of all there is already a crime on the books of criminal trespass and it's a Class D misdemeanor. This would make it a Class A misdemeanor. However, what this Bill does which I think is very questionable, it allows the airport itself to change from time to time what it deems to be a restricted area and it can do so orally as well as by writing and by posting. And it can change



this from day to day. I'm not sure that we should delegate to any airport the right to impose a Class A misdemeanor at their own whim. But further than that, the Bill has some language in here that.. that refers to certain kinds of groups or organizations and it's very possible that it is intended to create a Class A misdemeanor for persons exercising their First Amendment right. It may.. It may be an attempt to limit or prohibit religious groups and other organizations from doing the things that have been an annoyance to me and perhaps to some of you, but I really question why this Bill is before us. One other thing it was assigned to Judiciary II and a hearing was called and for some strange reason after some testimony was taken, it was reassigned to Transportation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan, to close. It's on Short Debate, Representative Skinner. Representative Ronan to close."

Ronan: "It's obvious I disagree with Representative Mugalian. I feel that the people who run airports do know what areas should be restricted. We shouldn't be interfering with the operation of airports except to protect airplanes and this Bill will do that and obviously protect airline passengers. I move for its consideration. It did come out of the Transportation almost.. Transportation Committee almost unanimously where it got a full hearing and was throughly discussed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ronan has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 324. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 324 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Representative Mugalian's question, an answer.. It's found in the Republican staff analysis. It says the Bill is probably not void for vagueness, but neither is it a



model for precision. Now, if it had gone through Judiciary Committee it wouldn't have any chance whatsoever, as all of us know. But we, in Transportation don't worry about picky little details. We just vote it out."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inexplaining my vote, I'd like to raise two points. First of all, I think this is a very, very good Bill, a Bill that's needed for the adequate protection of all airports, small and large alike. I feel this will add to the safety of the general public and also the safe operation of those airports. The second reason, of greater importance, this is the first Bill of Representative Ronan's I've supported. I think it's a very fine Bill, I commend him for his efforts."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye', 28 'nay', 7 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 324, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 404. Ewing."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 404, a Bill for an Act relating to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority and the Commission for Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Ewing... out of the record. Out of the record. Senate Bill 432. O'Brien or Marovitz. Senate Bill 432."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 432, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Is O'Brien back there? I can't see. Neither O'Brien, nor Marovitz.. Out of the record. Senate Bill



494.. Sharp.. Out of the record. Schneider, you don't want to handle that either? Out of the record. Senate Bill 509. Henry or Hannig. Henry's ready. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 509, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 509 restores the penalty provisions of the State Consumer Finance Act. Presently Illinois is now one of the few states in the nation that does not provide consumers with a means to obtain redress from a lending institution when these institutions fail to abide by the financial disclosure requirement of the law. Senate Bill 509 is supported by the Illinois Legal Assistance Program, Household Finance Cooperation, and agreed Amendments have been made. I have no knowledge of any opposition. I ask for your support of Senate Bill 509 and passage of a people Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? Anyone speak in opposition? The question is, 'Shall House pass Senate Bill 509?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Bruce, want to get me over there?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Lechowicz in the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye', 5 'no', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 553."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 553, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 553 is a result of the work of the



Special Education Subcommittee, the School Problems Commission, and clarifies some language that we got involved in last Session on Transportation for part time special education students and provides that this transportation will be related directly to the individual educational program set up to deal with the child's specific handicap condition. I would ask for your support for this Bill. There's no opposition, to the best of my knowledge.

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone else to speak in opposition?"

The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 553 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 565."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 565, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retail Installment Sales Act and Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Getty? Let's go."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent to have Representative Marovitz's name replaced as the principle Sponsor. I have filed a motion in that regard and Representative Marovitz has indicated he would like to be the principle Sponsor of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks unanimous consent. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Marovitz is the Sponsor of the Bill. Mr. Marovitz, you on the floor? You want to take it out of the record? Senate Bill 567."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record by request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 617. Mr. Cullerton, you on the



floor? John? 617. Out of the record. Senate Bill 628.
Mr. Bower. Read the Bill. 628."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act to add Sections
to the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

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

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I want to hold this. I've got an Amend-
ment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. 651 out of the
record. 715. Mr. Telcser. Mr. Telcser. Want to hear
Senate Bill 715? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 715, a Bill for an Act to amend Sec-
tions of an Act in relation to the founding and operation
of the University of Illinois Hospital. Third Reading
of the Bill."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 715
simply gives the same medical benefits at the University
of Illinois Medical campus to the dentists who work at
the hospital that is currently provided to the physicians.
The Bill is a simple Bill and I believe it passed out
of the House Education Committee without a dissenting
vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question
is, 'Shall Senate Bill 715 pass?' All in favor vote
'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Bruce. Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the
record. On this question there's 147 'aye', no 'nay',
none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received
the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Senate Bill 739."

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

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

Gaines: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This makes a few



housekeeping changes in the Fair Employment Practice Act. It changes 'Chairman' to 'Chair person' and changes the title of hearings to that of adjudicator and says that anyone who hires 50 or more employees for 20 more weeks prior to the infraction as well as those who hire for 20 weeks in the given year, shall be covered by the Act. And the Republican staff analysis says, 'not a great vital more employees will be covered through this Bill.' And we ask for a vote... a favorable vote in the House."

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

Wolf: "Is this Short Debate, or can I ask questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Short Debate. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 739 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye', 12 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 768."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 768, a ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Mr. O'Brien on the floor? Mr. O'Brien? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 811."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 811, a Bill for an Act to amend the Judges Retirement System Article of the Illinois Pension Code . Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #2 and Amendment #1 have been deleted so we have a very simple Bill and I believe there is no opposition to this Bill. It's been put in by the Judge... the trustees of the Judges' Retirement System and has been described as a clean-up measure which.. it does a number of items. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 811 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye';



all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye', 12 'nay', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 824."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 824, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 824, sponsored by the Chairman and Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate.... What it does is it changes the due date for the submission of appropriation Bills from the first Friday in April to two Legislative days after the budget message. This would allow the Legislature and the Appropriations Committee the additional time needed to look over appropriation Bills rather than the rather short time that we have now. Let me point out that many wonder what the opposition to various Bills is. This is a unique proposal in that it has gone through the Senate Committee, the Senate, and through the House Committee 19 to nothing just last week and it is only opposed by the Governor, the Bureau of the Budget, and every agency of state government. But that's what makes the Bill good because the bureaucracy does not want us to have the time to scrutinize the various details and items of the budget and it takes a lot more time than we're allowed statutorily now. I ask you favorable vote on Senate Bill 824."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 824 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye', 1 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional



Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 567."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend
a Section of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for going back to that.

There was a temporary problem. But Senate Bill 567 deals
with consumer ed. The Committee taking the... The House
Committee taking the recommendations of the School
Problems Commission modified the law to change the re-
quirement which listed eighth grade to nine through twelve.
So in effect what we do is delete eighth grade, allow
the Superintendent of Public Instruction of I.O.E.
rather, to provide program suggestions for the school
from nine through twelve. It's not a dramatic change,
but an acceptable one and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question
is, 'Shall Senate Bill 567 pass?' All in favor vote
'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.
On this question there's 149 'aye', 1 'no', 1 recorded
as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitu-
tional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill
861. Mr. Sharp. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 861, a Bill for an Act in relation
to surface coal mining fees and the use of their fees.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Senate Bill 861 declares that the recovery of coal from
mining waste is both an energy conservation measure in
age and mine land reclamation. It provides that aban-
donned land mine reclamation funds are to used in part
for purpose of coal recovery. This Bill will encourage
greater use of our coal supplies in Illinois and at the
same time it will help clean up our environment. The
Bill was introduced in the Senate and received overwhelm-



ing Senate approval. It directs that land reclamation include recovery of coal from gob piles and slurry ponds. These mining wastes contain a high percentage of recoverable coal. This Bill seems.. seeks to recover this coal by using federal money. Funds would be used for a survey to identify gob and slurry sites in the amount of recoverable coal. Lower interest loans would then be made available to finance recovery of the coal. This program would cost the state nothing and we could increase our available energy supplies while we are cleaning up our environment. I would ask for a favorable Roll.Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Yes, I have a question. Is it my understanding that federal law requires that this money be used for reclamation purposes? So is it possible to give this to counties to use as they see fit?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jimmy, did you hear the question?"

Rea : "Under Section 402 of the Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of '77 it levied a tax of 15¢ per ton for underground mine coal and 35¢ per ton of surface mine coal and these taxes are used to establish an abandoned mine reclamation fund. These... The federal monies are returned to the state on a 50¢ for each dollar that they have collected and this does fit within the use that they specify. As far as to the counties being designated , back to the county, I couldn't answer that."

Bower: "You're saying, on other words, there is no restriction in federal law for the use of this money, to your knowledge."

Rea: "This would fit within .. This has been checked and would certainly fit within the .. what the guidelines that have been set up by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of '77."



Bower: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 861 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robbins: "I think this is.. I think everyone should vote green on this Bill because the government is .. Since the farmer only got a nickle a ton for that coal when it's mined and he don't get anything out of this reclamation thing, I think it's a good Bill. It gives..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question theré's 152 'aye', no 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill. Senate Bill 871."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 871, a Bill for an Act to amend the..."

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

Conti: "I want to take it off Short Debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 907. Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell. What purpose do you seek recognition?"

Waddell: "A point of question. Is my light working up there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can't hear you."

Waddell: "Is my light working?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's working now."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're welcome. Senate Bill 907."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 907, a Bill for an Act to amend the Higher Education Student Assistant Laws of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate



Bill 907 amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Law. Presently the Illinois State Scholarship Commission accepts applications from individuals not yet admitted or enrolled in a qualified institution. The ISSC believes that it is in the best interests of these individuals to know what financial aid if any they will receive before they make final determination as to which school they wish to attend. Recently, however, the Auditor General has noted that this practice may be in violation of a 1957 law. Senate Bill 907 would change that 1957 law to allow the ISSC to continue to practice what they presently engage in. This Bill passed the Senate 50 to nothing. It passed the House Committee on Higher Education 14 to nothing and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 907 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Bruce. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 'aye', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 975."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 975, a ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor."

Senate Bill 983, Mr. Pierce? Mr. Pierce. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 983, a Bill for an Act to enact the Energy Conservation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 983 is a .. enacts the Energy Conservation Act. It's endorsed by the Energy Resources Commission and it authorizes the establishment of state and local programs to conserve energy and to hopefully generate federal funds for thermal and lighting standards. It's a voluntary program and it's to be done in cooperation with the Institute for Natural Resources. There was



no opposition to the Bill in Committee and I urge the adoption of Senate Bill 983."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "The Sponsor... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "There was supposedly a technical Amendment that was being drafted for this Bill. Has it yet arrived and been adopted?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pierce please."

Pierce: "You're not talking about Senate Amendment #1, are you?"

Darrow: "No."

Pierce: "Oh, I see. There was a House... a technical Amendment. You're right. I don't believe it has been and I think maybe we're going to need to bring it back to Second and to adopt it...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to bring it back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Pierce: "I don't believe the Amendment has been circulated, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has the Amendment been circulated, Mr. Clerk on 983?"

Pierce: "We'll take it out of the record and I'll file an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill... We'll leave it on Third."

Pierce: "Oh, excuse me. The Amendment has been distributed. So I offer the adoption...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Does the Gentleman have leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment? Any objection? Hearing none, Second Reading. You want to..."

Pierce: "I thought it was a Committee Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Pierce, amends Senate Bill 983 on page one..."

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



Amendment #1. Move the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The question is, 'It's a technical Amendment; What do the technicalities do?' Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Amendment that was circulated is the same Amendment as we have now, so I would like to hold this on Second for a minute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. We'll hold the Bill on Second Reading. Senate Bill 1038, Third Reading. Mr. Pierce, you ready with that Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act ..."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I just filed an Amendment on that Bill and I would like it returned to Second. The Amendment hasn't been distributed as yet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we just leave it on Third then? When it's distributed, we'll get back to it. Alright?"

Pierce: "Alright."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1047."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act to amend the Dram Shop Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1047 amends the Dram Shop Act and provides that the Illinois Liquor Control Commission has the power to fine anywhere up to \$500. Presently the Commission can only suspend or revoke liquor license. This Bill will give them the power to fine in the amount of up to \$500. Also, by Amendment, the Bill would provide that the Lake View Museum about the fines in Peoria will be allowed to sell alcohol liquors and all the fines collected by local and state Liquor Control Commissions will be used to .. for education for the use of child abuse... alcohol ... for alcoholic abuse and pre-



vention of alcoholism. So I move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1047?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote ... I said it was on Third Reading. Clerk will correct the Board. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grieman, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Grieman please."

Grieman: "I'm going to vote 'no' on this. This is a very substantial diminution of the penalty. The truth of the matter is that people who are in the liquor industry and the retailers industry who may suffer from having their door closed, that's very significant and this... liquor laws if they can, they really adhere to those laws if possible simply because the threat of suspension is very, very great. Up to... levying them a fine and it's not a minimum fine, it's up to \$500. You can find yourself fined, you know, \$25 in cost, \$50 in cost and what we'll do is, we will end up trivializing violations by liquor store owners into being like traffic cases and that's about what this Bill is going to do and I really recommend a vote 'no'. I think it will have a very substantial impact on the enforcement of the liquor laws in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston. Timer's on."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this Bill. What this Bill permits is a fine which will keep the liquor licensed establishment open so that the licensee can earn money and at the same time the State of Illinois will not lose money from sales tax and other taxes that the state collects. A fine will serve the same purpose and at the same time the state will continue to receive revenues. And I think



this is a good Bill. It is wanted and desired by the local Liquor Control Commissioner of Chicago and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Willer: "Well, it seems pretty silly to me that we just raised the drinking age back up to 21 because we're worried about young people consuming liquor and now we're going to turn around and vote this end and say, 'Well, if you do sell liquor, you know, we're going to slap your wrists.' I think it's pretty inconsistent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye', 25 'no', 31 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1061."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1061, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson. Abramson please."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1061..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What?"

Abramson: "He cut me off. .. Amends the Illinois Banking Act and the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. It removes conflicts between the current confidentiality Sections of this Act and with other statutes. And also it expands the notice provision to customers in the event that records are to be closed. The current Act has been enjoined by a court because of these conflicts and this will put the Act back into operation. It's the same as House Bill 1128 and 29 that we passed earlier. I move the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "May I ask a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's out of order, but proceed."

Stearney: "The Digest seems to read that the Director of Revenue has the power to release state income tax returns to any governmental agency. Is that the law?"

Abramson: "This doesn't have anything to do with income tax returns. The only thing that this deals with income tax is like when you get a 1099, the statement of interest, okay, under the current confidentiality Act it's technically prohibited for a bank to issue these things. This makes an exception for that so the routine business transaction of the bank deals that."

Stearney: "Right. One moment. The Digest reads that.. It says that it requires the Director of the Department of Revenue to give five days notice to a taxpayer before releasing his state income tax returns to any governmental agency."

Abramson: "That Digest is incorrect."

Stearney: "Oh, it is."

Abramson: "It was amended on Second Reading."

Stearney: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1061 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye', 1 'nay', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1085."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1085, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Shelter Care Homes, and Homes for the Aged Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1085 is a simple Bill. All it does is it requires



that when the Department of Public Health notifies a licensee of its intent to revoke or refuse to renew a license or deny application for one, it must also notify the local license agency and has jurisdiction over that facility. That's all the Bill does and I move for the adoption ."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1085 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye', 2 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1125."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, at the present time under certain retirement systems CETA employees are covered for retirement benefits. What this Bill does with the Amendment that was put on is it allows these various pension funds or governmental units to make it optional. It will allow them to take CETA employees off where the federal government ceases to fund them and this will be effective July 1, 1979. I ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1125 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 162 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1140."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1140, a Bill for an Act to amend of an Act relating to contractors and material mens liens, known as mechanic liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

Bill 1140 amends the Public Contractor Section of the Mechanics Lien Act. . It provides that a person who furnishes material or labor shall have a lien for the value of thereof. It also protects general contractors and subcontractors from the subcontractor who, for whatever reason, does not file his lien under the public agency , and is ready to make final payment to the contractor. The Bill by extending the time to file suit allows greater possibility that settlements may be reached without the necessity for court action. The Bill has the complete support of the Illinois Construction Industry Committee and various parties of interest have met in working out the Amendments to this Bill. I know of no opposition to the Bill as it stands now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1140 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye', no 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1162. Leinenweber."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act in relation to coroners and deputy coroners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading of the Bill. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1162 came out of the Counties and Townships Committee and was



placed on the Consent Calendar. It was removed from the Consent Calendar solely for the purposes of a technical Amendment to reduce the ...the penalty for embalming without coroners permission from a Class A misdemeanor to a business offense. It also repeals Section 4 requiring a newly appointed elected coroner to take oath or give bond within 20 days of his election or appointment. It allows the coroner to have testimony recorded. It authorizes the coroner to hold items found near a body and provides that a coroner and his deputy be bonded for \$5,000 with the cost of the bond being paid by the county. There's no known opposition. It passed out of the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Its proponents are the Coroner's Association and I urge the adoption of Senate Bill 1162."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson. Hudson. His light's on. He's not there. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1162 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye', no 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1171."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Vinson: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is a Bill that as a Member of the... 1171.... As a Member of the State Employees Group Insurance Commission I was asked by Senator Bruce. I know of no opposition to it. What it does is it conforms the State Group Insurance Program to the provisions of the federal mandatory retirement Act. I urge its passage."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1171 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 155 'aye', 2 'no', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1172, Mr. Stuffle, are you on the floor? Stuffle? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1201, Mr. Leverenz. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Private Employment Agency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1201 does four the same things. First, it would eliminate the fifty dollar fee for private employment agency and make them all uniform with \$150 and a base. Secondly, it would raise the bonding requirement for private employment agencies to \$5,000 from \$2,000. Third, it would raise the registration fee to some employment agencies charged from \$2.00 to \$4.00 and fourthly, it allows the employer paid fee agencies, those that receive all of their fees from the employer, to deal in the same manner as personnel departments of large corporations and would subject to the employment agency to possible revocation for placement of an individual and then taking that person from that firm and on placing him again. I would ask for your 'aye' vote. It is supported both by the industry and the Department of Labor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question.. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1201 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Marco. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 157 'aye', no 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1205."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1205, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the present Controlled Substances Act is inconsistent in its treatment of penalties for certain controlled substances. It requires that possession have the higher penalty than manufacture and delivery of the same controlled substances in certain orders. The First District Appellate Court has held that this scheme violates the equal protection clauses of both the U.S. and the Illinois Constitution. This Bill, Senator Bill, addresses this problem and insures that delivery of controlled substances is treated more harshly than mere possession of that same controlled substance. The penalty for manufacture .. manufacture and delivery of schedule 4 and schedule 5 are increased one step while possession is reduced one step. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1205 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Vote me as 'aye', Marco. Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 168 'aye', no 'nay', one recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1232."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1232, a Bill for an Act...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leinenweber? Leinenweber? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1237. Katz. Mr. Katz. Take



it out of the record. 1238. Mr. Kucharski. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1247, Mr. Yourell. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1281, Mr. Emil Jones. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a very simple Bill. It provides that coverage on eligible children if any shall be under the enrollment and election of either the female or the male retired employee where both husband and wife are eligible retired employees of the state. Currently only the male retiree can make their election, now giving it to both the husband and wife. I move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 1281?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 169 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1347."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Well, I think the Members will find this a very interesting and good Bill. We all have to file statements of our campaign contributions. This Bill amends the Section of the Election Code providing that the public may inspect our records. And what this Bill does, Senate Bill 1347, provides that those who come in and look



through our campaign contributions statement must identify by name, address, and telephone number the person or persons that they represent or the associations or the Committee or anyone that they are actually there for if it's someone other than themselves. Secondly they have to identify the specific reason that they're examining our contribution and the third provision of the Bill is they have to fill out an affidavit to the effect that the information is truthful. I think this will help make sure that we are able to find out if we want to exactly who is looking into our campaign contributions. That's only fair. We file this information. We should have a right to be informed as to exactly the principles involved. I would urge support for this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "I wonder .. I have some sincere questions about this and I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Alright. Do I understand that a failure to give your name or say, you would give an incorrect address, would result in a Class 3 felony penalty being applied?"

Deuster: "If a person fills out a false affidavit and it is proved that this was done with criminal intent I presume that we would want there to be a penalty to the same effect that when we fill out our campaign contributions statements we.. we subject ourselves to that. We make verifications stating that our.. to our knowledge and belief that it's a true and correct statement concerning our contributions. The answer is, 'Yes, that perjury is perjury.'"

Getty: "Alright, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I then rise in opposition, not to the intent of the Bill to



require that the person file a proper identification, but I think the penalty provided is just overkill. I don't think that the proper penalty ought to be a Class 3 felony where there is incarceration for 2 to 5 years in the penitentiary. I think that's a very serious error. I would vote 'present' on this Bill and hope that the Sponsor would amend it to be a reasonable penalty. I think it maybe a crime, we want to make it a crime to do this, but I think the penalty ought to fit the crime and I don't think that the Class 3 misdemeanor.. Class 3 felony is appropriate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1347 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we're taking this law and order scene too far. Now we have created felonious inspection of campaign reports. Pretty soon, before you know it, we'll have felonious littering and felonious sticking of chewing gum on the bottom of movie seats. I really think that this is a ridiculous Bill that is not worthy of our consideration. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Deuster: "Well, the red herring has been drawn across this. All this provides for is an affidavit. We have the Illinois statute just filled with the requirements of affidavits from one end to another and I.. the Bill does not provide any special penalty and I see no reason whatsoever that a person who is required to fill out an affidavit, whether it be a politician or a citizen, should be a privileged character and not be subject to



the same penalties that all citizens suffer from if they happen to lie, or fill out a false affidavit. I think there's nothing dangerous or wrong about this at all and I would urge many more green votes."

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

Mugalian: "We've come a long way from campaign disclosure.

What's wrong with letting anybody see what your campaign contributions are? I'm not even sure anybody should have to sign in. They should posted on the wall. The whole idea is to know whether or not a public official should.. could have any conflict of interests. The theory of this Bill would not only make it a felony not to file an affidavit or to file one erroneously or inaccurately, but you might as well also require them to file a \$100 fee in order to inspect your records. I can't see how anybody who claims that he has nothing to hide, one who says he represents the public, and that they're entitled to know what his interests are, would vote for this kind of a Bill if it even had a Class D misdemeanor as a penalty. I think anyone should have access to all records with the least inconvenience and if this Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Currie: "Thank you. In explaining my 'no' vote, very like Representative Mugalian's concept, unlike Representative Getty, I don't support the intent of this legislation at all. Representative Deuster suggested that since we have to file, people who want to see our files should be willing to tell us who they are. I think the intent behind disclosure legislation is to make information freely available to the public. This Bill, it seems to me, makes that.. makes that information costly, as a charge, in effect, to public people who



would like to see our campaign files. That creates, I think, a chilling effect on the exercise of what should be a right on the part of the public to know about campaign disclosure. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, after some of the things that have happened recently, I don't think there's anything wrong with having a person who affixes their signature to make an affidavit and as I understand it, the penalties are no different on this affidavit than any other affidavit. This is not something special. This is just to follow up on the present law and perjury is perjury. I don't care whether it's on election on this thing or anything else."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote, it's difficult to understand the red herrings that are brought up. The present law says that if we file false information, we are subject to a Class 3 felony. People who use these campaign disclosure reports can use them for reasons other than the law intends and they should be subject to a Class 3 felony. In fact, I'm surprised that the person who originally got up and spoke against this, who was one of the fathers of Class X didn't suggest a Class X penalty because this is probably more serious than the filing of false information. And this Bill is a good Bill and deserves our support."

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

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, it looks to me if someone intends to stick their nose into my business, at least I have a right to know



who's nose it is. And that, to me, is a logical way to look at it and I think we should vote 'yes'."

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

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to support this measure. I think it's excellent. I'm... Right now I know that people look at my records and at other records. I want them to identify themselves. I want to know who these people are and what organization they represent and many of you who are voting... not voting or voting 'present' or 'no', are.. these are some of the people that are looking at your records and reviewing it in organizations and are the same ones that are out there campaigning against you and I can't see where this.. anyone would be voting against this to protect some of these persons who are not even identifying themselves other than putting down their name."

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

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd urge more green votes because I feel like that when we file these records, we intend to file them honestly and all we have the right to ask is the people that want to examine these records that they examine them honestly also, put their name, put down what they want and we might be able to provide them with things that will be very helpful to them that are not in the record. "

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I support this Bill very simply because I do not like to be interviewed by persons under the name of Mickey Mouse, Donald Duck, and Orphan Annie. It's a good Bill. I think that if we're going to be constantly scrutinized as to whether we're telling the truth, I



think those who wish to do the scrutiny should do likewise."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff, to explain her vote. Timer's on." Balanoff please."

Balanoff: "I think the difference between us and them is that we are elected officials and the citizens have a right to know more about us. That's why I think we ought to vote 'no' on this Bill. There's a difference between the two of us. That's the one mistake I think we're making."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support this Bill also and I think that if our own reports are going to be used to ... somebody else to build their mailing lists, we have a right to know. And if my own report is being used to attack me, I certainly think I have a right to know. And I think if you are defined to become a classroom project I have a right to know and I think if people are going to capriciously build these lists like some of the media have done, I think I have a right to know. And I speak as one who was the original Sponsor of the Act that is under consideration. I think we have a right to know when this Act is abused and we have a right to move to correct any abuses that may crop up just because people have their so-called right to know. I think this legislation was enacted so that people would be able to study and examine and see if we have conflicts of interests, But not to be used against us capriciously or viciously and I certainly support this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Alexander: "Mr. Chairman, I support this Bill. Right here on this floor in this very Body a Member scrutinized another



Member's Bill to find out what their campaign disclosure was and used a fictitious name and sent them into to find out. I support this Bill and everybody else should too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye', 54 'nay', 9 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1360."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1360 amends the downstate police and firemen's pension code and all that it does is change the period of amateurization for the unfunded..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1360 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1423. Out of the record. Before we go to the Priority of Call... On Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 659. The Gentleman from Macoupin requests that that Bill be brought back from Third Reading to Second for the purposes of agreed Amendments. Is there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 659 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Hannig, amends Senate Bill..."

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

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

Amendment #4 amends Section 21-H and Section 4 to Senate



Bill 659 simply clarifies that the Bill does not affect public water, sewage works. This is an agreed Amendment and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'.. 'Aye'. Opposed. Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Hannig: "Amendment #5 amends Section 22.2 of Senate Bill 659 so that monies from the hazardous waste fund cannot be used to clean up actions by problems caused by materials specifically exempted from this fund. This is also an agreed Amendment and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Place the Bill back to Third Reading.

Also the same type of request by the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen. Appears Senate Bill 1277. It's on Third Reading. The Lady asked leave to bring the Bill back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. The Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, 1277 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?... Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Pullen, amends Senate Bill 1277 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1277 pertains to having the Pledge of Allegiance said in elementary school everyday....This Amendment would add to that having persons attending sporting events at elementary schools say the Pledge also. It is part of an Amendment that was adopted pre-



viously, Amendment #2, and this Amendment would essentially replace Amendment #2 whose Chief Sponsor is CoSponsoring this Amendment with me. We have worked out the details of this and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Bowman: "Yes, just a question of the Sponsor. She was speaking very softly and I didn't hear what the Amendment does. What does Amendment #3 do?"

Pullen: "Amendment #3 says that in addition to children's in grades one through six saying the Pledge in school, persons attending sporting events at such schools would also say the Pledge, which is part of Amendment #2, which was offered by a Gentleman from the Education Committee who is CoSponsoring this Amendment with me. "

Bowman: "So this Amendment just extends the Pledge to sporting events at elementary schools."

Pullen: "Essentially, yes."

Bowman: "Essentially. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed. The 'aye's have it. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Three Members came up to me and Senate Bills Short Debate, Senate Bill 1238, Mr. Kucharski."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1238, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1238 would provide in-patient psychiatric care to be at the same level as other in-patient care. I ask passage of this Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Lady from Champaign... Would you kindly repeat that? The Lady said she couldn't hear you."

Kucharski: "This Bill would provide in patient psychiatric care for state employees in their patie... in their dependents rather at the same level provided for other in patient care."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? If you are, see your psychiatrist. The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1238?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye', 23 'no', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1247, Mr. Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1247 provides that registration record coding to identify voters in the various political subdivisions such as municipality school districts, special districts and so forth, for the purpose of a deterrent... determining ballot entitlement shall be accomplished by the use of tax extension number or other coding method approved by the State Board of Elections. Most election authorities are now transferring tax codes identifying property owners in each taxing district for purposes of tax extension to the registration records as a method of identification of voters in each political subdivision. And this is necessary for the implementation of the consolidated .. consolidation of elections. It will take... go into effect in December of 1980. I ask.. urge a favorable Roll Call



on Senate Bill 1247."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer? Okay. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question? What is the cost of this indexing?"

Yourell: "The cost is in another Bill. It's the rate of a \$1.00 per registered voter as of October 5th, 1980."

Friedrich: "Which is how much?"

Yourell: "I think it's .. it's in 2 million, 2."

Friedrich: "Briefly, Mr. Speaker, we've been told how much consolidation of elections is going to save us. Here's 2 million dollars it isn't going to save us."

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

Yourell: "Just briefly, in response to the last Gentleman who spoke, there was nobody that said that it wouldn't cost something to start up. Our argument has and will continue to be that after a consolidation of elections becomes a reality, we will save tremendous amounts of money in the area of 11 million dollars. I urge a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 1247."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1247?' 'All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye', 15 'no', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. When I went to call backs from Third to Second a number of other people requested that their Bills be brought back. I'd like to go to that order of business now and then we'll go to Priority of Call. First Bill is Senate Bill 114, Mr. Davis, are you in the chamber? Alright. You want that Bill... You want leave of the House to have



Senate Bill 114 from Third to Second for the purposes of an Amendment? Hearing no objections, put the Bill on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, John Dunn, amends Senate Bill 144 on page one, line 10 and 18 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dunn, is that his Amendment? John Dunn? Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. John's here yeah. I was going to say that it's a friendly Amendment and we accept it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine, the Gentleman moves the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 1251, Taylor. Did you bring that Bill back? Has 1251 been brought back for you, Jim? Done? Senate Bill 330. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster asks leave of the House to bring Senate Bill 330 back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, Second Reading."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two Amendments..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #1, Mr. Clerk? Is by whom? One's adopted."

McMaster: "Number 2 and 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

McMaster: "They have been distributed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, McMaster, amends Senate Bill 330 on page..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, Amendment #2."

McMaster: "The language in Senate Bill 330 contains information in regards to Social Security for the road Commissioner and road district employees. It was incorrect in the original Bill so we are changing that to make it



according to the federal people. That's Amendment #2.
Would you like to take..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. All infavor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Amendment #3 reflects the fact that the passage of House Bill 330 (sic) would necessitate changes in other places in the statutes in regards to approval of the Township Road Commissioner, the Road District's budget. In other words, to make sure that we correct everything that would be necessary to put on Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #3?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1211. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines requests Senate Bill 1211 be brought back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Bill's on Second Reading. Second Reading, Jack. Any Amendments? I'm on Senate Bill 1211. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Bluthardt, amends Senate Bill 1211 on page one...."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Bill is a Bill that would create the Civil Rights Study Commission. The Senate Sponsor, Senator Washington, has no objection to the Amendment that was suggested in Committee and that is to raise the Membership from 2 Senators, 2 Members of the House, 2 from the public, ... the Amendment would raise it to four from the Senate,



four from the House and four from the public. I think it would give a better cross section of philosophies on that Commission. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Amendment, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, to the Sponsor of the Bill, is this the Commission that's going to study assessments in Cook County among other things?"

Gaines: "No, it isn't."

Skinner: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a correction, Ladies and Gentlemen.

This Bill appeared on the Calendar on Second Reading and I'm sorry. I was not aware of it. I was told it was on Third Reading. We'll proceed with this Bill, but there's a fiscal note that's been filed on that. And that fiscal note's request has to be completed before this Bill advances to Third Reading. We'll adopt the Amendment if it's the rule of the House and we'll keep the Bill on Second Reading. On the Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Sponsor of the Bill. Representative Gaines, I wonder if you might just take this Bill out of the record. I have some other issues I think we might discuss and then perhaps, with leave of the Body, you could bring it back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're on the... We're on the motion to adopt Amendment #1, Sir. Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I think we can proceed without Amendment #1. Then I'll hold it and then I'll talk to Mr. Bullock about any further Amendments he may have in mind."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What... What do you want to do?"

Gaines: "I said, we'll proceed with this Amendment"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Is there any discussion... Any further discussion on Amendment #1? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. On the Amendment? All in favor vote



'ayé'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye'; 14 'no', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill remains on Second Reading. Senate Bill 100. According to Mr. Deuster the Bill appears on Third Reading. He asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 100 on page, line one and so forth."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, about three Bills relating to the same subject, amending the School Code, that is, the transportation of students within a mile and a half where there's some safety hazard involved, passed the House and went over to the Senate. A couple of Bills on that subject came over from the Senate. The Education Committee..."

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

Getty: "Has this Bill been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What?"

Getty: "Has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has not."

Deuster: "Well, it has. I'm holding one here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've got an advanced copy. Keep the... Keep the Bill on Second Reading. On the Priority of Call. YOU want to put it back to Third? Put it back to Third and when the Amendment's distributed, we'll get back to it. The Lady from Adams has a... before Third Reading, she has a Bill on Third Reading, Senate Bill 228. She wants to bring it back for the purpose of an Amendment. Has the Amendment been printed and



distributed? Mr. Clerk, 228? One and two are out.
The Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Bill is on Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kent, amends Senate Bill 228..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also have another one, 292, that's on Third, I'd like to take back. Two twenty eight is the Bill that states that 75% of the payments to the.. for the scholarship fund shall be paid by October. The Amendment will make adjustments with the institution on a single voucher, rather than separate vouchers for each student. And also, it adds the academic scholarship program which was funded in the Appropriations Committee to Senate Bill 546."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Lady asks leave to bring Senate Bill 292 back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, 292 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Kent, amends Senate Bill 292..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "This is purely a technical Amendment that changes, '2B' to '2A', and it needs to be done to keep the Bill in the proper form."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye'. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Priority of Call. Senate Bill 1166."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1166 amends the Juvenile Court Act to require that if the juvenile court sends a juvenile to a local community agency that the payment be limited to the amount or be in the amount of the current payment that DCF pays.. DCFS pays for foster care. There's a one year limitation on the the Act. It will automatically expire on July 1, 1980. It has a minimal fiscal impact because the children involved would generally be going to DCFS anyway and the limitation on the amount to be reimbursed to the counties is included in the Bill. And again, there's a one year time limitation for this. The Bill passed the Senate 57 to nothing and it passed out of the Committee ten to nothing and the supporters include the Urban Counties Council, the Cook County Government, the Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois, the Child Care Association, the Illinois Catholic Conference, Catholic Charity, and the Salvation Army and I would urge your support for Senate Bill 1166."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, this is Bill that I've been interested in and tried to do something for years, without any success until now. I just want to add one thought, one thing. It's been... from 1964, now that's '64 until today our courts have been restricted just to \$35 a month per child. Now all of



you know this is perfectly ridiculous. And though I have such a Bill, a similar Bill with slight changes that is in Interim Study, this Bill may make it possible for me to forget my Bill and table it, so I certainly urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1166?' 'All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye', 9 'no', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1200."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1200..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 41."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 41, a Bill for an Act to amend the Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry . What? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 41 amends the Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center Act in that it requires the Department of Public Health to inspect each facility at least six times per year. This came as a result of in the fall of '78 when the disclosures were initially made about the abortion scandal involving the clinics on Michigan Avenue in Chicago and this received a very favorable support in Committee and I would move for, you know, passage of Senate Bill 41."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 41 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye', 1 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitu-



tional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 100. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Senator Lemkee wants to thank you for the passage of his first Bill out of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Having voted on the prevailing side... Senate Bill 100."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 100, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to return Senate Bill 100 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of considering two Amendments, which have been distributed on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have you checked? Because we were at the posture before. Okay. The Gentleman asks leave. Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second Reading. Senate Bill 100."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Deuster, amends Senate Bill...."

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

Deuster: "Amendment #1 merges the various Bills on the subject of pupil transportation into one vehicle. This is the same thing that has been done on the Senate side. As you may remember, Representative Yourell had a Bill on this subject to Representative Steczo and I cosponsored one. Representative Huskey had one. Amendment #1 here merges these good ideas from all these Bills into one vehicle. Representative Huskey's idea was to make sure that the calculation of the mile and a half was a normally traveled route. The rest of the Bill provides that where the local school Board finds that the walking would be a serious safety hazard with respect.. that is as a result of vehicular traffic that the school could determine that they would transport the student. This



would have to be in guidance... in accordance with the guidelines promulgated by the Department of Transportation and they would have the right to reject the determination and also the local school Board, if they differed could go to court over it. That's pretty much what the Amendment on the Bill does. At this point there have been communications between the Education Committee of the House and the Senate. I would urge the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "... Mrs. Hallstrom, on the Amendment. Your light's on, Ma'am. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Yes, would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Deuster, is there any reimbursement provided from the state to the local school districts for this transportation?"

Deuster: "The answer is yes, if there was a safety hazard and it was so determined in accordance with the guidelines in the procedures set forth here, there would be reimbursement."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed. The Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 100 as..."

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

Deuster: "Again, this merges into one Bill the various Bills on the subject. Amendment #2 is the idea initiated by Senator Schaefer that you should determine the mile and a half for students.. for children who are at either a grandmother's house or some child care facility from where they are picked up by the school bus to the school and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #2."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment 2?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 101. Out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 123."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 123, a Bill for an Act relating to wages of employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz. Kornowicz. 123. Out of the record. Senate Bill 198. Mr. Preston, you ready for that Bill? 198."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 198, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill. "

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

Preston: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 198 makes it a Class 3 felony to commit a battery on a senior citizen 60 years of age or older. This protection for senior citizens is necessary because senior citizens are first the primary targets of muggers. Secondly, senior citizens are the most indefensible to that kind of attack from muggers, and thirdly, an injury that might be of insignificant consequence to a younger individual suddenly becomes a serious ... a serious injury if committed on a senior citizen. I can be pushed down and made to break a bone and I'll recover. The same injury to a senior citizen will cause sometimes irreparable injury, irreparable damage, tremendous suffering, tremendous harm. On behalf of senior citizens, I urge, I beg, your support for this Bill. They will thank you for it. Please vote 'aye'."

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



Johnson: "Was the Amendment that required that the defendant know the victim as a senior citizen, was that Amendment adopted, Representative?"

Preston: "That was not. That was defeated on Friday."

Johnson: "Well, speaking to the Bill then, I agree that senior citizens need protection. I also agree children need protection. I also agree that all need protection against battery. What this would mean is if you have somebody you happen to run into on the street and have an argument with, really don't know how old he looks, whether he looks 55 or 50 or whatever it might be and you spit on him, or you push him in a really unobtrusive manner, but in a manner that in the statute would be insulting, quote, unquote, to him, you've committed an aggravated battery and you go to the penitentiary for I guess, a class 3 felony up to 15 years. The whole theory behind our criminal law is a scienter requirement, that the perpetrator of a crime have knowledge. It's difficult if not impossible to create a crime where you're just simply taking your chances. I don't know of anywhere else in the criminal law where this exists. I would support this Bill, at least be inclined to support it, if that Amendment which you had promised us was going to be adopted, would have been adopted. But it wasn't and I think this leaves it wide open to the situations that are.. while everybody wants to try to protect senior citizens, really leaves just a completely wide open field as far as the Bill is concerned. I know Senator Merlo and I assume you were in favor of that Amendment that would have made it a workable statute because what you're trying to do is to create a deterrent from citizens assaulting other citizens, namely senior citizens. But without the... Without the scienter requirement it doesn't do that. And it really is an unfair way to apply the statute for what's a good purpose. And



so I'm going to vote probably 'present' on it, but I just don't think the Bill in this form is going to be Constitutional or workable."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Bill now that we've gotten rid of the obnoxious Amendment. What this Bill says is that we're not going to allow people to kick around old people and even if you don't know that Representative Macdonald here is 104, you can't go knock her down if she happens to be over 60 or Representative Dyer. If I happen to trip over her on my way out of the... out of the Session.. out of the aisle here, and I happen to knock her over and aggravate her battery or commit aggravated battery... if she's over 65 I'm in big trouble. Now all joking, if she's over 60, I'm sorry. All joking aside, I disagree with.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're in big trouble now. Who's 104?"

Skinner: "... With what Representative.. the Representative from Champaign said. I'm willing to let the courts decide whether or not it's Constitutional. I know the legislative intent behind this Bill and that is that we want to protect senior citizens from people who yank their purses off their arms while they're running.. while they're walking along the city streets peaceably. And I think the way to get the message across is to pass this Bill. If anyone's in doubt whether somebody's over 60, don't molest them, don't... don't commit aggravated battery. And for that reason I think we should pass the Bill."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in spite of my facetious answer to Representative Skinner when he asked me how old I was and I admitted to being 104, I will say that I think this is a very important Bill and while I have sympathy for the aggravated



battery section of this that Representative Johnson is concerned about, I think that juveniles should have respect for all people and I don't think it's necessary that they know whether they're 60 or not. I think that they should be really taught respect for their elders whether they are elderly or whether they are under 60. And I don't think that the technical aspect of whether or not you're 60 years old means that much. I do think that the increasing, growing crimes against senior citizens is important enough for us to pay close attention to this Bill and pass this very good Bill out. I urge your vote for this Bill."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, someone just said I'm past 60 and I am and I'm proud of it. And I don't feel as though I need the special protection that this Bill is going to give people of 60. I resent being called a senior citizen because I don't feel like one and if you want to raise it to 70, I think perhaps at that age most people will need some additional protection, or could use it. But to the... You know, at 60 to be considered a senior citizen is ridiculous and it's hard to judge a person's age. You know, I'm not even adverse to being attacked once in a while."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Big Blue, you've always been an exception."

Bluthardt: "But I can't except the Bill because I don't believe that the age 60 is realistic. It should be the retirement age that we recognize at 70 and that would be acceptable."

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

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

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



Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the element of scienter is not necessary in many Acts, many laws as it now exists. The element of scienter is not necessary in statutory rape. The element of scienter is not necessary in many other areas of legislation. It is better to have the mugger worry about the age of the victim than to make the victim worry about whether or not he looks a certain age. This is protection for senior citizens. It's needed protection for senior citizens and I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 198?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mulgalian, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Crystal Lake didn't understand this Bill and I feel if he didn't understand it, possibly one other person didn't understand it. And for that one other person, I'm not sure who it would be, I think I ought to explain. If you rob... If you steal a purse or snatch a purse from someone that is a robbery. That's a felony. If you beat somebody up, that's an aggravated felony. But what this Bill does, and you weren't listening to Representative Johnson, what this says is if you commit a simple battery by just shoving someone, or pushing someone, that becomes by virtue of an aide to the defendant an aggravated battery in a class 3 felony. Now just stop to think about what that means, you realize we don't need this Bill to protect senior citizens. They're protected from mugging. There are laws against mugging, laws against purse snatching, laws against aggravated battery. What..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman... The... The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."



Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm over 60 and there's been a few occasions on this... on the floor of this House where more or less we've nearly, I won't say we've come to fist-a-cuffs, but there was indication that it was getting pretty hot. So, I think this is a nice advantage for me to have, so I hope you vote for this Bill and for those fellows that .. those people who want to take any matter up along these lines, remember it's at your own risk and you take your own chances cause I'm over 60."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Braun: "Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Johnson has hit the nail on the head when he talked about the fact that our system of justice has always been predicated on a requirement of guilty knowledge, of scienter. And I ask the question of those of you who are voting green, 'How do you know when a person is over 60?' Do you ask to look at their teeth? Do you ask to look at their Social Security card? Seriously, if a person is a day before their 60th birthday, or the day on the other side of their 60th birthday, do you aggravate the penalties for the perpetrator as a result of that fluke of time? I strongly urge that this Bill go down. I feel there's 120 votes up there and it will probably pass. I am for supporting protection of all citizens, senior citizens, young people, old people, black people, white people, and different people. But I say to you, if we carve out exceptions like this law, we'll be carving them out and carving them out and carving them out and soon, our system of jurisprudence will make no sense at all, whatsoever. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, when you're



talking about simple battery I want to tell you that right here in Lincoln Towers and on Fourth Street at 11:00 o'clock in the morning two women were walking along, elderly women, all that was done is their purses were snatched and pulled backwards and both of them are now in the hospital with broken pelvises."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just responding to the three prior speakers, I understand that the purse was snatched by a Legislator. In the prior case when you ask for their teeth if they take it out, Representative Braun, and present you with it, you know you'd better not run into them and to the prior speaker who was referred to as Mr. Blue from Schiller Park because he feels this applies to him, I presume we can call him in the future Old Blue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye'; 12 'no'; 27 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Good. We're going to talk Sunday.. Senate Bill 228."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 228, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from .. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 228 addresses the problem that many of your colleges have had with the payment of scholarship funds coming so late. This Bill says that at least 75% should be paid by October 1st so that they do not have to borrow funds against those scholarship students that are attending their schools.



And then of course I added the Amendment a little while ago that cleaned up the Bill, satisfied many of those who were not pleased before. The Bill passed the Senate 48 to 3 and the scholarship part for the gifted children passed this House 140.. 130 to 32. So I feel now that the Bill is in good shape and I hope that you will approve it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 228 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure about what... about the rule, but I think we amended this on Second Reading today. So do we have to move to suspend the rule and then bring it back?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "They endorsed it in the Senate. All we have to do is attach the Amendment. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', 9 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Totten: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the point?"

Totten: "Earlier the Chair had chastised or asked the Members to watch the pages running up and down the aisles. We're having a continual problem over here with a Member on our side of the aisle who is galloping up and down the aisle and kinda of shaking the whole place and I wondered if the Chair wouldn't mind asking her if she would be a little slower going up and down the aisle and walk like a lady?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe her name was mentioned, but for what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen,



arise?"

Pullen: "I wanted to suggest that if the Gentleman would act like a Gentleman, all of us would be happy to act like ladies.... all of us ladies."

Speaker Lechowicz: "These Gentlemen... Well, I think she's running in the Chamber now in the Senate. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bowman: "Well, I thought I might recommend to the Lady from Cook that she find out the ages of all the Members on her side of the aisle so that if she runs into one of them, it won't be an aggravated battery."

Speaker Lechowicz: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak, seek recognition?"

Klosak: "I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

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

Klosak: "I have a question of the Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Klosak: "Why is it when some of my colleagues have absolutely nothing to say they nevertheless get up and say it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you ask them instead of me? Let's get back to Senate Bill 235."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 235, a Bill for an Act reinstating the requirement of annual information returns to the Service Retailers' and Hotel Operators' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After that last remark by Senator Klosak, this is no time to be calling up a Bill. However, this is a package.. one of a package of Bills that came about as a result of the investigation called the 'Mirage Investigation' in the city of Chicago where it was found that a good many of people engaged in retail sales of liquor, grocery stores, were utilizing the cash



and skimming off a great deal of revenue from the state. This Bill amends the Service Occupational Tax Act and the Retailers Tax Act, the Hotel Operators Act and reinstates certain requirements and provides a penalty for failing to file an annual information return. This information will enable the Department of Revenue to more accurately check the books and records of some of our less reputable retail outlets in the city of Chicago and I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 235 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'aye', 3 'no', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair has been asked a number of times how late we're going today. May I point out to the Membership that the later we go today, there's a possibility that we won't have to work Saturday and Sunday so... Next Bill is.... I'm with you, John, but hopefully we'll be out of here by 8. 244."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 244, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members, there were some questions that came up with this Bill in the Committee and we're drafting some Amendments and we'll bring it back tomorrow. Would you take it out of the record?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks to take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 287... 287. Mr. Birkinbine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 287, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Child Labor Law. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 287 amends the Hazardous Occupation Section of the Child Labor Law. It would allow 14 and 15 year olds to work in ice skating rinks that are owned by schools or park districts. The thinking is that working in an ice skating rink does not qualify as a hazardous occupation. Indeed, there are a number of 14 and 15 year olds who presently work at concession stands of swimming pools that are open during the summer that are run by park districts. When the winter time rolls around because of the law as it now reads, those same students are not able to hold the same job during the winter time and this is an effort to correct that. I ask your favorable support..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 287 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye', 5 'no', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 362. Stuffle. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 384, E.M. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With leave of the House I would like Senate Bill 384 moved back to Second Reading for the purpose of tabling an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring Senate Bill 384 back from Third to Second for the purpose of ... What was the Amendment?"



Barnes: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Barnes: "Keane. Jim Keane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman... Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 384 (sic). I've discussed it with the Minority ... House Amendment #2 is it to 384. I've discussed this with Representative Waddell and he approves of it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One failed. There is only Amendment #2 on it. The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed. Amendment #2 is tabled. Put the Bill back to Third Reading. Okay. Senate Bill 492, Mr. Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 492, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the County Home Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 492 is almost identical to House Bill 2298 that I sponsored that passed out of here on the Consent Calendar. House Bill 492 (sic) provides that in any county which establishes and maintains a county shelter care nursing home, the County Board shall make uniform rules and regulations for the admission and discharge of patients in the home without regard to age, sex, race, color, religion, creed, ancestry, physical or mental handicap, occupation, or national origin. An exception is made to the requirement of uniform rates to permit rates to approximate actual costs in case of persons able to purchase their own care. This latter provision was endorsed by the Senate



on April 5th, 1979 with a 54 to nothing passage vote on Senate Bill 170 which deals exclusively with the approximate actual cost issue. I would urge a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 492."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Simms: "Representative Yourell, under your legislation would this give the County Boards... the county homes the right not to take Public Aid or the indigent on a first priority basis?"

Yourell: "Senate Bill 492 was amended in the Senate to require the County Board to publish adopted rules for county nursing home admission and discharge and also to not have that jurisdiction, I believe. If you'll bear with me just a moment... Currently... Currently the law allows the County Board to control admissions. This Bill spells out that authority by providing the Board shall make uniform rules and regulations for all persons or agencies purchasing care in the home and Amendment #1, I believe, required that those rules should be published."

Simms: "Well, is it a fair assumption to say that it is possible then under this legislation that a County Board could then under their own ... make their own decision and admit private paid patients on a priority basis over those of the indigent of public aid?"

Yourell: "No, I don't believe so. The Bill provides that such persons shall be admitted subject to uniform admission rules and regulations."

Simms: "Yes, of the County Board itself."

Yourell: "No. No, of the Supervisor of General Assistance."

Simms: "Of the Supervisor of General Assistance. Okay. That's what I... Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 492 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Sumner: "Well, I really wanted to ask a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Ask your question, Ma'am."

Sumner: "Who is the person or persons that establish the rules and regulations for this now?"

Yourell: "County Board."

Sumner: "County Board does it now? Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye', 3 'no', 10 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 495."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 495. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulatory functions of state government."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hallock."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill represents an attempt to deal with the unending bureaucracy that exists in the Department of Registration and Education. It intends to do this specifically by providing an orderly review..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Hallock: "This Bill intends to achieve that goal by providing an orderly review of proposed new areas of licensure and regulation and also by providing for a review of all licensing acts currently being administered by the Department of Registration and Education. More specifically, this Bill does this in the following ways. It first of all establishes a joint Committee made up of Members from the House, the Senate, appointees of the Governor and also from the BOB and Economic and Fiscal Commission. Secondly, that Committee will establish, through a review Committee, a schedule date starting in 1981 in which point in time all review and licensure regulations in that department shall be reviewed and considered. Thirdly, criteria for review have been established which will guide the Committee in trying to decide just which regulations of occupation should in fact be either amended or in fact in certain cases terminated. I believe this proposal represents an excellent proposal and attempts to phase in review and regulation and in many cases termination of certain state agencies and regulations which have in fact encumbered businessmen of all walks of life for many years."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Hallock: "I ask for your support."

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

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



opposition to Senate Bill 495 because of what happened with regard to the Bill. There has been added to the Bill an Amendment that really takes the teeth out of the whole sunset concept. It reminds me a little bit, a few years ago Toby Barry, who many of you probably remember, thought that the Commissions ought to be eliminated, that there were too many of them and he put a Bill in to eliminate all of the Legislative Commissions. Well what happened was that he wasn't able to get his Bill passed and it got amended and it ended up being a Bill to establish a Commission to study the elimination of other Commissions. Well I want to tell you that what happened with regard to this Bill is that the very heart of the sunset concept has been eliminated. The very heart of that concept is that at the end of a certain period the Legislative...the Legislature provides that the agency, the particular licensing function will terminate. That constitutes a trigger mechanism in which the Legislature then has to decide whether it ought to recreate that agency, recreate that particular license function. That is really the heart and soul of sunset in Illinois. It would be the heart and soul of sunset throughout the country. It was the heart and soul of sunset in Colorado. Now here suddenly what has taken place is..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz, would you bring your remarks to a close or else we're going to be here for sunset."

Katz: "Well, it's a very important Bill, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I am well aware of that, we know your opposition."

Katz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay... Please, proceed..."

Katz: "I haven't finished yet, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 changes the 'repeal' to 'review', so that all you're doing is creating another bureaucracy, you're not eliminating bureaucracy now, you're just creating a superstructure of more bureaucracy. So the agency and the license function is not terminated. They can review without this and so what



you have set out to do has been suddenly changed from something that was supposed to eliminate bureaucracy to, in fact, an increase in bureaucracy. And in view of that Senate Bill 495, which now accomplishes exactly the opposite of what sunset is intended to do, ought to be defeated here in the House."

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

Conti: "Forget it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Would the...would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Would you describe this as a 'twilight Bill' instead of a 'sunset Bill'?"

Hallock: "Well this is probably more like mid-noon I would think."

Speaker Lechowicz: "High-noon, was that the answer?"

Kane: "One other question, who is going to set up this review?"

Hallock: "The Joint Committee which was established and will be...contain Members of the Legislature and also appointees for the Governor will perform this review. And I must add and rebut Representative Katz's comments in that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Sir, you can do that while you're closing. You're answering Mr. Kane right now."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would concur in the last speaker's assessment of this Bill. This is not a sunset Bill and it's not even a twilight Bill. What we're doing is we're creating another agency to study other agencies and I think that we can do that perfectly well in our Committee structure now. I think that if we're going to have a sunset Bill we ought to have a sunset Bill and not a dim twilight Bill that masquerades as a sunset Bill and I'd urge the defeat of this...Senate Bill 495."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago...no...Cook... Mr. Birkinbine, to close... Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock, to close."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't said once this is a sunset



Bill but rather this is a review Bill. R and E does not now have the power in any way to review the different licensing occupations. And accordingly they strongly support this Bill. I submit to you that Illinois now has more occupational regulation than any other state in the nation. If we are ever, in any way, going to attempt to address that important issue and get government off the backs of our individuals and our businessmen, we have to support this Bill. It's a strong step forward to sunset and to help the businessmen and individuals in our state and I ask for your strong support on this proposal. Thank you."

Speaker Lechwoicz: "The question is, shall the House pass House Bill... pass Senate Bill 495? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco... Marco, vote me 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 'aye', 50 'no'. The Gentleman asks... Wait a minute, Simms 'aye', 89. Mr. Huskey, you're voting 'aye' already, so you can't vote twice. Do you want to change your vote?"

Huskey: "Oh, I was just asking...I...I'm afraid that you don't see too good out of your left eye..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I see well enough to see in Hawaii, Sir. Mr. Piel, 'aye'. Mr. Katz wants a verification. Mr. Hallock wants a poll of the absentees. His light's flashed exactly 30 seconds and I recognized him. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff...Okay. Poll the absentees, please. What's that count right now? 90 to 49. Mr. Ewell, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Change him from 'aye', to 'no'. Cullerton from 'aye' to 'no'. Cullerton, John. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Change Mr. Telcser from 'no' to 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Huff as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Yourell: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell."



Yourell: "How am I recorded, Sir?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Yourell: "Please, change me to 'no', Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Yourell as 'no'. Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, please switch me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Kelly as 'no'. What's the count now, Sir? It's 87 'aye' and 53 'no'...Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "I'd like a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Balanooff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bullock. Caparelli.

Dawson. Ebbesen. Farley. Hannig. Hoffman. Emil Jones.

Keane. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Leon. Margalus. McGrew.

Meyer. Molloy. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Schisler.

Schoeberlein. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek. Winchester.

Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, would you please vote me 'present' on this Bill, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'present'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well we haven't got to that point, Sir. We only have 86 votes." The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Sandquist: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Sandquist as 'aye'. Mr. Wolf has a tentative 'aye'... Okay. Mr. Pierce, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is...is not recorded as voting."

Pierce: "Please vote me 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Margalus, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Margalus: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Margalus: "Will you record me as voting 'aye', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. Mr. Molloy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Molloy: "Record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Molloy as 'aye'. Mrs. Balanoff."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Balanoff as 'no'. Mr. Schraeder as 'no'. Change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Dawson as 'no'. Mr. Friedrich, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know this was a partisan issue. If we're going to take up sides I'll vote with the Republicans and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change him from 'no' to 'aye'." Mr. Kulas, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Kulas from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. DiPrima from 'aye' to 'no'. May I point out to you that Laurino and Hanahan aren't here. What's our count, Clerk? Mr. Donovan, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Donovan. Okay, what's our count? Let's go."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 88 'aye' and 56 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "From 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schlickman from 'present' to 'aye'. What's our count? The Gentleman from Champaign,



Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye' also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Johnson as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "This...this just seems to becoming a partisan issue for some reason. I'm going to...change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Borchers from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. White, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

White: "Will you kindly change me from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker: "Kindly record Mr. White from 'yes' to 'no'. Mr. Ebbesen." Kindly record...Mr. Ebbesen as 'aye'. Is there anyone else because we're going to go through a verification and it will take about another half hour. Mr. Stearney, do you want to be recorded twice, Sir? Not today." Anyone else that wants to be changed or recorded? What's the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 92 'aye' and 54 'no' and Mr. Katz asks for a verification. Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mulcahey: "Do I have leave to be verified now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're voting 'no'. We're going to be checking the affirmative vote, Sir. Well you can still have leave. Proceed the...with the...would the Ladies and Gentlemen kindly be in their own seats? And the Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, wants to be verified as well. Leave is granted. Mrs. Kent... Mr. Katz... Would you kindly be in your own seats? The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative votes. Mr. Katz. Proceed to verify the affirmative votes, Sir."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Ackerman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly wave your hands when your name is called, it makes it a lot easier? And kindly be in your own seats. All right, please proceed."



Clerk Leone: "Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine.
 Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Campbell.
 Capuzi. Catania. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis.
 Deuster. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick.
 Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Griesheimer.
 Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hoxsey. Hudson.
 Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak.
 Kucharski. Laurino. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar.
 Margalus. Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster.
 Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters.
 Piel. Pierce. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney.
 Robbins. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schlickman.
 Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney.
 E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Summer. Swanstrom. Telcser.
 Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Waddell. Walsh.
 Watson. Wikoff. Williams. J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz, do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Katz: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Ronan...Mr. Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ronan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Speaker Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me...wait a minute. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock, seek recognition?"

Hallock: "At what number will the count begin?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "92."

Hallock: "92."

Speaker Lechowicz: "92. Okay, Mr. Ronan is off the record, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Fine. Mr. Ben Polk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Katz: "All right. Mr. Hanahan."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Hanahan in the chamber? Take him off the record."



Katz: "Mr. Laurino."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr. Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who, Brummer?"

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer?"

Katz: "Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

Katz: "Mr. Bianco, is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco. Bianco. He's back there."

Katz: "Mr. Kempiners."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kempiners. He's here."

Katz: "Mr. Kucharski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kucharski. Take him...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr. Anderson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anderson. He's here."

Katz: "Mr. Klosak..is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Henry is here."

Katz: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leinenweber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Totten's trying to go incognito over there."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr. Johnson."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Katz: "Mr. Schuneman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."



Katz: "Mr. Telcser, is he here, I didn't..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Telcser's here."

Katz: "Yes, I see him now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, what's the count?"

Katz: "Mr. Cullerton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cullerton is changed from 'aye' to 'no'. I believe..
is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman changed from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Good. What's the count? On this question there
are 85 'ayes', 54 'no'. The Gentleman from Winnebago,
Mr. Hallock...ask leave to put the Bill on Postponed..."

Hallock: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed Consideration. Okay. Senate Bill 533."

Clerk Leone : "Senate Bill 533, a Bill for an Act to create the
State Fair Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 533 is a
Bill that sets up a State Fair Commission. It actually
deals with the concerns dealing with the State Fair and
tries to reimplement some of the financial problems
that we have in that area to put the State Fair Agency
back on a sound footing. It does have the Amendment
that it should be operative, self-sufficient within
3 years which may not totally be a possibility, but
it's a step in the right direction. And I urge a favor-
able Roll Call on Senate Bill 533."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall
Senate Bill 533 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; op-
posed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On
this question there's 125 'aye', 10 'no', 3 recorded
as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Consti-
tutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
Bill 560. Bus."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act to revise the



Election Laws governing nominating petitions. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 560 amends the Election Code to provide for fair and impartial method of random selection to break ties in simultaneous petition filing for local government offices. Those of you know that the State Board of Elections now holds a lottery and drawing from a hat to determine ballot position for our seats and all this does is extend that uniformity and make it applicable to all local election officials in their placement of those individuals who run for municipal and township and so forth offices. I move for favorable Roll Call, I urge a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 560."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 560?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. 'Aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "If this receives 89 votes I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I hope it gets about 120. Have all voted who wish?"

Conti: "I still want the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Hudson?"

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. You want to explain your vote, Sir?"

Or ask a question?"

Hudson: "No, I'm sorry. I misread my documents."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's quite alright."

Hudson: "I'm on the wrong day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.



On this question there's 122 'aye', 22 'nay', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I was off by 2. Senate Bill 659. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "I just want to make my point, that there had better not be any controversial Bills called because the last two Bills ago there wasn't controversial.. wasn't partisan and we made it partisan. Now if there's going to be any partisan Bills that are going to be called I'm going to ask for a verification on every Roll Call cause your side is empty. Our's is still working."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, look around. Sir, there's a lot of our Members seeing... your Members as well. We just went through a verification. We have a very good attendance element and I want to compliment the Members of the House for their diligence and the work product and with your cooperation, with everyone's cooperation we'll be able to vote for another hour, get completed with the Senate Bills on Third Reading and hopefully, with your cooperation, everyone's cooperation we won't be here Saturday and Sunday. That is my goal. That's the Speaker's intent and it's all up to each and everyone of us. Okay? Senate Bill 659. Take it out of the record. The Gentleman's not on the floor. Or he is on the floor... At the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 674. Mr. Bower? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 674, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Medical Practice Act to .. in regard to physician advertising which affects medical doctors, D.O's and chiropractors. This legisla-



tion is supported by the Department of Registration and Education and it is necessary because of a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision which declared the current restrictions on advertising as unconstitutional and in that court decision the court recommended that the General Assembly take action in this regard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 674 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Marco. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Mr. Schraeder please."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask a question. It talks about revocation of licenses. That's what this Bill does?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the question?"

Bower: "Yes, I did. If a physician would be not in compliance with this statute in regards to violation of the advertising laws, their license should be revoked. That's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schraeder. Mr. Schraeder please."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, according to the Digest, it says it allows the physician who is temporarily incapacitated to temporarily surrender his license. "

Bower: "The Amendment... That was amended. The Digest does not reflect what the Bill is."

Schraeder: "Okay. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'aye', 3 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 687."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 687, a Bill for an Act transferring the control of the Kankakee..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 688. Mr. Swanstrom, you want that Bill called? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 688, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Conservation to convey the Rock River Dam Site in Ogle County. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 688 transfers the control, operation, and maintenance of the Rock River Dam in Oregon, Illinois from the Department of Conservation to the Department of Transportation Division of Water Resources. The Bill passed out of the Executive Committee by a vote of 16 to nothing and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 688 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye', 6 'no', 3 recorded as 'present.' This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 752."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 752, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is an effort on the Department of Local Governmental Affairs to equalized and put additional fairness in our farm land assessment process in this state. There are certain disparities under the law which we passed 2 years ago caused from county averaging of top farm land to arrive at the percentage of the value which is to be included in the formula for assessing our farm real estate. Farm land on one side of the county line and on the other side, the same quality land might have quite a difference in assessed evaluation. This Bill eliminates county averaging for determining the top value of farm land and goes to 10 county averaging for northern Illinois and for southern Illinois. In addition, the Bill provides that all farm dwellings will be assessed at 33 and 1/3rd percent of market value and that the multiplier applying in that county will apply to that farm dwelling. And finally, the Bill provides for a hold harmless so that for one more year, we can have a transition period from the old assessment method to the new assessment method and local government will not lose any tax revenues. I would ask for... This Bill is supported by the Department of Local Governmental Affairs and by the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. And I would ask for your favorable approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 752 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'ayes', no 'nays', 7 recorded as



'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 756. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 760, out of the record. Senate Bill 765. Mr. Terzich. Read the Bill. Let's go."

Clerk Leon: "Senate Bill 765, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 765 provides that the appointments to fill vacancies of the Office of the Secretary of State, the Comptroller, the Treasurer, or the Attorney General shall only be until the next general election rather than for the remainder of the term. What this Bill does, it will let the voters of the State of Illinois vote for these very important offices. It would put the reelection in the same position as those provided for the Senate appointments. In other words, that if a vacancy occurs that the Governor can't appoint to fill that vacancy until the next general election which would give the people of the State of Illinois the opportunity to vote for the persons who sit in these very important positions. This Bill, I think, will afford the citizens of the State of Illinois the opportunity to select people for office rather than an appointed position. And therefore, since this Bill was... did come out of the Committee on a very partisan vote, I would move that we take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 788."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 788, a Bill for an Act to create the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent. Take it



out of the record. Senate Bill 799. Mr. Bowman."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 799. A Bill for an Act to create a new Act requiring the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission to prepare State Debt Impact Notes for all Bills in either the House or in the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was the work product of the Joint Committee on long-term state debt. It has had strong bipartisan support in the Senate. It was sponsored jointly by Senators Netsch and Rhoads. Representative Kempiners joins with me in sponsoring this Bill here in the House. It was recommended by the Auditor General. In addition, basically, all the Bill does is to extend the Fiscal Impact Note to debt authorizations. It was...has been generally felt that fiscal Bills are not, themselves, the proper subject of Fiscal Impact Notes, because their impact should be obvious on their face. That is not true of Bills involving debts. You buy into a project, and you find that later on down the road you have to spend considerably more money than you did in the original Bill. I think this is a good piece of legislation, and urge your support."

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

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Collins: "I forget the figure, Representative Bowman. How many additional people are going to be hired by this Commission as a result of this action?"

Bowman: "Mr. Collins, you're probably making reference to the Economic and Fiscal Commission's budget Bill, which was approved by both chambers just recently. They are hiring, I think, five additional people. However, this particular



Act, I have a memorandum here from the Executive Director, and it was confirmed by our staff, at least, that it would require, this particular Bill, would require no more than part of an analyst's time and part of the Clerk's time, so I think we're talking about, basically, one position."

Collins: "Which Executive Director?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Coin."

Bowman: "Ray Coin. Yes."

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Coin."

Bowman: "Ray Coin, the Executive Director of the Economic and Fiscal Commission."

Collins: "Well, I would submit to you that maybe that statement might be somewhat suspect to those of us who find that this Economic and Fiscal Commission is not only not doing up to their statutory authority or ruling outside of it, I should say, but it is inundating us with worthless reports already, and here is a lot of more paper work that you're hiring additional people to expand this Commission. I think we have seen the expansion of Commissions in this Session like we've never seen before, and if there's any Commission that should not be expanded, it's this one. I would further submit that if this function is to be performed, and I'm not so sure it should be, because I don't think anybody would pay attention on these reports, anyway, it should be done by the Auditor General, himself. Now, I know the Auditor General doesn't want to do it, but that does...that really shouldn't cut that much ice with us. I think that we have an Auditor General who is, basically, a legislative officer, and if we are going to have reports on long-term debts, this is a function that would fall well within the structure of the Auditor General's office and of his Act. I don't like to be getting into a Commission expanding itself. Again, we seem to see a power structure building here, and needlessly. I would



urge every Member to reject this needless, worthless, and probably harmful Bill."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join Representative Bowman as a joint Sponsor on this Senate Bill, just as we were joint Sponsors on the two House Bills that were part of a four Bill package, and regardless of the problem that the previous speaker may have had with regard to the Commission that has been assigned this task, the Longer-Termed Debt Study Commission spent a considerable number of hours looking at various alternatives as to what agency ought to have this responsibility. We did look at the Auditor General's office, and the Auditor General said that it ought not be his responsibility, and he is very strongly in support of both this Bill and Senate Bill 800 which follows. If we, in the Legislature, are ever going to get a handle on what we are doing to future generations when we issued debt notes, this is got...this is what we've got to do. It's my understanding that for every 1 dollar that we bond, we pay back a dollar and seventy-two cents. Now, that is a debt that we are leaving for our children and grandchildren, and if we do want to know what impact our actions today are going to have ten years from now, or twenty-five years from now, we have to have an agency of this Legislature preparing this type of note for us to make legitimate decisions upon. Again, the previous speaker had a problem with this going to this particular Commission, but I think it's our duty that we have problems with Commissions, which we create, to improve the operations of those Commissions. Once again, if we're to ever have a handle on what we are doing to future generations of the State of Illinois, we ought to pass this Bill and Senate Bill 800."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Are you aware that the Auditor General made a very detailed report of a long-term debt just last year?"

Bowman: "Representative Friedrich, I'm quite aware of that.

In fact, it was that report that provided the basis for the House Joint Resolution, which established the Long-term Debt Study Committee, and it was one of the recommendations in that report that we set up a Legislative Oversight Committee, and this is one of the...we're going to be picking up 800 next, which addresses that specific point, but this is one of the functions that a Legislative Oversight Committee should be taking up. I think this fits in very well with that Auditor General's report to which you refer."

Friedrich: "Well, then, just on the Bill. We've got..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "...two Commissions that are growing faster than state government, you know state government has twenty-two hundred fewer employees than they had a year ago. We've got two Commissions that have got about ten more employees apiece. I don't know where this is going to end, but I'm sure that this is not the solution, we create Commissions and spend money to save money, and we just keep on putting on more people on the payroll in these Commissions. I don't think the public approves this, and I know I don't."

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

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I rise in support of what I consider very good Bills. I think all of you know that I'm an outspoken critic of Commissions, and the proliferation of Commissions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proliferation."

Davis: "That's it. That's the word. However, the Economic and Fiscal Commission, of which I happen to be a Member, but that's beside the point. I've had an opportunity to view them up closely. It's true that they don't do a



great deal now, because we don't let them do a great deal. It really depends on what we want them to do. They can be our Bureau of the Budget. They should be our Bureau of the Budget. The Representative in the Chair right now, Representative Lechowicz, was a strong Director and Chairman of that Commission for two years, and took it to places where it properly should have gone, but I don't think took it far enough. These two Bills will add in...add in functions for us, for our benefit, from our own stepchild that we control, and we direct, that can help us decide what's right and what's wrong in terms of budgets, and not have to depend on the Bureau of the Budget."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good management Bill. We have a triple A bond rating in the state, but the Auditor General's report to which Representative Friedrich alluded, did indicate that our triple A bond rating was coming under closer scrutiny by the bonding houses. We are not in eminent danger of losing that rating, but we do have to take steps to strengthen the legislative control over the process, so that the bond authorizations and appropriations do not get away from us. This is a necessary tool for that purpose..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 799 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Marco...Flinn. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye'...29 'ayes', 25 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 800."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 800. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Bowman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 800 is the companion legislation to 799 and two other Bills, which have already passed the House. It is an essential part of implementing that legislation. At the present time, the statute establishing the Economic and Fiscal Commission provides it with very, very general responsibilities. In fact, with the exception of developing the state economic report and a revenue estimate, there are no specific delegations of responsibility to the Economic and Fiscal Commission. If there are critics to the Commission in this chamber, who feel like it's been floundering, I would suggest that, perhaps, one of the reasons is that we have not given it clear legislative direction. That's precisely what Senate Bill 800 would do. All of the other pieces of legislation, which this House has passed, does tail into this, and provides the necessary implementing legislation. I urge an affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Monroe Flinn in the Chair."

Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 800 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 voting...134 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 828."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 828, a Bill for an Act to release an easement in Cumberland County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, take it out of the record please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'm sorry. I got one Bill ahead of myself. Bower. Representative Bower."



Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a release of a highway easement in Cumberland County which was supposed to have been on the Consent Calendar and accidentally was not placed there. I ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 828 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 voting 'aye', and none voting 'nay', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 918, Representative Mulcahey, you want that out of the record? Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 927."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 927, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, you have to disregard the synopsis in our book. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the Judges' Retirement System. That was all taken out. House Amendment is now the Bill. It amends the IMRF Article of the Pension Code. It provides that a Member could elect to pick an additional 48 months for service that he was involved in a municipality if he pays all of the costs, all of the interest, and previously he could pick up less months time that. But this extends the amount of time that he could pick up and I know of no opposition to this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

McCourt: "Is it true, Mr. Beatty, that at the present time a person can pick up 50 months of time served, eligible



time served in IMRF even though he did not elect to participate in IMRF at the time he was a municipal employee? Is that right?"

Beatty: "Except in this Bill, it would allow him to pick up 98 months, but those months he would have been employed in that municipality."

McCourt: "Alright, now when he picks up his additional 4 years... the additional 48 months, how much will he pay into the system he's bringing the time into?"

Beatty: "The employee contribution would pay what he would have been required had he initially elected plus interest from that time to the date he puts a payment in."

McCourt: "And how much does he pay in for the initial 50 months?"

Beatty: "Well, the initial 50 months he would have paid in whatever his contribution was supposed to be at that time depending on what his wages were."

McCourt: "So, it lets him bring into the system 8 years even though he had never elected to be a part of IMRF at the time of his service."

Beatty: "Well, but he put the time into the municipality. He did work there. Now he elects at a later date. I don't know... The interest is being paid and he's paying his contribution."

McCourt: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Do you wish to close, Representative Beatty?"

Beatty: "I would just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 927 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 voting 'aye', and 20 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 939."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 939, a Bill for an Act to provide



for the establishment of agricultural districts.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor.
Senate Bill 942."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 942, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of
the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson. Out of the record at the
request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 955."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 955, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act in relation to regulation of rivers,
lakes and streams. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner on Senate Bill 955."

Skinner: "Does Representative Neff have an Amendment that's
been distributed on this, because if so, I would like
to take it back to Second Reading and put it on. Is
there an Amendment that's been distributed, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Flinn: "There's no Amendment filed. They do have an
Amendment out on the floor."

Skinner: "That's funny because my seatmate, the official
Amendment keeper...."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we see them out on the floor there. The
Clerk's looking again."

Skinner: "Amendment #2. Is 2 on?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner, you're requesting to take
the Bill back to Second?"

Skinner: "If the Amendment has already been adopted.... It is
adopted."

Speaker Flinn: "It is adopted."

Skinner: "Oh, superb."

Speaker Flinn: "Do you wish to have it...."

Skinner: "Oh, yeah. This is a.. This is a Bill that delimits the
Department of Transportation's power in forcing farmers
to get permits to build bridges over creeks on their
farms and it also limits the authority of the Department



of Transportation to tear down dams unless they can prove that there's really a problem. They can't just do it on a windshield assessment like they tried to do in Lake Marion near Carpentersville or in Lake in the Hills. In addition it.. Let's see. In addition it puts in authorizing legislation to allow the Illinois Department of Transportation to be the authority to handle the 408.. is it 408? Anyway, the... No, It's not 208. It's the .. It's the dumping provisions that are now handled by the Corp of Engineers. You know, when you have to.. When you do dredging, you have to get a permit to put the dredging someplace and it anticipates the passage of 404.. 404. We've got the right clause now...the right code number. This anticipates the passage of federal .. of federal legislation in order to... well and gives that authority to the department."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, ... Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you. Cal, on the removal of a dam, I'm only working from the synopsis, the cost of that is dealt with by which people? Does the Department take on the cost? Like if they decide that there's eminent danger and they've had a public hearing, decide to remove it, is the cost born by the.. by the order or by the department?"

Skinner: "Frankly, I'm not sure I know. They attempted to...."

Schneider: "It may be in the Bill. I don't have the Bill."

Skinner: "It may indeed be."

Schneider: "Get Schaffer down here. Answer that question."

Skinner: "I don't know.. the Amendment. Jack, who pays for the damn if they .. the department wants to tear it down?"

Schneider: "I mean if it's a private... I mean if it's the department, a private person might let a dam deteriorate to the point where he'll say, 'Well, I don't want to



mess with it.'..."

Skinner: "Well, they tried to force the money out of the owner of the dams.

Schneider: "What?"

Skinner: "They have previously tried to force the money out of the owner of the dams, so I presume there would be no change."

Schneider: "Alright. I don't like to see DOT do it, but sounds like a crusade from the McHenry County brigade."

Skinner: "We're just trying to keep IDOT out of our District, at least for dams. They can build roads though."

Speaker Flinn: "Further questions? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 955 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'nay'. This question, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1002."



Speaker Flinn: "Senate Bill 1002."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1002. A Bill for an Act to create the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1002 creates the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act with the objective of protecting dealers from the abuses of manufacturers and their franchise dealings. The Bill prohibits, essentially, unreasonable conduct by a manufacturer and such things as pricing a new franchise in a given market area and prohibiting a transfer of an interest in a franchise and terminating a franchise and failing to renew the franchise in seeking modifications of the terms of the franchise agreement at the time of renewal. This Bill has been thoroughly heard in both the Senate and the Judiciary Committee of the House. I believe it's in excellent form and I would urge your favorable support."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Bill 1002 pass? All those in favor vote aye. Those oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 voting aye and 1 voting no and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

Representative J. David Jones was off the floor when 1200 was called a while ago. We'll back up to that. That's on page 10. Representative J. David Jones, were you requesting to take this back to Second? Or you're wanting to move it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act creating the Municipal Housing Finance Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jones, J. David Jones."



Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1200 amends the Illinois Municipal Code. This Bill would provide nonhome rule units with the same authority as home rule units relative to issuing municipal revenue bonds for the purpose of offering loans for home financing. We passed a similar Bill for the counties. These are for the cities that are not under the home rule provision and there's a front door referendum for any county that wishes to do it. I move its passage at this time."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1200 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 voting 'aye' and 9 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back to the Priority Calendar. Senate Bill 1053."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1053 amends the Illinois Income Tax Act as it pertains to the calculations of base income for individuals in corporations. For Illinois tax purposes Senate Bill 1053 allows corporate and individual taxpayers to deduct from base income the amount of wages added back onto gross income as a result of participating in the federal targeted jobs credit or work incentive credit program. The Bill was amended to strike out the tax indexing proposal that was in it before. So Senate Bill 1053 just provides an additional incentive for Illinois employers to participate in 2 federal job credit programs which really help in areas



of needy and high unemployment and will thereby alleviate unemployment problems in the state. It's similar to a Bill sponsored by Senator.. by Representative Tipword that passed this House in the last Session and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The... Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1053 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye' and 3 voting 'nay.' And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1101."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act in relation to the powers and authority of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: " Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1101 raises the bonding authority for the Illinois Housing Development Authority in the amount of 300 million dollars and I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate...' Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Could you tell us what the maximum authorization now is for the Housing Authority with this additional 300 million dollars?"

Telcser: "It's currently 800 million. It'll go to a billion, 100 million."

Kane: "Could you tell us when the last time the limit was increased?"

Telcser: "The last time it was increased was in the 80th General Assembly when it was raised from 500 million to 800 million."



Kane: "And how much of the existing 800 million is presently authorized?"

Telcser: "Seven hundred and seventy million is currently outstanding."

Kane: "And how long do they expect to go with this additional 300 million?"

Telcser: "I don't know, Representative."

Kane: "What's the maximum that they hope to put out? Do you know?"

Telcser: "No, I have no idea what their plans are or what projects they have ready to go with. I just don't know what their work load is or what the.... program is."

Kane: "One last question. What's the backing for these bonds?" "

Telcser: "These are revenue bonds."

Kane: "Are they moral obligation bonds?"

Telcser: "Are they what kind of obligation?"

Kane: "Moral obliga..."

Telcser: "Moral?..."

Kane: "Of the State..."

Telcser: "To the best of my knowledge, they are simply revenue bonds period and they are paid off from the revenues derived from the projects at which they're financed."

Kane: "And what happens if one of the projects defaults? Who assumes the responsibility?"

Telcser: "Fortunately, up till now, there never has been a default. So I.. it's difficult to try and guess what may happen. These are revenue bonds. They're to paid off with revenues derived from the projects. There never has been a failure or a default. And we hope it will stay that way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for more.. for another question or two?"

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

Mautino: "Alright, I know there was about 800 million in. .in the



bonding authority last year. Okay? So, we enacted in the 80th General Assembly. My question to you is, 'What's the breakdown between the metropolitan Cook County area and downstate?' And I'd like to know how much of that bonding authority is spent in the downstate areas outside of the County of Cook."

Telcser: "Representative, I don't know that answer. I do know that during the course of the Committee hearing, in our discussion with certain individual Members, IHDA sets aside a certain amount and I don't know what percent for downstate."

Mautino: "Would you say that there's probably 80% of those funds being spent in the metropolitan Cook County area and about 20% of that downstate?"

Telcser: "I don't know, Representative. Perhaps Representative Huff would know. He's been very much involved."

Mautino: "I'd like to have some answers to that because otherwise, I'm going to speak in opposition to this Bill because we keep increasing the bonding indebtedness and yet we see no programs for downstate Illinois. "

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates that... Representative Huff may have an answer. Turn Representative Huff on please."

Huff: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge, Representative Mautino, those figures are just reversed. It could be documented that about 80% of those funds are spent in the suburban areas, 20% in Cook County Chicago area, because of the 'Gudthrow' decision. That's it. I don't know about the rest of downstate. I know that the 80% that you're alluding to is not spent in Cook County of Chicago area. It's spent elsewhere downstate."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's just that the additional bonding revenue also was to help participate with some savings and loans in areas that



needed money to help some of these areas out. And that was my understanding why the increase in the appropriation in the general obligation bonds."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this particular Bill, I think, illustrates very, very well why we needed the Senate Bill 799 and 800. I'm not really sure that any of us on this floor know precisely what the implications of this additional 300 thou... 300 million dollars bonding will be. I would like to point out however for the edification of the House and the Sponsor that the.. the statute that establishes this bonding program does require that in the case of default that the Governor shall in his next budget request to the General Assembly .. make a request to the General Assembly for a sufficient money to pay on the defaulted notes. Now there's no requirement that we actually make the payment, but there is a requirement that the Governor approach us and put that sum in his budget. Now, if that isn't a moral obligation, I'd like to know what is. There is no definition of moral obligation in the statutes. That's something the bonding houses determine, but this is something that looks like a moral obligation and I think one ought to take that into account in casting a vote. I, for one, plan to vote 'present' until we have more information about this program."

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

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Two questions. First of all, our analysis indicates that there is total principle outstanding of about 465 million dollars and yet it indicates that this is increasing the amount from 800 million to 1 billion, one



hundred million. Why do we have the necessity of increasing the amount when we have only about 465 million outstanding?"

Telcser: "Well, Representative, our analysis and the people from IHDA tell me that there are 770 million dollars outstanding in loans and commitments at the present time. So there's a difference between your analysis and ours."

Brummer: "Well maybe the difference is that they have issued 770 million and..."

Telcser: "They may have made commitments, but not yet dispersed the funds or gone to market with them. The difference may be in commitments made."

Brummer: "Okay, the second question, more importantly, as I recall, this is the agency that was criticized by the Auditor General at having excessive funds on hand to pay out .. to pay off outstanding bonds. On other words, they have the revenues that have been raised to pay off outstanding bonds, and they don't go.. they have not seen fit to go on and pay off the outstanding revenue bonds. They merely apparently are banking the money and paying the bonds off as they become due and payable. Am I correct?"

Telcser: "Representative, this is the first I've heard of that. It may have.. the report may have slipped by me, but this never came up once in any of the House..."

Brummer: "Okay, I'm sorry. I'm thinking of the Illinois Building Authority. Thank you."

Telcser: "Wrong one."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser, to close."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1101 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's 92 voting 'aye',



93 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1102."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1102 ..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters would like to be voted 'no' and you step right down here and fill out a slip and you'll be voted 'no'. You're welcome Sir. Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm sorry. I was out of the room when you answered the question, how many votes it took. I wanted to make sure it got enough. Did it?"

Speaker Flinn: "No one raised the question."

Skinner: "Well..."

Speaker Flinn: "I announced that it was passed."

Skinner: "Whether they raised the question or not, if it takes 107 and it didn't get 107 you know we're not going to be able to sell the bonds, because Chapall and Cutler will never give us a.. an opinion. If it only takes 89 votes you ought to say that."

Speaker Flinn: "The Sponsor tells me that he checked it out and it takes 89 votes. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear and I suggest to the Speaker that this is a revenue bond. It would therefore take 89 votes."

Speaker Flinn: "Eighty-nine votes it got. It passed. I announced it. We're on the next Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act in relation to powers and authority of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1101 (sic) simply increases from 8% to 9% the maximum interest rate which can be paid on bonds and notes issued by the Illinois Housing Development Authority. This becomes



necessary because of the rising money market which everyone is familiar with, the rising interests rates, and the competition in the market place for investors who want to place their money at the highest possible yield with as much safety and security. And Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall ..' Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "Tell me, will the bond and note holders be exempt from paying federal income tax on these.. on the interest?"

Telcser: "My staff man tells me that they are, Representative."

Stearney: "Well, isn't 9% unusually high considering that there's no federal income tax to be paid?"

Telcser: "That is an excellent return."

Stearney: "Well, assuming that someone's in a 30, 40, 50 % bracket, that amounts to 14, 15 % return. Seems to be unusually high."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Telcser, you wish to close? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill..' Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to point out to the House that these are tax free security and as such, the tax break is taken into account by the market place in setting the interest rate. There are two ways of looking at this.. this particular measure. I think in one.. on one sense, since these are revenue bonds, you can say, well the state.. since the state's credit is not directly on the line, so what about the interest rates? On the other hand, you can.. you can say, well it's the Illinois Building Authority .. is got.. vastly expanded authority to negotiate higher rates and has got.. now they have



an additional 300 million dollars of authority to go out there and negotiate with. That could have a serious impact on the market for the other kinds of securities that we market with the same kinds of investors and so, I'm not really sure what the.. the real need for this legislation is. So, I'm planning to vote 'no!'"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser to close."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in closing let me simply say that the debate has brought out the issues which are at hand in this particular Bill. When an investor is going to purchase a bond for a ten... for a 20 or perhaps longer period of years, if one looks at a rising inflationary rate, an investor may be reluctant to put their money into a security if he or she feels that the return will be eroded because of inflation. My understanding is that in the bond market rates are in order .. bonds should be made more market-able and to create market.. a market for them, higher yields have to be offered. What this simply does is to allow the authority if necessary to go up to a 9% rate. Needless to say, if the market conditions change they will go into the market at a very competitive rate and try and sell them for a lower interest rate. This simply gives the authority the permission if necessary to go to 9% and I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1102 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Before I recognize some people to explain their vote, I'd like to say that our Former Speaker, Jack Walker, is in the back here. Representative Borchers to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Borchers: "Well, I feel that this would be a good investment for people to have fit in money. Now as I understand what I've heard, you have no income tax to pay. It's 9%. I believe I would like to know where I can go and buy



some of these bonds. So I think I'll vote 'yes.'"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. Currently they can issue these bonds at 8% and that's tax free. Now that worked out to as much as 16% in taxable interest. I suggest to you that that is more than sufficient. But moreover, these bonds are all secured by real estate. They don't have to worry about repayment. There is ample security behind them. I suggest to you that this Bill ought to be defeated."

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

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Very simply, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the real world the prime rate is 11%. All this Bill is attempting to do is to make their bond offering somewhat competitive to the prime rate by raising it from 8 to 9% of which I would say 4% is guaranteed by the federal government and the fact that there's never been a foreclosure on any of these bond indebtedness. It's a good Bill and it's gets some housing in Illinois and hopefully this year, in Chicago."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn, to explain his vote. No? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1117."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act to clarify the types of property under jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1117 is a Bill developed by the Department of Conservation to update



the categorization of parks. This was given a thorough review in Environment and Natural Resources. Amended to conform with some of the requests of some of the outside groups that were very interested in this Bill. I believe it's a Bill that's been long overdue, certainly accomplishes what we need in Illinois to have firm definitions of our park systems. I would urge its passage."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1117 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1150, out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1183, Representative C.M. Stiehl."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act to release an easement in St. Clair County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, would you take this Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1203. Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1217. Representative Laurino. Not in his seat. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1227. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1239."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1239, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill allows the state income tax deductions for the runaway corporate of property taxes defined as 30% of gross annual rent. To qualify, the rent must be paid on a resident subject real estate tax-



tion. This also allows residential renters deduction from state income tax equal to 30% of their annual rent. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "You do a good imitation of Jaffe and Giorgi combined."

Cullerton: "Talk to your Leader."

Johnson: "I couldn't understand what you were saying. Could you go over it a little slower?"

Cullerton: "Alright. I'll do it.. It's very similar to House Bill 710 which we passed out of here .. which was Sponsored by Representative Ryan which is now pending over in the Senate. This Bill was Sponsored by Senator D'Arco. It allows residential renters a deduction from income.. from state income tax equal to 30% of the annual rent."

Johnson: "Now let me ask you this. I guess it's a good preliminary question. Why should we do this? And what's the fiscal impact of it?"

Cullerton: "The fiscal impact is in the range of 20 to 25 million dollars."

Johnson: "Twenty-five million dollars?"

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Johnson: "Secondly, why should we do it?"

Cullerton: "Well, for the same reasons that we passed the .. that you voted for Representative Ryan's Bill, House Bill 710 that we voted out of the House and sent over to the Committee to give renters the same break that we give homeowners."

Johnson: "The difference is we don't really give homeowners the .. a deduction for what we'd call... we give them a deduction for interest paid just as we give tenants or anyone else a deduction for interests paid in however they pay their interest. But we're talking here about something that's not a.. We don't give landlords or homeowners a deduction for principle reduction do we?"



Cullerton: "No, but tenants obviously don't care to pay interest on their rent the landlords pay interest on the money they owe to buy the home."

Johnson: "Well the only thing they really.. The only thing that a landlord gets in terms of a deduction is the same as I get if I borrowed \$1,000 from the bank at 8%, I'd get the \$80 that I paid back. It's not really having to do with real estate. It's just a matter of paying interest on .. for the use of money over a particular period of time. It's really completely unrelated to the real estate. If you took out a \$50,000 loan and put up your stocks as security, you'd get the same deduction as you would if you took out a \$50,000 mortgage loan."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "There seems to be some confusion on the part of Mr. Johnson. I'd like to take this out of the record and explain this to him."

Speaker Flinn: "Take the Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 1271."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code." Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know since August of 1976 we have had a program of self insurance in Illinois. Senate Bill 1271 provides where a state employee operates a motor vehicle covered by self insurance, the state's obligation shall not exceed \$300,000 per person for occurrence. Currently the state's maximum liability is 2 million per accident. Has no relationship to the person for occurrence. It also makes technical changes stating that coordination of insurance programs shall be through the Department



of Administrative Services Office of Fiscal Management-Mismanagement. Currently the statute states that this shall be performed through the Department of Administrative Services with no reference to this specific division. The Bill also provides that the term employee means while the employee of this state .. it defines who the employee of the state is. For instance, driving home after work would not constitute while in the employee of the state. The... At the Department of Administrative Services, feels that the limits that are being described in this Bill will be of great favorable impact on the state and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty."

Macdonald: "It also passed the Senate 55 to nothing."

Getty: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will."

Getty: "Did I understand, Representative Macdonald, that this would reduce the state's liability from the present 2 million dollars to 300 thousand?"

Macdonald: "No, it.. you still would have a 2 million dollar per accident, but this would be a per person occurrence... per person per occurrence a 300 thousand dollar limit."

Getty: "Well under present law, if I were injured going home by somebody operating a state automobile, for example, and I were to become totally and permanently disabled, and the loss would be 2 million dollars to my family, as I read this and correct me if I'm wrong, I could get an award theoretically at least for up to 2 million dollars. Where as if we were to pass this, even though my loss and damages would be much greater than \$300,000, I would be limited in the award to 300 thousand. Is that correct?"

Macdonald : "Well, my understanding is that the 2 million dollars in such an accident, for instance if there were a bus accident and there would be 30 people are killed, the maximum



liability of the State of Illinois is 2 million dollars which would be divided by those 30 people. If you are in an accident which you described and you are the only person then the 2 million dollars is still... you still get that. Now, it's.. However there is.. My understanding is that there is a limitation that there shall not be an award per occurrence of more than \$300,000 per person if they agreed to settle with the Department of Administration. Even today I don't believe you could get 2 million."

Getty: "I'm just.. I just have some questions about this and I don't know if they've been answered. I just wonder if you might want to take this out of the record so we could look at it and get back to it later."

Macdonald: "Well, I would be happy to yield to Representative Epton, who does have some answers apparently to the questions that you're asking. I had hoped to have one of the Representatives from the Department of Administrative Services but they are not on the floor so I... if you will let me yield to Representative Epton and then if you still have questions, I would be very happy to take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to your previous question, even under today's.... even under today's statute there is a limit of liability in the Court of Claims so you could not get the 2 million or 3 million. You could only get the maximum of 300 thousand dollars if unfortunately, or God forbid, you were killed. All this does is simply increases the amount so that if it's a multiple occurrence it retains a substantial limit but divides it among several participants. What it simply does is streamline the operation in a Court of Claims."

Getty: "Well, if that is your representation, Representative Epton, I thank you. I won't oppose it."



Epton: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, some questions of the Sponsor. Or Representative Epton, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Turn them both on, Epton and Macdonald."

Schuneman: "As I read the Bill, the Bill strikes the 2 million dollar limit that is presently in the law and inserts a lower limit, which in effect says that there's 300 thousand dollars maximum insurance coverage for any employee who may be sued by a third party. Is that correct?"

Epton: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "Well, then in the event a state employee should be sued for an amount in excess of 3 million dollars, where do they get the money?"

Epton: "No, there million should be 300 thousand. There's a 300 thousand maximum originally presently today for individual. Now what it simply says is that if you have a number of, as Representative Macdonald explained, a number of people in a bus it can go up to 3 million dollars divided amongst all these people."

Schuneman: "Well, but I'm thinking in terms of a state employee who may be driving a state automobile. And he's involved in an accident in which he is the defendant in a law suit for injuries to other parties. And as I read this, that employee would have no more than 300 thousand dollars protection against that kind of a three party... or a two party liability claim."

Epton: "You would have 300 thousand... There's an Amendment to this Bill. You would have 300 thousand dollars per individual injured party."

Schuneman: "Well, that's what I'm saying. So that the suit... If the court finds in favor of the plaintiff and awards a judgement of more than 300 thousand dollars, the employee it seems to me who was negligently operating a



state owned vehicle, would be called upon to come up with the difference."

Epton: "No, unfortunately the Sponsor and I didn't add that the maximum award can not exceed 300 thousand dollars. The claim is limited."

Schuneman: "Okay. Well then is this something that we're doing for the State of Illinois? Are we only doing it for the state, or are we going to do it for other.. for other units of government? Are we going to reduce the possible liability claim for all units of government? Or just for the State of Illinois?"

Epton: "This is just for the State of Illinois as it presently exists. In other words, this particular Bill changes only any state owned vehicle, lease their own, of course. It doesn't apply to municipalities or county if that's what you're referring to. But we have not in the past limited that either..."

Schuneman: "Well, I hate to oppose the Bill and I'm not sure that I have an credible reason to oppose it, but I'm not very comfortable with it."

Epton: "Well, I can only respond by saying I'm not very comfortable either. Neither is Representative Getty. Unfortunately really what Representative Macdonald is doing is simply trying to remedy a situation which already exists. The Supreme Court has stated that the Court of Claims has the right to put a cap on the liability. Many of us don't like that, but it does exist and what they're saying, in effect is, in an attempt to save some of the expense to the state, that they will limit the number of people that can come under that cap and I feel, as you do, and as Representative Getty, if there is a great reluctance on the part of our colleagues to vote for this, then of course, she'll take it out of the record."

Schuneman: "Well, but Representative, is the cap on what the state



would pay on behalf of an employee or...."

Epton: "No..."

Schuneman: "Or is the cap on the judgement of what a plaintiff could collect from?"

Epton: "The cap as it presently exists, is on what the plaintiff can recover. It's on the amount of the judgement. They cannot collect individually from the state employee or pursue the state employee."

Schuneman: "Okay. If that's the case, I'll vote for the Bill and I'll introduce legislation to do the same thing for every unit of local government."

Epton: "I think that's a good idea, but we'll have trouble."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald to close. You wish to close?"

Macdonald: "I think that there has been enough discussion about this Bill. I would..."

Speaker Flinn: "Wait a minute. I overlooked someone. Representative Darrow. I'm sorry I didn't see your light on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the Sponsor would hold this Bill due to the lateness of the hour and the number of questions. When we have such astute and esteemed people as Senator (sic) Epton and Getty and Schuneman, you kind of wonder we aren't experts in insurance deals. We look to these men for our Leadership and they have some question. I wish you'd hold this until tomorrow."

Epton: "Actually Representative Macdonald would control it. One of the reasons we were trying to pass at this time was because everything was going so smoothly and I'm sure, Representative Darrow, with a lovely Lady like Representative Macdonald you certainly would want her to pass the Bill at this late hour. I hope, plead..."

Darrow: "Well, unless you're 100% for it, I'll have reservations."

Epton: "I uphold Representative Macdonald's wishes."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald to close."



Macdonald: "I really think because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that we do have a full Calendar and with respect to Representative Darrow I would like very much to hold the Bill but I think I will at least ask for a vote on the Bill and if we find that there are too many unanswered questions then possibly we can make an arrangement later. But I would ask for your positive vote on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1271 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Epton."

Epton: "I'm not explaining my vote but I would simply say that I recognize some of the problems we've raised and if we find that they are valid, I'm sure that we can have ... convey it to the Governor so that the appropriate changes can be made."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 1277 we amended that earlier in the day and we cannot hear it on Third Reading today. Senate Bill 3116 (Sic)."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1360(Sic) a Bill for an Act prohibiting the pumping of gasoline containing excess water or sludge. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1325. Representative Friedrich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1325, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to regulate the supervision, accountability and control of all state owned properties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the law presently provides that.. for the disposition of surplus real



estate by the Department of Administrative Services. This merely adds one paragraph which says that if a Department head decides that his property is surplus, then he can turn it over to the Department of Administrative Services at that point and then it's under the management of the Department of Administrative Services."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1325 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1386."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fair Employment Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very fair Bill. The decision has been arrived by both employers and employees. It is supported by the Fair Employment Practices Commission, their General Council. Their Administrative Manager came to testify in Committee. It merely specifies that a Commission or a hearing officer can order affirmed or employer found in violation of the act to pay back wages for up to two years to an individual deemed to have been adversely affected by an unlawful act. It grants them the authority to order reinstatement or hiring in addition to other necessary costs and attorney's fees. The other part of the Bill says that in the event the decision rules that the employer was not in violation of the Act, then the order issued by the Commission can specify that the employer can receive an award to cover legal fees if the complaint was frivolous and



unreasonable and groundless. I would urge your support."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Is this a... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will."

Getty: "Is this a limitation of two years in back pay?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, Sir. There was an Amendment though because Representative Grieman was concerned about pending cases and I believe that the Representative was assured through that Amendment that this would not include any pending cases."

Getty: "Alright, but presently, theoretically, at least, if the Commission didn't rule for, say four years, then four years in back pay could be awarded. Is that correct?"

Hallstrom: "No, Sir. I believe it's just a limit for two years."

Getty: "Okay. But without this Bill under present existing law we could have an award for four years in back pay. Is that correct?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, I understand that that is true."

Getty: "Alright, so that in the future, if the Commission were for some reason or another to fail to rule for four years, then the person would only be entitled for up to two years in back pay. Is that correct?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, Sir. I would like to point out again that the Fair Employment Practices Commission was very much for this Bill. They felt it was an important piece of legislation and did come to testify and it did come out of Judiciary without any votes against it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman. I'm sorry. Representative Getty, were you finished?"

Getty: "Yes. That aspect of the Bill I don't believe was brought out before the Judiciary Committee though. Was it, Representative?"

Hallstrom: "I'm sorry. I think you may be right, Sir, that that wasn't specifically mentioned because I think they concentrated on the problem of the pending cases..."



Getty: "That was my recollection also having been there and I think I supported the Bill but I don't think I was aware of that two year limitation and I would suggest that as to that part, I don't think it was completely brought out and I'm just wondering if you wouldn't want to reconsider that aspect of the Bill. The rest of the Bill I have no problem with, but I'm afraid, for the time being, if you persist in this, I would vote 'present'. I don't think that it's appropriate to put a two year maximum limitation because the affect would be just because the Commission for one reason or another didn't get to hear the case within that period of time a claimant would be cut off at two years. So I.. I would, in its present condition, I'm afraid I would have to oppose the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative... Representative Bowman."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates she will."

Bowman: "Representative Hallstrom, I'm working just from the synopsis here and sometimes they aren't very clear. I'm concerned about the authorization of an award of the defendent attorney's fees when the complaint is frivolous and persists and after it becomes so. At the present time is there.. in the law is there any provision for award of defendent's, namely the employer's attorney's fees?"

Hallstrom: "To my knowledge there is not, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "So this would be a new addition to the law."

Hallstrom: "Yes."

Bowman: "Okay. Now who determines whether the complaint is frivolous?"

Hallstrom: "I believe it's the FEPC. "

Bowman: "The FEPC itself would determine that. Now how would a person then persist in pursuing their complaint? If the FEPC determines it to be frivolous and then simply



refuses to take any action, how would the person be able to persist?"

Hallstrom: "I believe they would have their legal right to go to court although on this basis I did question the Gentlemen.. the General Council from FEPC. I think what they really believe is that the person will not go on with a hearing if FEPC says to them in advance of the hearing that really this is not a good move, that this does appear to be frivolous, unreasonable and unfounded."

Bowman: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill? This particular provision concerns me because it seems to me that if a person did go to court on what they knew to be a frivolous charge, that they would be incurring legal expenses on their own and I don't.. I think that would be a sufficient deterrent. I see no reason here to award the defendant's attorney's fees in addition and so for that reason, I oppose this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all this really does is to bring the Illinois law into conformity with the same procedure under Title 7 of the federal law. If if anyone files a suit or a claim under Title 7, if they are successful the person is entitled to attorney's fees. That's what this does here. The federal law is also that the defendant .. the employer usually can recover attorney's fees against the plaintiff, against the petitioner, only in an unusual situation where it was frivolous. That 's a standard that is very rarely met under the federal cases. There is a substantial body of law developing and it is designed so that people who invoke the procedures of the Title 7 or here, the FEPC, don't end up getting socked with a big legal fee. Here, I think that the result would be probably the same as under the federal law so that the concern that you express here



Representative Bowman, has not materialized under the federal law and I don't think that this entire Bill ought to be viewed as anything revolutionary. All it does is to bring Illinois law into the same kind of procedure on employment discrimination cases that is found in the federal law. In addition to that, as far as the point raised by Mr. Getty, the back pay award under the statute here as we have drafted it, will last for not more than two years prior to the filing of the charge so the date is not the time the case is concluded, Representative Getty. It is two years back to the filing of the charge. So if you litigate two years, that means four years. So that I think the concerns are not well founded and that this is a good and desirable Bill for people who believe in eliminating discrimination in employment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye' ; those opposed and the 'aye's have it. The Sponsor to close. Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to thank my colleagues from the First District. I believe that everything that he has said is absolutely true. I hope that answers Representative Getty's problem. This Bill was an honest attempt to come up with a fair compromise and as I said, it was supported by both the employers and employees. And I would ask you for your favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1386 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 134 voting 'aye', and 20 voting 'no'. This



Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Lechowicz 'aye'. Senate Bill 1406."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act to amend Section of the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1406 amends the Capital Development Bond Act. It increases the time in which the advertisements must be published before the opening bids on bonds from ten to 20 days. The Capital Development are having problems and this is a problem that could be solved by advertising ... to extend it to 20 days. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1406 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 voting 'aye' and 3 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1412."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act..."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor Senate Bill 1425."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1425 amends the Horse Racing Act. It eliminates the flat 8% tax on the charity meets and provides that they shall pay the same daily graduated tax as the other organizational licenses subject to the 8% maximum. This is an



an effort to help the charity meets because they are having difficulty in making their money, namely on the winter races. They can only run 7 days at a time and this is encouragement for them to continue their charity races in Illinois. There was an Amendment on it which dealt with the Hamiltonian Stakes and all this.. the Amendment did was increase instead of the income from just the third race, they added the fourth race to it because that will increase the money coming into the agricultural premium fund that a record is kept of and that will in turn go back to increase the stakes and the purses for the Hamiltonian Race. So what the Bill does primarily is to help encourage keeping horse racing going in Illinois and I would ask your favorable support."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1425 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brummer? To explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Brummer: "Yes, Representative Giorgi is here usually to explain the skimming process to us and he's not here today and he's our Leader on the process of skimming and horse racing and I really don't know what to do without our Leader."

Speaker Flinn: "He'll be out right away to take care of Agreed Resolutions. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 32. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 32, a Bill for an Act concerning mass, multiple and second murders. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe."



McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 32, quite simply, is a Bill that would punish people who were convicted of a second crime of murder or convicted of mass murder or multiple murder. It would give them life in prison unless the death penalty is imposed. This is a good law and order Bill. We have people like John Gacey and Richard Speck. This would insure that they'd spend the rest of their natural life in the penitentiary if they haven't been sentenced to the death penalty."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is unquestionably the dumbest Bill that has ever gotten out of the Judiciary II Committee this year. In fact it was discharged. That's right. Aside from creating a new crime, the only change in substance is to take away from the power of the court the right to impose punishment other than life imprisonment. Right now, under present law, when someone commits a murder and commits a second murder, he can be sentenced to the death penalty. Or he can be sentenced to something less if a judge wants to. All this does is take away all the discretion of a court. There's absolutely no need for it. If somebody committed a murder when he was 17, was sentenced and served time in prison and then when he was 55 committed another murder, he would automatically, mandatorily have to be put in jail for the rest of his natural life without having the court allow some discretion. Now if the court wants to do that they can under the present law. This, this is absolutely unneeded and I would remind that, Representative McAuliffe or any-



body else that speaks about these Bills, he's obviously talking about Mr. Gacey when he put these Bills in. Mr. Gacey... All we're doing here by talking about him is, is hurting the chances of convicting him by making it very difficult for him to get a fair trial in Springfield or Chicago or anywhere else. So we shouldn't really be talking about somebody who hasn't been found guilty yet. But I want to say that this Bill is really, really trying to direct itself at one person, but it's so broad that it will apply to anybody who definitely does not need to be given a life imprisonment and for that reason I'd ask for you to vote no."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well we do all kinds of things here in the Legislature as we should to limit the discretion of the court. We have a statute that says armed robbery shall not be probationable. We have a statute that says rape and devious sexual assaults shall not be probationable. And the list goes on and on. Part of our obligation as the General Assembly making laws for the state is to set certain guidelines that the court has to abide by in the determination of its sentence or whatever particular subject area we're talking about. This Bill does say that an individual who is involved in either a mass, multiple, or second murder, and second murder being defined as a murder after conviction on a first murder, shall be sentenced to natural life as a sentence for the conviction of that crime. I don't think anybody in here thinks that's unreasonable. I think that this Bill is directed to a real problem. It doesn't limit itself as it shouldn't limit itself to the situation of the Gacey case. It's broader than that. It ought to be broader than that and those individuals who have the capacity to commit multiple, mass, or second murders ought not to be able to go out to do it again. To those of you who oppose capital punishment and feel in opposing



it that you wish there was some alternative, this is the alternative. If the death penalty isn't imposed, the individual won't be on the streets to do it again, and I urge a yes vote in support for Senate Bill 32."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The gentleman's moved to previous question.

The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye' aye, those oppose. The ayes have it. Representative McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "Well very briefly, the previous speaker said this was the worst Bill that ever came out of the Judiciary Committee and that of course is a laugh. The regularly reported Bills out of the Committee that only get 20 or 30 votes on the House floor. So I think the fact that it didn't get out of Judiciary Committee is a very good, something good to speak in behalf of this Bill. He's mentioning Mr. Gacey and his fear for Mr. Gacey getting a fair trial. Well Mr. Gacey was from my district and either he is a murderer or else he was operating a cemetery without a license. I'm not, I'm not really too concerned about Mr. Gacey's rights and his welfare. I'm sure that there'll be a lot of lawyers speaking up for him and he'll get more than a fair trial. If you get down, if you get down to the basic part of it. This is a Bill that would simply, would help protect prison guards, would help... He mentioned the fact that a fellow committed a murder at age 17 and if he committed another murder at age 55 well maybe we should give him three chances. Let him go back out and maybe by the time he's 75 he'll commit the third murder. I think it's a very reasonable Bill and it's certainly not the worst Bill that was ever got out of the Judiciary Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Senate Bill 32 pass?"



All those in favor vote aye, those oppose vote no.
Representative Bowman to explain his vote. One minute.
The timer is on."

Bowman: "Thank you. I just want to point out to the Membership that this, this Bill obviously got out of Judiciary but it did not get out on a do pass motion. It was recommended do not pass then we took from the table as I recall. So the Judiciary did not vote this Bill out, Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 voting aye and 30 voting nay. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 644."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 644, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House.. Senate Bill 644 is really a very simple Bill and I very much appreciate the fact that it was discharged from Committee...."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion?"

Macdonald: "The Bill actually does one simple thing. It makes all correctional institutions employees under the same protection.. gives them the same protection of a correctional officer in terms of aggravated battery. This Bill arose out of a situation that happened at the Dwight Correctional Center where a medical technician went into the prison, was assaulted and then there was an attempt to bring charges. The State's Attorney was very reluctant to pursue the charges due to the fact that the interpretation of the statute was that it was only correctional officers who could be protected under the aggravated battery Section. Now I know that that Section of the law causes a great deal of trouble..."



Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 644 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 voting 'aye'; and 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1246. Representative Farley back there? Out of the record. Out of the record. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 380, Robbins, 381, Meyer-Keane, 382, Christensen, 383, Waddell, 386, Henry et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Have we had announcements on the Appropriation Committee? Representative Barnes before we put the Agreed Resolutions."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Appropriations II Committee will meet Thursday, Thursday morning 10:00 a.m. in room 118. Thursday morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Instead of when?"

Barnes: "Instead of tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Matijevich."

Barnes: "Instead of."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ditto for the House Appropriations I Committee. We will not meet until Thursday, at 9:00 a.m. in room 114. Thursday, at 9:00 a.m. room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich on the Agreed Resolutions."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Resolution 380, Robbins commends the Mt. Carmel High School baseball team. House Resolution 381, Meyer-Keane, congratulates the St. Xavier baseball Cougars for their fourth place finish in the NAIA. House Resolution 382, Christensen, congratulates the village of Gardner on its 125th anniversary. 383, Waddell, con-



gratulates Mr. and Mrs. John Hower for their 65th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 686 (sic), Henry et al congratulates the David G. Farrogot High School advanced mixed choir for their outstanding accomplishments. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 385, Braun. House Resolution 387 Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments.. Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you arise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to suspend the provisions of Rule 18 for the purpose of hearing Senate Joint Resolution 40 in the Executive Committee. I 've checked with both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Representative Kornowicz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kornowicz: "And also House Joint Resolution 59."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there.. Are there any objections to hearing Senate Joint Resolution 40 and Senate Joint Resolution 59, was that right Representative Kornowicz?"

Kornowicz: "59, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "59. Representative Kornowicz, did you clear that with Representative Ryan?"

Kornowicz: "House Joint Resolution 59. It's the investigation of the CETA program."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objection, 40 and 59... rules are waived. Anything further? Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 379, Mautino, in respect of the memory of Robert M. Arch. House Resolution 384, Bowman-Grieman, with respect to the memory of Lee J.



Epstein."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I move the adotion of the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion.
Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The
'aye's have it. The motion carried. Death Resolutions
are adopted. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Com-
mittee on Appropriations II, to which the following
Bills were referred, action taken June 19th, 1979.
Record the same back with following recommendations;
'Do pass' Senate Bill 389. 'Do pass as amended'
Senate Bills 157, 575, and 587."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Mr. Clerk? Representative
Madigan. 10:00 o'clock. Motion to adjourn."

Madigan: "Does the Clerk require any time? I move that we adjourn
till 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Madigan's
motion to adjourn till 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.
The motion was put at exactly 8:00 o'clock. Those in
favor indicated by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'.
The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The House now
stands adjourned at 8:00 o'clock tonight until 10:00 o'clock
tomorrow morning."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 19, 1979

PAGE

(46)	SB-0032	3RD READING	PAGE	228
	SB-0048	3RD READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0041	3RD READING	PAGE	157
	SB-0100	2ND READING	PAGE	158
	SB-0107	3RD READING	PAGE	105
	SB-0114	2ND READING	PAGE	151
	SB-0122	3RD READING	PAGE	113
	SB-0133	3RD READING	PAGE	75
	SB-0139	3RD READING	PAGE	78
	SB-0185	3RD READING	PAGE	84
	SB-0198	3RD READING	PAGE	160
	SB-0203	2ND READING	PAGE	7
	SB-0219	3RD READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0228	3RD READING	PAGE	166
	SB-0235	3RD READING	PAGE	168
	SB-0202	3RD READING	PAGE	150
	SB-0287	3RD READING	PAGE	169
	SB-0292	2ND READING	PAGE	155
	SB-0313	3RD READING	PAGE	116
	SB-0318	2ND READING	PAGE	13
	SB-0320	3RD READING	PAGE	14
	SB-0324	3RD READING	PAGE	117
	SB-0330	2ND READING	PAGE	151
	SB-0379	2ND READING	PAGE	13
	SB-0382	2ND READING	PAGE	13
	SB-0384	2ND READING	PAGE	170
	SB-0399	3RD READING	PAGE	16
	SB-0406	3RD READING	PAGE	85
	SB-0455	2ND READING	PAGE	7
	SB-0482	3RD READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0492	3RD READING	PAGE	171
	SB-0495	3RD READING	PAGE	174
	SB-0509	3RD READING	PAGE	120
	SB-0511	3RD READING	PAGE	92
	SB-0513	3RD READING	PAGE	92
	SB-0514	3RD READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0533	3RD READING	PAGE	183
	SB-0553	3RD READING	PAGE	120
	SB-0560	3RD READING	PAGE	184
	SB-0567	3RD READING	PAGE	125
	SB-0585	3RD READING	PAGE	17
	SB-0626	3RD READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0627	3RD READING	PAGE	2

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 19, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-0636	3RD READING	PAGE	18
SB-0644	3RD READING	PAGE	232
SB-0659	2ND READING	PAGE	146
SB-0674	3RD READING	PAGE	185
SB-0688	3RD READING	PAGE	187
SB-0715	3RD READING	PAGE	122
SB-0717	3RD READING	PAGE	18
SB-0722	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-0739	3RD READING	PAGE	122
SB-0746	3RD READING	PAGE	20
SB-0752	3RD READING	PAGE	188
SB-0764	2ND READING	PAGE	93
	3RD READING	PAGE	94
SB-0790	3RD READING	PAGE	98
SB-0799	3RD READING	PAGE	191
SB-0800	3RD READING	PAGE	195
SB-0811	3RD READING	PAGE	123
SB-0824	3RD READING	PAGE	124
SB-0844	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-0857	3RD READING	PAGE	33
SB-0861	3RD READING	PAGE	125
SB-0872	3RD READING	PAGE	33
SB-0884	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0907	3RD READING	PAGE	127
SB-0927	3RD READING	PAGE	197
SB-0930	3RD READING	PAGE	35
SB-0940	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0955	3RD READING	PAGE	199
SB-0966	3RD READING	PAGE	5
SB-0983	2ND READING	PAGE	128
SB-1002	3RD READING	PAGE	202
SB-1047	3RD READING	PAGE	130
SB-1053	3RD READING	PAGE	203
SB-1061	3RD READING	PAGE	132
SB-1072	2ND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1084	3RD READING	PAGE	36
SB-1085	3RD READING	PAGE	133
SB-1101	3RD READING	PAGE	204
SB-1102	3RD READING	PAGE	209
SB-1116	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-1117	3RD READING	PAGE	212
SB-1125	3RD READING	PAGE	134
SB-1140	3RD READING	PAGE	135

SB 828
3rd Reading
Pg 196

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 19, 1979

PAGE 3

SB-1146	2ND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1162	3RD READING	PAGE	135
SB-1166	3RD READING	PAGE	156
SB-1171	3RD READING	PAGE	136
SB-1178	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-1200	3RD READING	PAGE	202
SB-1201	3RD READING	PAGE	137
SB-1205	3RD READING	PAGE	138
SB-1211	2ND READING	PAGE	152
SB-1238	3RD READING	PAGE	148
SB-1239	3RD READING	PAGE	213
SB-1247	3RD READING	PAGE	149
SB-1251	2ND READING	PAGE	37
SB-1268	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1271	3RD READING	PAGE	215
SB-1277	2ND READING	PAGE	147
SB-1281	3RD READING	PAGE	139
SB-1287	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-1314	3RD READING	PAGE	39
SB-1325	3RD READING	PAGE	221
SB-1328	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-1342	2ND READING	PAGE	11
SB-1344	3RD READING	PAGE	62
SB-1347	3RD READING	PAGE	139
SB-1360	3RD READING	PAGE	146
SB-1375	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-1386	3RD READING	PAGE	222
SB-1396	2ND READING	PAGE	14
SB-1406	3RD READING	PAGE	227
SB-1411	3RD READING	PAGE	74
SB-1425	3RD READING	PAGE	227
SB-1433	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-0379	3RD READING	PAGE	234
HR-0384	3RD READING	PAGE	234
HR-0385	1ST READING	PAGE	234
HR-0387	1ST READING	PAGE	234
HJR-0059	MOTIONS	PAGE	234
SJR-0040	MOTIONS	PAGE	234

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
 JUNE 19, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. WEBBER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
CLERK LEONE - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	12
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	233
ANNOUNCEMENTS	PAGE	233
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	235
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	235