

1.

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be lead in prayer by the Reverend Henry A. Gambrell, Pastor Holy City ^{Missionary} Baptist Church in Springfield."

Reverend Gambrell: "Lord of power and Giver of grace and wisdom, we commend to Thee all who are engaged in the government of this State; grant to them clean hands, pure hearts, and unfailing devotion to the cause of righteousness. To Thee, merciful Lord, we commend their work, praying that it may be such as will promote Thou work in our midst, to the help of the poor, the relief of the oppressed, the putting down of all social evils, and the redress of all social wrongs. Let all they think or speak or do, be for Thy glory and the good of Thy people. O Lord, God Almighty, guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the government of this nation, and grant to them at this time special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength; that upholding what is right, and following what is true, they may obey Thou holy will and fulfill Thy divine devotion through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your own switch only. Representative Simms is here. Take the record. House Bills, Third Reading. Short Debate Calendar. Page 2. 975, is Representative Wikoff here? Out of the record. 1072. 975, Representative Wikoff's Bill? Representative Getty, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Getty. Out of the record. 1072, Representative



Reilly. Third Reading, Short Debate. Page 2."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1072, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "I'm sorry for not saying it before. Representative Ewing asked me to hold that one more day."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Representative Leinenweber, 1232."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1232 amends the Coroner's Act by requiring the coroners to take blood and urine samples to analyze for alcohol or drugs. When the coroner suspects drugs a toxicological examination to be made by a toxicologist. And then... That's basically what the Bill does. It came out of Senate Consent Calendar. It... was on the Consent Calendar briefly before the House. It was removed, I think, because of the fact that these tests which are to be performed.. Originally the Bill provided that the tests would only.. could only be used at the coroners inquest and for no other purpose and it was felt that this is restrictive of access to what may be very pertinent evidence and information so that information was stricken in Committee by a Committee Amendment #1. And I would... If there are any questions or if there's no questions, I would urge the adoption of ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Is there an adoption of an Amendment that Representative Leinenweber has suggested?"

Leinenweber: "No, there was an Amendment put on in Committee which deleted the language which specified that the



tests .. what the coroner now has the authority to take or have taken by a toxicologist would be used only at the inquest and for no other purposes it was felt. And I certainly agree that any relevant information if it's admissible in civil or other types of proceedings ought to be admissible because the purpose is the ascertainment of truth."

Getty: "Well, I thought that there was some discussion about keeping the language that it would be under the direction of a physician in there. It would seem to me that if you're going to expand it beyond that point, to use it for any purpose rather than limit it to the coroners inquest, and you're not going to have the language requiring that the.. that it be under the administration of a physician, that there would be a very serious problem with chain of evidence."

Leinenweber: "Well, that might very well be. On other words, we're not necessarily trying to.. All I'm saying is, that in my opinion, that.. and in the opinion of the Senate Sponsor, Senator Sangmeister, if the information is otherwise admissible then it ought to be admitted. Now, if the chain is broken, if it's not done under the appropriate circumstances then certainly it would not be admissible, but there's no reason why we, as the Legislature, ought to specify that it's not admissible if it otherwise would be."

Getty: "Wasn't there some tinkering in here with the language that would require that the blood sample be taken under the administration of a physician or supervision of a physician?"

Leinenweber: "I don't think that we did any tinkering with that particular provision. As a matter of fact, as you know, the blood samples are not admissible for any purposes. We have not... I personally would have favored eliminating that limitation from the Act, but it was felt that



there was no sense tinkering with that. So I don't think there's any changes made. All we're doing in this Bill is to permit the coroner to have tests performed including an analysis of urine, bile and gastric content where he suspects the death is due to toxic substances. Now if the.. If the death is due to toxic substances other than drugs then the coroner shall consult with the toxicologist prior to collecting the samples. That is in the Bill."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that the announced purpose of the Bill is not a bad one. However I think that when we expand the purpose to permit it to be used at any time, that we ought to build in some safeguards. It's not just.. It would not, under this Bill, be limited solely for the purposes of the coroner's inquest. Therefore I would suggest to you that to protect everybody and interests that we ought to require that it be under the supervision or direction of a physician and I would vote 'present' unless the Gentleman would want to amend it to so provide."

Leinenweber: "Well, it's time to close. Or at least to make a response to that inquiry or that statement, I would say we are not making anything admissible for any other purpose other than the inquest unless under the strict rules of evidence for the civil or criminal proceedings, such results would otherwise be admissible. And I agree with the Gentleman that if we were mandating that a Civil Court in a Dram Shop case or a criminal court in a drug related death case, or something similar, if we were mandating that such a court would have to consider and admit the results into evidence then I would certainly agree with the Gentleman. However, we are not so mandating. All we are saying is All we are saying is that these tests are otherwise admissible if they've been taken according



to the strict rules of evidence of either a civil or a criminal proceeding there is no reason in the world why if they are relevant to the issues in that civil or criminal proceeding in order.. in an attempt to proving the truth of the issues in those proceedings, why someone should be denied the use of such evidence. So, I would agree with the Gentleman if we were doing what he said we were doing, that was mandating that courts would have to take into consideration these results. But we are not doing that. All we're saying is that if they're otherwise admissible pursuant to the rules of evidence, that they may be so used. And I would urge the adoption of Senate Bill 1232."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Leinenweber to close."

Leinenweber: "I had closed. I would just..."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I could verify and it would take an awful lot of time. May I suggest we dump the Roll Call and ask people just to vote their own switch? I really don't think this Bill ought to pass out in its present form."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we'd better take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. We'll take it out of the record. Representative Barnes? Representative Barnes on the podium."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to interrupt to take a few seconds. John Vitek is with me and Bill Margulas is with me and I have the honor of introducing.. I feel very proud about it... my own Minister from Chicago who's church is in John Vitek's District in the 11th Ward, has been there. We've celebrated our 60th anniversary there. It is the largest Baptist Church in the city of Chicago and it has



the clear distinction, as John Vitek was indicating to me, it has the clear distinction of being the only large modern building of its time.. of its kind that I know of that was completely picked up and moved for about two blocks to.. for the convenience of the Dan Ryan if any of you went down through Chicago. This church was moved two blocks to get out of the ^{way for that} highway. So I really have a distinct pleasure and with Representative Vitek and Bill Margulas on my left to introduce to you Reverend Retha Brown, who is the Minister of the progressive Baptist Church in Chicago located there just two blocks... two blocks south of Chicago's White Socks Park. Anytime you go the park, you see that large church sitting there."

Reverend Brown: "Mr. Speaker, Distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, I feel somewhat like the little boy who came to his minister and said that the Lord has called me to preach. After he began to talk about all of the nice things his family had done in the church, he kept feeling somebody pulling at his coattail. Finally he turned around and he said, boy did you tell me the Lord called you to preach? He said, yes, Sir, but I think since then he changed his mind. I'm distinctly honored to be in your midst and to see you at work and I do bid you God's choicest blessings and may you continue to do the fine work you're doing for this House Society in which we live in this day and time. Thank you so much for allowing me this privilege ."

Speaker Redmond: "Just to set the record straight, and to keep the youngsters in line, there was a Catholic Church on North Ashland Boulevard that was moved across the street probably 75 years ago and the House movers that did it were Kro Brothers which was the Grandfather of the Speaker. So history repeats itself. Representative



Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, while the Reverend is here and Representative Barnes, Representative Barnes can we have your attention? While the Reverend's here, you said the church is two blocks from Kominski Park? South of it. I thought maybe we'd get the 'ok' for Friday night parking in the church parking lot because we've had to park about six, eight blocks away on Friday nights for White Sox games and I'm sure you'll get the Minister's okay for Friday night parking for any Member of the Legislature. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman was perfectly within his right to say he was going to have a verification. I think we ought to do one of two things. Either have a quorum call or get on some order of business besides Third Reading because any Member can shut it down by the same method. I don't begrudge Representative Getty doing this, but certainly I can do it on any Bill too. Let's either have a quorum call or get off of Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "1342, Representative Peters. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, are any of the Sponsors appearing on page nine.. any of these Sponsors going to move to nonconcur? Let's go right down. 18. Deuster-Huskey. Representative Huskey. 18."

Huskey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate Amendment on House Bill 18."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? What's the Amendment do, Mr. Huskey?"

Huskey: "It reduces.. It reduces .. It went through the Senate with.. on parental responsibility and it went to the Senate with \$2,000. They cut it down \$500. They clipped \$500 off of it which rather than get in a hassle I would rather agree to the 1500 rather than the



2,000."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 18?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Beatty. Beatty."

Beatty: "I'd like to explain my vote. I've been against this concept. Tried to get an Amendment on and apparently the people in my neighborhood are so.. suffering so much from vandalism that they feel that there should be an imposition of a penalty on the parents. The youngsters are running wild and even though I voted 'no' on this in the past, I'm going to support this Bill because there are people in the District want some curb on vandalism."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye', and 10 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 18. 96. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 96 is the same as Senate Bill 100 which we discussed at length on Second Reading and yesterday on Third Reading and passed. House Bill 96 is the Bill that relates to the transportation of students within a mile and a half where there are hazardous safety conditions. I think the House fully understands it. What happened is the Senate put on the Amendments that we had all agreed to and I would urge that we concur with the Senate action to House Bill 96."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Representative Deuster, one more time. What are we concurring with? What did the Senate do different?"

Deuster: "Yes, this is the Bill that... relating to where students live within a mile and a half of the school district. There were a number of House Bills passed. It went over to the Senate. The Senate merged them all into one



which was 96 and we are concurring now with those Senate Amendments. It's the same as Senate Bill 100 that we passed yesterday."

Mulcahey: "All the provisions are the same in this House Bill as it was in the Senate Bill?"

Deuster: "There's one exception. House Bill 100 which we passed yesterday had an additional provision relating to transportation from where a ^{baby} child would be for child care services."

Mulcahey: "But the reimbursement is still there in 96?"

Deuster: "Yeah. No, that's not in 96, but the House... The House passed yesterday everything that's in 96 and very briefly it's that the local school District in accordance with guidelines that the State Department of Transportation promulgated would determine if there were conditions where walking due to vehicular traffic was a serious safety hazard. If so, they could transport them as they transport other students."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I had thought before you went to this page on the Calendar that you were simply going to be polling Members who had Bills here to see whether they wanted to nonconcur. This Bill, in particular, is now in the shape of a Bill that we passed yesterday with a very narrow margin and I'm wondering whether it's a good idea to be considering concurrence motions now when the Members in their offices heard you say that you were asking Members whether they were going to be moving to nonconcur? I think... ought to be doing that."

Speaker Redmond: "The Members in their offices know that the House came into Session at 12:00 o'clock so my heart doesn't really bleed for them. If Representative Deuster does not desire to proceed, that's his..."



He can... We can take the matter out of the record. I did intend to go to nonconcurrency because you don't need a record vote on that. But Representative Huskey stood up and asked for recognition and he moved to concur so what I had thought I was doing was not accepted so... Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry. If the Speaker's intention was to go to nonconcurrency.. I'm concurring and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to back up what Mrs. Pullen... (what) Mrs. Pullen had said is because I think we ought to be working on Senate Bills and on nonconurrencies. So those that nonconcur we can do on a voice vote and get them in that position. But for us to be going on concurrences when we yet have work on Senate Bills, I think is folly. I think you were right in the first place and why don't we do it that way?.."

Speaker Redmond: "That was my preference and part of the reason that I went to this order is that I went down the list and there was so few Sponsors on the floor. I called Representative Leinenweber, Representative Reilly. Representative Peters took his out of the record. If the Members are not here there's nothing much I can do about it. So, I was looking for things I could do. I would prefer that on the Order of Concurrence that the Members who are going to nonconcur would identify themselves so that we don't have to have a record vote on that. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Is a motion in order to return to Nonconcurrency?"

Speaker Redmond: "To do what?"

Kosinski: "To return to Nonconcurrency?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's all under the same order so... Maybe we'd better take 96 out of the record. 148, I understand that that's nonconcurrency Is that correct?"

Deuster: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Let me explain what House Bill 148 is. The Senate added an Amendment which I must confess is a project of mine and I was pleased with it. That was an Amendment that the Senate added to this Bill that would change the name, 'Dissolution of Marriage', back to the word, 'divorce.' And although I strongly support the Senate Amendment and support that concept, I understand two things. One; some... a Bar Association Members don't support that and it is a controversial matter. Also Representative Greiman is going to be Chairman of a Subcommittee or he's going to hold some hearings to give further consideration to changes in the Divorce.. or Marriage and Dissolution Act and because of those circumstances I do not, at this time, want to ask the House to concur with this change in language from 'Dissolution of Marriage' to 'Divorce'. So I would ask that we nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 148."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment going to House Bill 148?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Motion carries and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment 1. 153. Yeah, we non-concurred. Grieman, 183, is that nonconcur or concur? Huh? Is there anybody out there that's going to move to nonconcur in any of their Bills that appear on the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence? Well, in the mean time let's go to the Order of Motions on page 14. Senate Bill 1271. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I owe the House an apology. The other evening, late in the evening, some questions were raised relative to Senate Bill 1271 by Representative Getty, Representative Schuneman and Representative Darrow. The answers



I gave were correct with one exception. And that one exception was extremely important and unfortunate. It's unfortunate that I gave the wrong answer. Since Virginia.. Representative Macdonald was the Sponsor the House was kind enough, despite the late hour, and despite the question by some of the Representatives, the House was kind enough to pass the Bill. Representative Macdonald and I spoke to the Department in question and reviewed the Bill and found out that the answer I had given was in error. In effect, we had not told the truth to the House and for that reason, I'm asking... Well, I should say I did not tell the truth to the House. And for that reason, I am .. having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1271 was passed."

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

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, I want to absolutely concur with what Mr. Epton has said, but I want to add further that I don't think that the responsibility lies with Representative Epton. Really the responsibility was mine. I should not have called the Bill without the Department of Administrative Services who had proposed this Bill and I was given the assurance as was Representative Epton that our analysis was correct where, in fact, it was not correct. So, I would ask for us and join with him in asking of course that we reconsider this Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on Representative Epton's motion, having voted on the prevailing side, he moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1271 passed. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 134 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion prevails. The vote by which



Senate Bill 1271 passed is reconsidered. The Bill is now on Third Reading. Who is the Sponsor of the Bill? Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have an Amendment. I would like permission to bring the Bill back to Second Reading to put on the Macdonald-Epton-Getty Amendment which does, indeed, put back in the language that we said was there in the first place, which restores the 2 million dollars for any single occurrence in connection with the operation of a motor vehicle."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to return Senate Bill 1271 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, it's on Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Macdonald-Epton-Getty, amends Senate Bill 1271 on page 4 by deleting lines 8 through 15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again the Department of Administrative Services .. I do not see them on the floor and so, I will defer to Representative Epton, but I will tell you that it does restore the 2 million dollars cap for a single occurrence and connection of insurance that this Bill, 1271, does respond to. Representative Epton, I defer to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Macdonald. Very simply, the one pertinent question that was not correctly answered was the one by Representative Getty which asked in the event there was an injury created and he was deceased as a result of an accident by a state employee, could his widow or survivor collect up to the 2 million dollars which is presently in the statute. This Amendment simply restores that and the answer now is, yes, she can, a



survivor can and I join with Representative Macdonald and Representative Getty in asking the passage of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? The question's on the motion for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, can we have leave to have this then remain on Third Reading? Or can we call it at this time having brought it back?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's not on the Calendar so why don't we wait until it's on the Calendar. It'll be on tomorrow so... We'll get to it."

Macdonald: "Alright."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Motions, appears Senate Bill 222. Representative Dunn is recognized. It's on the top of page 14."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was passed the other day. I voted on the prevailing side and I would like to offer the House an opportunity to reconsider. What this Bill does is permit the .. the lock-up of juveniles over the week end merely for the convenience of Judges and I know I voted hastily on this Bill and I think maybe some of the other Members of the House did and I think it would be a good idea if we would reconsider the vote by which this .. this measure passed because we really don't need to.. to extend out present laws..."

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

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting Representative Dunn in his motion. But if I'm not



mistaken, Representative Woodyard was the House Sponsor of this Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative who?"

Kempiners: "Woodyard. Am I correct in that? And also Representative Woodyard had a death in the family and he is not here and I was wondering if that would be appropriate."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. I think that the correct vote is 'present'. If you don't vote 'present' you ain't going to get paid. Everybody on the Roll Call? Take the record. If you're worth it. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce the wife of a stalwart Member of my Appropriations I Committee, Mrs. Jim Keane, up in the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar on page 3. Senate Bill 1423. Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have leave to take Senate Bill 1423 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment by Representative Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 Dyer, amends Senate Bill 1423 on page one by deleting lines 1, 2 and 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another in a series of Bills applying only to the two downstate counties that elect a County Board Chairman at large. It is to add a power that the Cook County Board's President already has. Simply the Chair-



man may have a veto power which of course maybe overridden by a Majority vote of the Members of the Board. Permissively the Board may extend the County Board Chairman term to four years from two if they wish. I move for the adoption of this Resolution. (sic) (Amendment)."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would the Sponsor yield to a question or two? Giddy, can you tell me just what the genesis of this particular Amendment is? Who.. Who wants the County Chairman to have this veto power?"

Dyer: "Representative Hudson, this is a Bill that I developed on my own. It was House Bill 2383, which we never got to , of course, in the busy, busy pace over the last days. It is pertinent to Representative Hoffman's Bill. It has the support of the Sponsor Hoffman and Representative Daniels. It is, I consider it just a good government Bill placing a County Board Chairman who has been elected by all the voters in the county in the same relationship to the Board as a Mayor is to a city council, as the President of the Cook County Board is to the Board, as the Governor is to our Legislature ."

Hudson: "Well, I'm not so sure, frankly, if I may speak to the Amendment, and I hate to take this point of difference with my colleague from DuPage County, but I'm not so sure in my own mind that we want to make a Mayor out of the Chairman of our County Board nor do we want to make a Governor out of the Chairman of our County Board. It seems to me that he is elected as a .. pretty much as a legislative Member. He certainly is a Member of the Board. There's no disagreement on that. But to give him veto power over all the actions of the Board seems to be placing in the hands in my opinion, placing



in the hands of the Chairman of the County Board a power that he previously hasn't had and I'm so sure that it's a power that he should have. Now under your Amendment, as I understand it, it would only take a Majority vote to overrule. Well, if it only takes a Majority vote, of course, here in the State of Illinois it takes more than that, and usually takes an extraordinary vote to overrule the veto of the Chairman. It would seem to me on that basis that the Amendment is weak if that's what you're trying to do is to give him that power of veto. So, it's somewhat meaningless from that point of view in my opinion." But, furthermore, I feel that unless this is something that is really seriously wanted by all the Members of that County Board, and I'm not so sure it is.. I haven't had time to check out with all the Members of the County Board as to how they feel about it. But it seems to me that we're placing in the hands of the Board Chairman a power that I think it's questionable at this time that he should have. So, I'm rising in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you will note by the Sponsorship of the Amendment I am in support of this Amendment. This affects DuPage County where we elect our Chairman at large and it gives our Chairman veto power over Committee action. However, we leave the override at a simple Majority. The executive function of the .. of the county is the kind of function that requires the authority as well as the ability to meet the needs at any particular time and therefore, I concur with the Sponsor of the Amendment and ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."



Friedland: "What counties did you say this affected?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer? Question."

Dyer: "Pardon me. Would you repeat the question please?"

Friedland: "What counties does this affect?"

Dyer: "This affects only DuPage and St. Clair Counties. The only two counties outside of Cook where the Chairman is elected at large by all the voters in the county."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is... Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, would the Sponsor answer a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Van Duyne: "Giddy, what would really be the practical difference? What would be the effect if, in the first place, the County Board passes an ordinance with a Majority, which they have to have and then if the County Board Chairman vetos it and if they can override him with just another simple Majority, doesn't the whole thing negate itself?"

Dyer: "I'd like to answer that. It's a good question, Representative Van Duyne. The answer is that when a County Board meets it can pass ordinances by a vote of the Majority of those present and voting. And the only difference is that to override the veto it would have to be the Majority of those elected to the Board, which might be a difference of two or three votes, as you can see."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it strikes me that this is a good Amendment. Number one, this veto authority that we would be giving to the Chairman of the Board is a traditional power that relates to legislative Bodies within these United States. Number two, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, please consider



and take into account the fact that this veto authority is being given to a Chairman who is elected county-wide, whereas, the Members of the Board are elected by districts. It's the Chairman who has the county-wide view. And what we are simply providing is that that Chairman elected at large with a county-wide view would simply have the authority to present an ordinance back to the Board for their review or reconsideration. Their review or reconsideration would not be based on an actual ordinary Majority, simply on a simple Majority. I think it's a good Amendment and I would urge your support."

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

Dyer: "Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good government Amendment. It is supported by all the other Legislators in DuPage County and it does not affect other downstate counties. It simply gives to a County Board Chairman elected at large the power to represent the voters who have chosen him. It does not affect Cook County. This is a power the Cook County President of the Board has. I would appreciate a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 975 (sic), page 2, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask unanimous consent to remove.. er to take Senate Bill 975 back to Second Reading for some Amendments which have been agreed to."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 975 to



the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, it will be returned. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Wikoff, amends Senate Bill 975 on page 1 by inserting immediately after line 26 the following and so forth."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to withdraw Amendments #1 and #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff withdraws Amendments 1 and 2. Any further Amendments? Representative Getty?"

Getty: "As to Amendment 2, I withdraw that in favor of Amendment 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty withdraws Amendment 2. Any further Amendments? We don't have 3, so we have 975 with no Amendments. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I have an Amendment 1, Wikoff and 2, Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "And they've both been withdrawn. Now..."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a little confusion because there is an Amendment #3 and... Let's just take this out of the record for... Well, wait just a minute. I may have my hands full."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your pleasure, Representative Wikoff?"

Wikoff: "Just take this out of the record for a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. You want it back on Third Reading? Mr. Clerk says... Better handle it, we'll put it back on Third Reading. Does Representative Hoffman have leave to keep 1423 on the Order of Short Debate? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On page 9, Consideration Postponed Senate Bill 1364. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to return Senate Bill 1364 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of considering an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no ob-



jection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 1364 on page one in line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Duester: "Amendment 3 has been replaced with Amendment... Amendment 2 has been replaced with number 3 so at this time I withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws 2. Is there any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 1364 on page one, line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Duester: "Amendment #3 is an Amendment that I withdrew with the assistance of staff on the other side of the aisle. This is the Bill that relates to townships adopting ordinances to regulate the motor boat traffic. This is a Bill that only affected Lake and DuPage County. What Amendment 3 says is that the township would not be able to act unless they had written petition of the owners of a Majority of the shoreline. I think this is a safeguard and well written and I ^{would} urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Back on Consideration Postponed. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Short Debate Calendar on page 2. 263. Representative Griesheimer. Representative Campbell sit down. Representative Watson sit down. Representative Johnson sit down. Representative Griesheimer on 263."



Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, from saving me from that oncoming hulk there. I would request on Senate Bill 263 that it be returned to Second Reading for a motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 263 to the order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would then move the House to table House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 263. This Amendment was put on in Committee. I have cleared this with the Committee Chairman, Representative Jaffe, the Subcommittee Chairman, Representative Greiman, is also in .. requested to support this. He said he would not object to it. It just puts the Senate Bill back in its original condition which was at the request of the Senate Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Why?"

Griesheimer: "Because the Senate Sponsor requested it."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think that is justification for tabling an Amendment that was offered in Committee because if that Amendment had not been offered, this Bill would not have been reported out of Committee. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 263 deals with rights of people who have been adopted. And deals with rights of people who place their children for adoption and people who do adopt. There are 3 people involved, 3 parties. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Judiciary I sometime ago gave through indepth consideration to this matter and the interested parties, the adoptees, the natural parent, and the adopting parents, all presented their various views. As a consequence, a House Bill, this Gentleman's own Bill, went to a Subcommittee and thorough



consideration was given to the respective right and the product of that Subcommittee resulted in properly relating the respective rights sometimes conflicting. That Bill was passed by this House and is now in the Senate. Senate Bill 263 in its original form, as it came to us, as it came to Judiciary I, it would not have gotten out ignored totally the rights of adoptive parents. The people who have gone on a line and said a natural parent doesn't want her child, or his child, we'll take that child and make that child ours for all purposes. And 263 in its original form completely ignores the rights of those people who assume responsibility. In Committee we put on 263 by Amendment #1 the House version which takes care of all the rights and does it in a very responsible way. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I vigorously oppose this motion to table Amendment #1 for 2 reasons. Number one; this Bill would never have gotten out of Committee with this Amendment and number two; without this Amendment the right of adoptive parents are ignored. And I think that would be unfortunate and would have the effect, in my opinion, of subsequently discouraging adoption and I would urge a 'no' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, both the preceding speakers are correct. I think there's a no question about that the House Bill is far superior to this Senate Bill. However, I'm going to support the motion to table Amendment #1 because it is part of the agreement that we made with the Senate Sponsor. He agreed to let that House Bill get out in substantially the form that we had in the House so that we could get his Bill to Third Reading. It would seem to me that the House Bill is far better than the Senate Bill."



I won't support this Bill on Third Reading, but I will support the tabling of the Amendment so we can live up to the agreement with the Senate Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion ... Representative Greisheimer."

Greisheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness I must speak to the comments of Representatives who opposed this particular motion. Let me explain that with regard to the Bill that this House passed out, that there was a great deal of study in-depth put in through Representative Greiman's Subcommittee and we did modify the Bill to comply with all of the requests of the various diversified parties. This Bill then went into the Committee and the Committee gave a thorough examination. It was amended and it went to the Senate. At the same time, Senator Maragos was working on his version of a Bill that was aimed at accomplishing the same end. I'm not saying that Senator Maragos's Bill is perfect. I'm certain that the Bill that I sponsored in the House which is the product of Judiciary I is not a perfect Bill. But it was then sent over to the Senate and put in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Senate's attitude on the Bill was to gut the House Bill and put Senator Maragos's Bill in its place. I requested the Chairman of that Committee, Senator Daley, not to do that, requesting that our Bill be left in its original condition, to be given a fair opportunity for passage in the Senate. At about the same time, the House had already gutted Senator Maragos's Bill and imposed the Bill that I originally sponsored on it. Senator Daley and Senator Maragos both suggested to me that as a courtesy to Senator Maragos that I return his Bill to its original condition so that it could have a fair opportunity on Third Reading in the House as it had in the Senate. I cannot help but feel that



if there's any honor in these two Houses, we have an obligation to return Senator Maragos's Bill to its original condition. If this Bill does pass the House, it's up to the Governor which one of these Bills he'll sign. I do not quibble with the former Speaker's right to an opinion on either of these Bills or both of these Bills. But I do feel that Senator Maragos has an opportunity to have his Bill heard as he had anticipated it would in this House, just as we, of the Judiciary Committee, hope that the Bill that I sponsored will be heard on Third Reading in the Senate. I would urge passage of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman who just spoke said if there's any honor in this Legislature, implying that opposition to his motion...."

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

Greisheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I heard.. I never mentioned this man's name in debate. What's the point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, state your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if the Gentleman would look at Robert's Rules.. Robert's Rules of Order, he would find that the point of privilege goes beyond the mention of the person's name. It is the integrity of the House that can be at issue and that is what.. in the process and that's what I'm commenting upon. You stated, Sir, that if there's any honor we should accede to the desire of the Senate, the Senate Sponsor of the Bill, implying that an opposition to your motion was not honorable and that does reflect on me individually and it reflects on other Members in this Body. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that honor involves a



couple of things. Number one; honor involves voting for, working for a Bill, voting against a Bill based on its merits. That Bill right now belongs to us. It's in the House of Representatives and we have an obligation to our constituents to do what is right by them. Number two; if you want to talk about honor, this Bill would never have gotten out of Committee without this Amendment and I think it's dishonorable Sir to move to table an Amendment that was necessary to get the Bill out of Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that Amendment #1 be tabled. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've just about had it with certain comments of a Member of this House who is so altruistic that when he is here, he has the time to speak, and when he is not here, which is most of the time, he has to get up and attack other Members. Let's say something here. If this House guts Senator Maragos's Bill as this prior Speaker wants us to do, then the Senate most assuredly will gut the other Bill and there will be no Bill passed on this important issue. Now if we really want to give Senator Maragos an opportunity to have his Bill heard on Third Reading, you're going to have an opportunity. If you want to vote it down, you have a complete opportunity to vote it down. I'm not saying that it's a perfect Bill. It may have many, many things wrong with it. As one of the prior Speakers said, the Chairman of Judiciary Committee, it does have certain things that he disagrees with and he's not going to support it. But he's going to have an opportunity to vote on that Bill as is on Third Reading. Now, if we don't give Senator Maragos an opportunity to have his Bill heard over here, then



we've really destroyed at least half the process and that is the Senatorial end of this bicameral system. I would urge ^{you} /in all fairness to Senator Maragos to allow his Bill to be heard and to vote 'aye' on this motion. That's all we're asking for is to allow him the opportunity to have his Bill heard as it came out of the Senate. And I don't think that's too much to ask in this particular situation. If you want to vote 'no', you can vote 'no' on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 41 'aye' and 70 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "No further Amendments, Mr. Speaker, I just request that it be returned to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests that it be returned to Third Reading. Does he have leave to leave it on Short Debate? Oh, right. That's right. We did not amend it. House Bill 404, Representative Ewing. Page 2, Short Debate, Third Reading."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing? Is Ewing in the chamber? Out of the record. 432."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members, Senate Bill 432 does not have an Amendment on it. Amendment #1 was taken off in the Senate. It's a very simple Bill. It just amends the Chicago Sanitary District Article of the Pension Code and deletes chronic alcoholism as an excuse for



ordinary disability benefits. It provides for termination of benefits for the refusal to participate in the rehabilitation program. We had a similar Bill in the House, House Bill 541, sponsored by Representative Beatty, that passed out 114 to 18 to 10. This Bill came out of the Senate 55 to nothing. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? We've been in Session an hour and we've passed one Bill. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 129 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 455, Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry. Have we changed House Rule 55.1...?"

Speaker Redmond: "What does that do?"

Collins: "It prohibits distribution of literature on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "We have not changed it. I have not given permission to distribute anything on the floor."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a good occasion to raise this point because we have a controversial Bill and both sides have distributed literature in violation of the rule. I wonder if you wouldn't put a stop to this."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you know the only thing that I can do is like an alcoholic. There's nobody that can dry them out except the alcoholic. Until the Members decide that the rules apply to them, there really isn't very much I can do. When they come to me and I say you cannot distribute it, you put it in the post office and if they do it without my knowledge it would seem to me that it's up to the membership to



chastise and chasten their own Members. Now,..."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why I raised this particular rule. I don't think most Members are aware of it and I think perhaps you're announcing at this time might do some good."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The rules prohibit the distribution of any literature on the floor of the House. And there is no power in the Speaker to violate that rule. There's no power to waive it. It would have to be done by suspending that rule and I would ask the Members to obey that rule. 455, Representative Hoxsey."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Surface Mine, Land Conservation and Reclamation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, one of the Members had asked me to hold this. They wanted to see me about this Bill. Would it be possible to come back to it in a few minutes? They're not on the floor and I would like to accommodate them for a moment and then come back to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll do the best I can to get back, but you do it at your own peril."

Hoxsey: "Well, maybe I'd better go with the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that's what I would do if somebody asked me to hold it and then they weren't on the floor. I think you've done all that you have to do."

Hoxsey: "Alright, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 455 sponsored by Senator John Grotberg in the Senate... The substance of Senate Bill 455 authorizes the counties to regulate and restrict the location of any surface, mineral mining operation and provide that if a county zoning ordinance and provisions of the Surface, Mine Land Conservation and Reclamation Act concerning the location of any surface, mineral mine conflict, the



county zoning ordinance would prevail."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do stand in opposition and I'm sorry to do so. It's a fine Sponsor, Betty Hoxsey. But I think I'd better inform all Members of the Legislature what this legislation would actually do. First of all, it by-passes state control and gives all control on any sand or gravel pit within the State of Illinois to that local county Board. Secondly, it circumvents all federal dollars for land reclamation in return use. Now, for example, in central Illinois we have a lot of sand and gravel companies that have pits in more than one county. They would have to be going through all their application processes, Environmental Protection Agency Acts, and environmental regulations through the County Boards. Now, I don't know anybody in this General Assembly that wants to have the County Board controlling the second largest most important industry in the State of Illinois. That is the aggregate mining industry. This legislation takes the State of Illinois back about 20 years in land reclamation and control of aggregate mining in the State and I'm in opposition to the Bill and I recommend a 'no' vote on it. It's a bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson, for what purpose do you arise on Short Debate?"

Anderson: "I would like to have nine others join me to take it off of Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he joined by nine others to take it off? It's on full debate. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an important Bill and it's a very good Bill and I'd like to explain why. Several years ago we passed the Surface Mine Land Conservation and Reclamation Act which deals solely with reclamation plans rather than the



land use question .. the initial land use question of whether or not a particular parcel of ground ought to be surface mined. Now, it was never contemplated and you can read the Act. In my opinion, it was never contemplated that we had intended to preempt local zoning, that is the question of where land.. whether.. where surface mines could originally be started. Now, a rather unfortunate decision came out of the Second District Appellate Court which is in conflict with a decision of the Third District Appellate Court which held.. basically holds that the Surface Mine Land Conservation, Reclamation Act somewhat similar to the EPA Land Fill provisions preempts the powers of local counties or municipalities to determine where surface mining operations can be accomplished. Now, this puts in peril local county land use plans. It puts in peril the people who own property next door to places where there's gravel underneath. And if you talk to the department that enforces the Surface Mine Land Conservation and Reclamation Act they will tell you that this decision caught them by surprise. They have no land use controlled. They have nobody that is in a position to exerting land use controls. All they are concerned about is that once the decision is made to surface mine that the land be put back.. there be a plan filed which would put the land back in the type of condition that is best for the area. It has nothing to do with whether or not there ought to be surface mining in the first instance. So, Senate Bill 455 will return to local government the power which we thought they had and the Appellate Court of the Third District says they had, but the Appellate Court of the Second District says they apparently do not have, where you can have surface mines. I would just suggest to you that if you have a sub-



division in your district which happens to be near some land that is subject to being surface mined, you'd better watch out or they maybe out there digging gravel right under your nose and you won't have anything to do about it. So I would certainly urge adoption of Senate Bill 455 which is a good local government home rule type of proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this Bill. I think Representative Leinenweber gave you the good legal and technical reasons that a Bill of this type is necessary. For those of you who are concerned about local units of government and the impact that a particular quarry this type would have, I've been working for the past five years regarding blasting that's occurring at a quarry that is right on the edge of Joliet and in a residential district. I, for one, recognize the fact that we have to have these types fo quarries and I think we ought to be reasonable in permitting them to operate. However, I feel very strongly that when it comes to their operating within a residential area, there ought to be some local control over them, over the type of traffic and the amounts of traffic they generate and the type of local nuisances that are created, such as the blasting problem. I feel very strongly that this is a responsibility of local government and this Bill will give units of local government the zoning authority which they so badly need to act as a traffic cop in this type of situation. I urge your support of Senate Bill 455."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster. I've been joined on the podium by Representative Ewell. Everybody recognize Representative Ewell? Representative McMaster."



McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to interfere with the Gentleman in the white coat if he has some words of wisdom to give us."

Speaker Redmond: "He's from George Ryan's area, Kankakee."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have Representative Leinenweber listen to what I'm going to say or going to add. I would be inclined to support the intent of this Bill, but I have some questions that I cannot answer and perhaps one of the legal eagles down here can. My county happens to have taken about two or three law suits as far as the State's Supreme Court in regards to location of surface mining operations. We have gone up there trying to restrict them as to location. We have gone up to the Supreme Court trying to control them by zoning rules and regulations, I think we've been up there three times altogether, Harry. And in each case, we've lost in the Supreme Court saying that the State has the right to regulate rather than the county. Will the passage of a Bill like this have any effect upon the Supreme Court's decisions? In other words, if we put this in the statutes, will the Supreme Court rule differently than they have in those other cases?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative McMaster, I, at your suggestion some months/^{ago} when I talked to you over the telephone I did call the attorney that you had suggested I talk to and the decisions that they were involved with was Knox County had to do with whether or not the county by use of a zoning ordinance by other ordinance powers could control the reclamation plan, in other words, the actual conduct of the surface mining operation. And the courts had held that the Surface Mine Land Conservation, Reclamation Act in that respect



had to do with reclamation plans, did preempt local counties whether they used the zoning ordinance or whether they used some other type of land use ordinance in order to regulate the actual operation. Now as I read the Bill, Senate Bill 455, we're talking only about the powers by zoning whether.. by zoning, whether or not an operation can be started in a particular area. This would not have.. would not be in conflict with the decisions that you're talking about and would be in conflict however, with the decision which came down very recently from the Appellate Court of the Second District which held that not only the conduct of the operation, the reclamation plan, was preempted but the power to determine where an operation could be conducted in the first place, in other words, the power to determine the appropriate land use, the highest and best use of a particular parts of a property, with the various zoning issues that this also was preempted. Now, as I read the Bill, Senate Bill 455, that's all we're dealing with. We would, in effect, be reversing that Appellate Court decision. Now out of my Third District, a case arising out of Will County the Appellate Court for the Third District did uphold the right of the County of Will to determine by zoning powers whether or not a surface mine could be commenced in a particular location in Will County. That went to the Appellate Court and was affirmed. So we do have two conflicting Appellate Court decisions. As I read Senate Bill 455 it would in effect sustain the Third District's opinion. It would over.. It would reverse the Second District opinion, but it would leave intact the opinions arising out of Knox County, as I understand them from talking to the attorney that you suggested I contact."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

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



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

McMaster: "I was not done, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Continue. Then we'll get back.."

McMaster: "Harry, I think you're overlooking a previous case that we took to the State Supreme Court in regards to location, not on reclamation. This was on location of surface mining and went back to, I think, our first case which was in the early '50's or maybe even prior to that. And what I am saying is that the State Supreme Court at that time did rule that we could not restrict mining by location with local zoning ordinances. "

Leinenweber: "I did not read the decisions which ^{the} Attorney Branch gave me to say that. As I recall, I don't have the decisions before me, but as I recall those decisions that your ordinance did more than ^{intend} to locate. It also attempted to control.."

McMaster: "Now, you're going back to the most recent cases, Harry, and that.. I guess what you're saying is that you have not taken any looking into on that particular case and don't misunderstand me. I am in support of controlling if we can with local ordinance."

Leinenweber: "Yeah.."

McMaster: "But what I'm doing is warning you that there might be a possibility.. What I am asking I guess is by legislative fiat, by statutory law, can we change the ruling of the Supreme Court?"

Leinenweber: "Well..."

McMaster: "Now, don't take so long explaining Harry. Can we change by statute what the Supreme Court says?"

Leinenweber: "The answer to that is simple 'yes' and because what we're changing ... is"

McMaster: "That's what I wanted to know.."

Leinenweber: "Interpretation of the Supreme Court of a particular



statute by another statute clarifying our original intent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Winchester: "Alright. Presently I understand the Department of Mines and Minerals has this responsibility of what you're trying to correct and change to the County Boards, is that correct? Would you turn the Sponsor on please, Mrs. Hoxsey?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Representative. Presently the county is authorized to review the mining permits and request a hearing on the proposed mining site. However, the final determination is with the Department of Mines and Minerals."

Winchester: "Alright, if we take it out of the hands of the Department of Mines and Minerals and put it into the County Board, what is that going to do to the Surface Mine Land Conservation and Reclamation Act that was set up by the State of Illinois to work with the federal government on land reclamation of abandoned mines? It's my understanding that only the Department of Mines and Minerals could get this money as long as they had the responsibilities that you're wanting to give away to the county governments. And if you give it to the county governments we could lose those federal dollars for abandoned mine land reclamation. Do you have any comment on that?"

Hoxsey: "I'm sorry. I don't. I don't know."

Winchester: "Okay. Well then, I would like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think the idea and the intent is probably good, but I think it needs more research on the part of the Sponsors and other Members of areas that



have a lot of quarry operations in their districts, such as we have in southern Illinois. I'm concerned about the fact that the Department of Mines and Minerals has this responsibility presently and if we take it away from them and give it to the county governments, then we stand to jeopardize the federal funds that are coming into the state to the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council and that's important money and that is being used for reclaiming of old abandoned mines as well as quarries and if we lose that, then we're back in the shape that we were in years ago and I would just hope that this Bill would be defeated, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My light was on and I did speak in debate earlier, but I spoke in debate when I thought it was strictly Short Debate and I would like the opportunity to at least hold for the General Assembly some other concerns I have. And that would be, Representative Hoxsey, that what you would be doing with this legislation is you would basically be affecting the business climate of the State of Illinois and I can see many of those business people who operate those quarries throughout the State of Illinois making the same type of presentation that they do to the Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Mines and Minerals to every County Board in the State of Illinois where there is a facility. Most importantly, I'm an ex-Member of the County Board and I ^{can} guarantee that where I come from there are very few, if any, Members of the County Board that know anything about landreclamation and surface mining. I'm very hesitant to give that authority and responsibility to County Boards because I don't think they know what they would... could be doing for controlling



putting restrictions on this type of industry and I would say do not support this legislation. Vote 'no'."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for the second time may we 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. The motion carries. Representative Hoxsey to close."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe the Bill has been debated very fully and well. I would remind you that this is a local government Bill and ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 43 'aye' and 91 'no'. The motion... The Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. (sic) We're trying to evaluate our schedules. In an hour and a half we've had final action on two... failed. That's what I said, didn't I? Well, I should have said it. Shame on me. 9... 494. Oh wait. Pardon me. Representative Ewing. Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "I was out last night with Zeke Giorgi and Dan Pierce and I got tired of being called a dirty old man so I put on a white suit. But we have a very nice honor here today. We have with us Miss Margerita Grady who is from Woodrich, Illinois, the District represented by Hudson, Dyer, and Schneider and Miss Grady is Miss Black Illinois of 1979. She is a teacher in Joliet High School... in Joliet, Illinois. Leroy Van Duyn of Joliet, Illinois, and also she is a product



of Southern Illinois University. And so at this time I'd like to introduce to you Margerita Grady, Miss Black Illinois from Woodridge, Illinois and say just a word or two to the Body."

Miss Grady: "Thank you very much. As you know I'm Miss Black Illinois of 1979. And this year the national pageant is being held in Hollywood, California. Now I'm taking myself there and I intend to bring the national title back to the great State of Illinois."

Ewell: "Thank you and let's have one hand for Jo Green who is one of the pageant directors in Illinois. Jo Green."

Jo Green: "Thank you very much for your support and I just wanted to introduce you to a couple of the other Ladies that are with the black business and career women, Miss Liz Jones and Marlene Allen. Thank you for having us."

Ewell: "One further announcement, we're getting married right after the pageant, so it's alright."

Speaker Redmond: "494, Representative Sharp."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 494, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody left their glasses at the podium before we get started on Representative Sharp. Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 494 is legislation that's identical to a Bill that we passed out of the House about 3 or 4 months ago, House Bill 211, which addresses the problems and the inequities associated with the manner in which the state reimburses school districts for the transportation costs as compared to district that contract with the private carrier for the transportation of their students. Under the present methods of reimbursement districts that do their own bussing, own their buses, are not



reimbursed on the same level with districts that contract with a private carrier. Senate Bill 494 addresses this problem and it allows districts that do their own bussing to claim a cost in the reimbursement for transportation that represents the cost of administration for the operations of the bussing system. This Bill will provide for additional reimbursement for districts that do their own bussing and put them on a more equal basis with districts that contract with a private carrier. I believe that we should pass this Bill because there is this unfairness associated with the reimbursement. House... Senate Bill 494 the same as House Bill 211 will provide additional funds for districts that carry on their own bussing programs. There's no fiscal impact for the coming year because they reimburse on a prior year basis. The fiscal impact for the following fiscal year will be a about 2.4 million dollars and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 494 was originally introduced as part of the legislative program on the School Problems Commission. In the Senate it was amended as well as taking an Amendment here in the House. It does what we intended it to do when it was introduced, meeting a particular kind of need on the School Committee and I rise in support of Representative Sharp who's worked on this project for a couple of years now and would ask that the other Members of the House join Representative Sharp and myself...for Senate Bill 494."

Speaker Redmond: "This is Short Debate. Short Debate. Two minutes support. One in opposition. Two minutes. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor



vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Sharp has worked long and hard on the issue along with others in the Senate. School Problems Commission has been pointed out by Representative Hoffman has worked with this through a Subcommittee which I have shared. This, I think is one of the most important and most significant steps we've taken in this area in some time. I think it deserves an 'aye' vote. We've made great progress trying to bring the district owned and operated bus systems up to par with those of the contract type districts so we do need an 'aye' vote on this if we're going to be fair and equitable to all the districts involved. So, I solicit an 'aye' vote."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, we're going to verify this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Telcser: "Request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, if you feel that strongly about it, maybe I ought to give an RTA twist on it on why people in the RTA region ought to vote for it. Eventually we're going to have a public transportation problem in the part of the RTA District that are the boonies. That's out where I live. That's in Will County. That's in rural Kane County and even parts of Lake County. We cannot afford to be running.. to be ignoring school buses as a potential source of public transportation. Now the RTA is .. usual has its fingers in its eyes and something else in its ears and won't listen to logic here. But it's conceivable that school buses could provide the only public transportation opportunities



for people living on rural roads. For that reason I believe that we should encourage school districts to get into the school bus business. In the County of McHenry and the County of Kane there are absolutely no private school bus companies. And I see nothing wrong with that. The buses run on time and in the long run when the RTA ends up pulling its head out of the quicksand in the Chicago River we may even be able to get some cooperation between the school districts and the RTA. So I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye'... Representative Kempiners votes 'aye'. 117 'aye' and 45 'no'. Representative Telcser withdraws his request for a verification. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 565. Representative Marovitz. Marovitz on the floor? Out of the record. 617. Representative Cullerton on the floor? Out of the record. 628, Representative Bower."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower. Out of the record. 651. Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz on the floor? Out of the record. 768. 768, Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. 404, Representative Ewing?"

Clerk O'Brien: "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 Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Industrial Development Authority Act and



it adds one additional Board Member. The only change it makes is it increases the number of Board Members from 7 to 8 and it adds an exofficio Board Member the Chairman of the Commission for Economic Development for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, 'Shall the ...' Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Darrow: "Doesn't this create a situation where we have an legislative appointment to an executive Board and thus create constitutional problems?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative Darrow, that point has been raised. I really can't answer it. You're an attorney like I am. What the courts would hold in this matter, I couldn't tell you. It does say that he's an exofficio Board Member. But that is a possibility. I know some people have raised that question. "

Darrow: "Well, to address the Bill. We have a question here, a Constitutional question, that's been raised on other occasions. This agency issues bonds. These bonds are for industry. We're trying to improve the business climate and help industry in the State of Illinois and I just hate to jeopardize our business climate and jeopardize industry just because we want a legislative appointee on that Board. And I would solicit a 'no' vote until we get that clarified."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing to close."

Ewing: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, the, as I say, that question has been raised about the possibility of a Constitutional effect, but unfortunately that's something that hangs over every piece of legislation we pass in this House. Those who've raised it have not shown any case law that would apply directly to this situation.



This Bill was proposed by the Commission and I would ask for your favorable approval."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter. I'd like to see just a few more green votes up there. There's enough."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 42 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Speaker Leinenweber in the chamber? That's Speaker Leinenweber going down the middle aisle there. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "This is a very exciting day in the Illinois Legislature for black women. You have just met Miss Black Illinois. Now you're going to meet an athletic star, a leading forward on the Chicago 'Hustle' basketball team. I'd like to introduce Representative Susie Catania to introduce our star."

Catania: "As you probably all know the Chicago Hustle which was described by one sports writer in Chicago as the only game in town did very well in the women's pro basketball league this year. So we are presenting them with a Resolution honoring them for doing such a great job and here to accept the Resolution are Liz Gallaway, who's their leading forward, and John Garrety who's their President and I'd like to introduce Liz Gallaway to make a few remarks."

Gallaway: "Thank you very much. This is very exciting for me and on behalf of the Chicago Hustle and myself I'd like to express the deepest gratitude for this Resolution and we had a pretty good season this year. The support



was great. All the fans were great and next year we hope to go even further. We hope to bring Chicago a national championship. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 871, we don't have anybody down there. 871, Taylor. I don't see Taylor on the floor. Alright. Walking down the aisle, I understand Peg Breslin is escorting the girls from girls state at Jacksonville, Miss Mary Lou Kent and Harry Leinenweber. Representative Mary Lou Kent will make an introduction."

Kent: "Tuesday evening Representative Breslin and I were so fortunate to be able to go to girls state in Jacksonville and speak to them and answer their questions. Can you imagine what the future of Illinois politics is when you see this fine group of women who are learning how to campaign and get ready for election. Those girls that are with me today are the candidates for state office and Mary Patterson will introduce them."

Patterson: "Thank you, Mrs. Kent. This is a very memorable day for these girls of Illini State and behalf of the American Legion Auxiliary Department of Illinois I sincerely thank you for the opportunity to present the future leaders of our America. Thank you very much." And also happening at girls state is something that we are all proud of, I know, because of our friend Harry Leinenwber, can you imagine that the Speaker of their House will be Jane Leinenweber and I believe that we have a Resolution that we'd like to have read. This is Jane."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 393, sponsored by the Conference of Women Legislators; Whereas Jane Leinenweber, daughter of our distinguished colleague of this Body, the Honorable Harry D. Leinenweber, has been elected Speaker of the House of Representatives by the 36th annual Girls State of American Legion, now meeting at Mac-



Murray College, Jacksonville, Illinois. And whereas, she ran on the Nationalist Party and promises to carry out the parties platform. Whereas, she was sponsored to go to Girls State Convention by the Hartwood Post of the American Legion. And whereas, she will be a senior next year at St. Francis Academy in Joliet, Illinois. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly, the State of Illinois, that we heartily congratulate Jane Leinenweber, daughter of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Harry D. Leinenweber, upon being elected Speaker of the House of Representatives at the American Legion's 36th annual Girls State now meeting at MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Illinois, and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Jane Leinenweber."

Speaker Matijevid: "Leave for immediate consideration of the adoption of the Resolution? Leave and Representative Giorgi moves for the adoption of the Resolution and now the Speaker of the House."

Jane Leinenweber: "The House will now come to order. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leroy Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my own personal congratulations to Janie. Also on behalf of my daughters who attended St. Francis Academy, I know everybody in St. Francis must be very proud of you, but especially I know Grandpa and Uncle Tommy are very proud."

Speaker Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, while we've got the right kind of Speaker up there, I've got something I'd like to get called."

Speaker Matijevid: "Joint Constitutional Amendment 13. Alright"



We welcome everybody from Girls State and we wish them well and have a good time. Let's all... Give all of them a good hand up in the gallery. And a few words from the proud Father. Harry Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I just want to say I think the term Speaker Leinenweber has a great ring to it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you very much. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, on the Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 388, Kane-Jones-Oblinger. House Resolution 391, Schlickman et al. House Resolution 392, Jaffe et al. House Resolution 393, Conference of Women Legislators."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 388 by Kane honors a 54th wedding anniversary or 64th wedding anniversary. 391 by Schlickman honors Junior College tennis team. 392 by Jaffe-Griesheimer and Daniels allows for a study restructuring the various judicial circuits and 393 is a conference of Women Legislators. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 390, Leverenz et al."

Speaker Matijevich: "Committee on Assignments. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "I just wondered if you'd gotten to House Resolution 387 on the Fire District yet."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're going to get to you later, I understand. Alright?"

Ewell: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "I was wondering why you came dressed up today. Senate Bill 975, Wikoff. Are we ready for that



Bill? Alright. Senate Bill 975, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 975, a Bill for an Act to... creating the Attorney General's Environmental Trust Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must admit that the last Speaker that was up there was a little more attractive than you are, but I guess I'll go with you anyway."

Speaker Matijevich: "Anybody is."

Wikoff: "I would like to have unanimous consent to take this back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to place Senate Bill on the Order.. 975 on the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment. Leave and the Bill is now on Second Reading. Read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Getty, amends Senate Bill 975.."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3 addresses itself to a problem that was raised last week. It sets up a Commission to administer the Environmental Protection Trust Fund which would be constituted of the Attorney General, the Director of the Institute of Natural Resources, the Chairman of the Pollution Control Board, the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. I would move.. And it would.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty moves for the adoption of the Committee... House Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and the Amendment is adopted. Does the Gentleman have leave to keep the Bill on the Short Debate Calendar? Leave and it shall so remain. Senate Bill 1038, Pierce are you ready for that one? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1038, a .."



Pierce: "Mr...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Pierce. Go ahead, Dan."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this is an important part of the mirage series of Bills and Representative Ewing handled this in Committee because I was presiding Chairman of Revenue and so Representative Ewing will present the Bill, having done such an admirable job in Committee. He's the Chief Cosponsor of Senator Netsch's mirage Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman of the Revenue Committee, thank you for those kind words. This is probably the last of the mirage Bills in the House. It passed overwhelmingly out of Committee and it increases the criminal penalty for filing fraudulent tax returns under the income..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Ewing. There is an Amendment up here. Was.. No, that's out now. Alright. We haven't read the Bill yet a third time. Will the Clerk read the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act in relation to the penalties for fraud.. failing to file.. for filing fraudulent tax returns . Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Proceed, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes. This Bill increases the penalties for filing fraudulent tax returns under the Income, the Motor Fuel sales, the Cigarette and the Liquor tax Acts. It extends criminal liability to tax preparers and I think this is important, who knowingly assist in filing fraudulent returns. The penalty is increased from a Class B misdemeanor to a Class 4 felony and as you will remember, in the Mirage Study some of



the fraudulent returns were being prepared by tax preparers who knowingly were preparing these fraudulent returns and aiding their clients in defrauding the State of Illinois of deserved tax revenues under these different Acts. And I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1038. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "I'd just like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Have any Amendments been placed on this Bill?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment. No Amendments."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry of the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "Can you tell me, Representative Ewing, I had a similar Bill which was one of five Bills that was sponsored by .. or a result of the mirage investigation and this specific Bill that you have now, I believe that it came over from the Senate, the companion House Bill wasn't able to make it.. Can you tell me if this has got the Amendment on it, the one word Amendment that the House Bill didn't have? I think the one word Amendment that we were looking for which came out of Representative Stearney's questioning was the word 'knowingly' files or causes to be filed a fraudulent tax return. The word I'm looking for is 'knowingly' and if that's in the Bill, it's a good Bill. If it's not then it's in the same posture as the Bill that I had which was a little ..little short of the mark."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing, before you answer that



there's a young blonde page here who is walking around with a coke or something.. Oh, he found his.. Alright. Proceed, Representative Ewing. Proceed with your answer, Representative Ewing. Proceed with your answer, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "I'm looking at the Bill. According to the analysis, Representative, it does have. It says, 'knowingly' in the analysis. Now, I have the Bill in front of me and I had not seen the word 'knowingly' here, but if you'll wait a minute, if they want to take it out of the record, we'll look and see."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1172, Stuffle. Is he here? Stuffle I don't see. Senate Bill 1232, Leinenweber, is he back from the celebration? The.. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1237, Katz, are you ready? Alright. Read the Bill."



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 1237, Katz. Are you ready?
Alright. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1237, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act to regulate the practice of public
accounting. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
we have discovered that when people adequately, that in
order for people to adequately render services in certain
fields that it's not only necessary that they initially
have requirements, graduation from a school perhaps, or
passing a test, but that they also must keep up with
their skills. Otherwise they can't do it adequately.
Thus the General Assembly in recent years has passed laws
requiring continuing education for physicians in order to
keep up their license because we know that if a physician
only knows what he knew when he graduated from medical
school that he isn't really competent to render medical
services in the state. Similarly, we have done the
same thing with regard to optometry. This Bill requires
continuing education as a condition of being continually
able to practice in the field of accounting. Certainly,
there is no field more important than the question of
accounting in terms of keeping up because tax laws change
and an accountant who doesn't know any more than he
knew when he graduated from accounting school is not com-
petent to render accounting. And that's all the Bill does,
it's simply to treat accounting as we have treated medicine,
as we treated optometry and as we will be treating podiatry
under another Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Katz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1237. This
is Short Debate in opposition. The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, there are dozens of people who like to express their outrage at this Bill and I would ask to be joined by nine others to have this taken from Short Debate."

Speaker Matijevich: "You are joined by nine others at least. So in opposition, do you want to lead off? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this idea has had kind of a checkered career. We spent considerable time on House Bill 675 a few months ago and when it was obvious that that was not going to pass, it was taken out of the record. The analysis for Senate Bill 1237 says that it was caught in the Third Reading deadline crunch, but that's not quite accurate. It was debated and was defeated soundly. Now, I submit to you that on that day that it was defeated so soundly in the House, or thereabouts, it was introduced in the Senate because those people who are behind this idea could see that it was not going to get any place in the House. Continuing education, Mr. Speaker, is a new idea, an idea foisted upon us by associations of big people in the business who would like to squeeze out the little people, or have the little people spend a lot of money joining their association and in that, in so doing, have to raise their cost to the consumer. I submit to you the continuing education for accountants is no better than continuing education for real estate brokers, insurance brokers, lawyers, or anyone of the other 87 or 88 regulated professions and trades in our State. The notion behind this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm surprised at the Gentleman, the House Sponsor handling it because I thought we agreed on these matters pretty well. But the notion behind it undeniably is to raise the cost to the consumer by making it expensive for people to be members of trades at no benefit to the consumer. I urge that you defeat this illconceived notion."



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

Piel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Piel: "I don't seem to have it in front of me Mr. Katz, but maybe I'm under a misinterpretation. Is it true that you added an amendment that attorneys would be included in this also, for continuing education?"

Katz: "As a matter of fact, attorneys are regulated by the Supreme Court, not by the General Assembly. I might tell you that a number of States have in fact, do require continuing education. It is a trend, but it's not anything that the General Assembly regulates."

Piel: "It was not added as an Amendment to this Bill then. I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Piel."

Piel: "I would just like to inform, I'm not sure about what the Democratic analysis looks like, but I can speak for the Members on our side of the aisle. The...our analysis says that the Illinois CPA Society supports this. I don't know about the rest of the Members in the Chamber, but I have received many many letters from members who are, from accountants who are members of the Illinois CPA Society and I have yet to get one in support of this Bill. So I would ask the Members of the House to defeat Senate Bill 1237."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would also rise in opposition to this. It just seems to me that the only people that are really going to benefit from this are the people that run the schools. My own certified public accountant who does my tax work told me that he has enough trouble just finding the time to read all of these Federal update from Washington, much less find the time



to go and attend school. And I would hope that we could defeat this illfounded piece of legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster. Alright , Representative Katz to close. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see your light. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps somebody from this side of the aisle should also rise to express some oppositon to this concept. I think that the fastest growing industry in Illinois, if not the country, is the continuing education industry. We've got thousands and thousands of new employees every year because they're finding more and more ways to afford continuing education on trades, occupations and professions. Now, I suppose that, I don't suppose, I'm sure that I'm considered by most of my colleagues to be a liberal. And I think my District perceives me to be a liberal. However, I also know some people who think that a liberal is one who thinks that Government should intrude itself into every area of one's occupation in life. Well, if that's liberalism, I'm not a liberal. I think that we're overdoing this constant intrusion into our daily activities. There are a lot of people here who will approve of the idea of sunset. If sunset has any merit, it would deal with the regulation of professions. Here we have a proposal that compounds the licensing process by making it a lifetime, continuous burden on those who are trying to make a living in their chosen profession. I think this is a mistaken concept and I oppose the Bill."

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

Katz: "I thought that we, in Illinois , and in the General Assembly were committed to the concept of education. They speak of the requirement that a professional person attend classes as some onerous obligation or duty. How, in the



world can anybody practice accounting if they, in fact, are not giving attention to the new laws that are being passed federally, to the new laws that are being passed at state level. I would tell you that as long as you have a system of licensure it is a fraud on the people to say that a person is qualified when that person is not keeping up to date in the field and that is why we have required continuing education in medicine, in veterinary, and in other fields where rapid change makes obsolete what one may have learned a numbers of years before. I believe that it is in the interest of the consumer that when they go to a professional person who is licensed that they know that that person has cracked the books since he graduated from school. In these fields of rapid change, I think it is desirable that people have the certainty that there are some kinds of requirements so that the individuals involved who write us these letters who are so actively involved in making money that they can't take a few hours out to go to school that they ought to have to go to school in order to keep up the quality of their service and to know what is in fact going on currently in their field. I would urge support of Senate Bill 1237 that was reported out overwhelmingly from the Committee of this House to which it was referred."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Katz has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1237. The question is shall Senate Bill 1237 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye, those oppose by voting no. And the gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker I think it's a little unseemly for those of us who are lawyers to say the accountants must keep know what th up and must take courses to keep up with the laws, latest laws. We don't require it for our own professions. Lawyers don't have to take any courses to keep up, they're not required to to keep ^{their} license and I don't think it's



seemly for lawyers to come in and require other professions to do it when we don't do it for ourselves and for that reason at this point of time I'm not prepared to support this legislation and I vote no."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Have all... Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 ayes, 65 nays, 7 voting present and Senate Bill 1237 having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Priority of Call Calendar, the first Bill is Senate Bill 2.. Just a minute. One moment. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think the question on 1038 has been resolved. The wording is in there and we took it out of the record for a moment and maybe saved time since we've been through all the discussion..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "We'll have to get back to it cause we're going on now to the Priority of Call Calendar and the first Bill is Senate Bill 292."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 292, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 292 is sponsored by Senator Knuppel . It amends the Park District Code and authorizes Park Districts to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of constructing airports and landing fields in their district."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 292. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to inform the House that this came up in Mrs. Kent's absence. Representative Polk brought this up about two weeks ago and this is the Bill, I stand to be corrected if it's not, but I believe this is the Bill that allows for a back door



referendum for Park Districts and I would vehemently oppose this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 292.. ' The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, are you seeking... Who? Alright. The question is. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 292 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 59 'aye', 42 'no', 10 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 292, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. We have a perfect record. Two Bills, two failures. Let's keep it up. Senata Bill 291, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 291, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to regulate the business of restoring personal property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Senate Bill 291 is also sponsored by Senator Knuppel and this is a Bill very similar to one that I had earlier where it takes the County Fair Associations out of the Warehouse Act so that they have a fee that they must pay to the Department of Agriculture but it does not.. they do not come under the Warehousing Act because their's is just part time storage. I urge your vote for this Bill."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Lady from Adams has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 291. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 291 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 135 'aye', no 'nay', 4 'present'. Senate Bill 291, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 407. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of an Act to create the Commission for Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's have two up and one down isn't too bad, is it? This is a good Bill. This amends the Commission for Economic Development Act and authorizes the Commission to hold public hearings to accept public and private funds for the performance of its duties and to have access records and studies of State agencies that pertain to the objectives of the Commission. The Commission worked very diligently to see that the economic conditions of Illinois are improved and this would be very helpful in their performance. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 407. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 407 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 153 'aye', no 'nay', one 'present and Senate Bill 407, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For one moment, we are going to turn to the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar, on page 6, Senate Bill 93. The Clerk will read the Bill. Yes, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, at the proper time, I would like to get this off of Short Debate. I'd like to have some Members join me on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "You mean 93?"

Conti: "93."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, as soon as we work on the Amendment. Senate Bill 93."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 93, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Flinn, amends Senate Bill 93 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, is he on the floor? Getty are you going to handle this for him? Alright he's on his way. So we just hang lose for one second. Here he is. The Gentleman from .. Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 was designed to correct a problem primarily in St. Clair County. Down in our County we have a countywide elected Chairman and the present law requires that you be a Board Member of the County in order to serve on the County Board. The term of County Chairman is two years and the term of a County Board Member is four. This causes every other year half of the people in the county can't run for County Chairman since there's no term open. The person who is the County Board Member in that District is not running and therefore, it keeps that many people each year from not running for County Board. I've discussed this with Representative Stiehl and some of the others from down there..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Flinn has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments? Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see your light on. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "Monroe, you have indicated that you have a problem in St. Clair County but if this Amendment goes on the Bill what it does.. Well, let me ask this question. Are you aware of how it might affect our County of DuPage?"

Flinn: "No. Do you elect your County Board Chairman countywide?"

Hudson: "We elect our County Board Chairman countywide, but also



he has to be .. he has to be elected as a Member of one District. We have five Districts, five Members coming out of each District, and he has to be elected..."

Flinn: "Alright. Do you elect him for four years or two?"

Hudson: "We elect him for four..."

Flinn: "Well, you don't have the same problem. Our problem is that we elect a County Board Chairman every two years and the County Board..."

Hudson: "Wait a minute.. Two years, I beg your pardon..."

Flinn: "Alright. Then you have the same problem we have.."

Hudson: "Two years.""

Flinn: "Alright. Half of the districts.. Do you elect the odd numbers one year and the County Board Members in the even the next two years? Let's assume that you lived in district 2 and I'm the County Board Chairman and I live in district 1 and you want.. or you live in the same district that I do and I'm in the middle of my County Board Membership, but am running for County Chairman. Now you can't run against me because there is no opening for County Board Member. So half of the people in DuPage County just like St. Clair/^{County}cannot run for County Board Chairman simply because there's no opening for a Member."

Hudson: "Well, this to my knowledge has not been a problem, at least it has not been an expressed problem in DuPage County and it seems to me the provision of your.. Well, I'll speak to the Amendment in a minute. But I wondered if you had talked with any of the Members of the DuPage County Board along with the problems that you have in St. Clair as to whether this is something that we really want in DuPage County or not?"

Flinn: "Well, I'm certainly willing to amend. When this goes back to the Senate, have them refuse to concur and amend DuPage County out of it. They don't want it in the meantime maybe you could contact them. It wasn't pointed in the direction of any other county."

Hudson: "No, I understand that, Monroe, and I respect your...I



would appreciate it if .. if we would have some kind of a chance to see if this is something our Board Members in DuPage want because it will change... We have a 25 Member Board... and it would seem to me it would change the number of the Members on that Board. I don't know that they want to do that."

Flinn: "Alright. I'm certainly willing to do anything you want to do in order.. if they want to exclude themselves we can exclude themselves by the Senate not concurring in the Amendment and if they want to go along then of course we can leave it like it is."

Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and the Amendment's...o No? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative Flinn's willingness to cooperate because I think there are some concerns. I understand there is another Amendment coming up being prepared for this Bill and I wonder if it could just be held on Second until these problems are ironed out?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He says he'll move it to Third and then he'll agree to come back if there's a problem. Alright? Alright. All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Yourell, amends Senate Bill 93 on page one, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell on Amendment #2. By the way, the Bill will be off of this Calendar because of the Amendment. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 93 is an Amendment that would allow the County Board of Cook to reapportion the County Board into 15 Legislative Districts based on compact and continuous Districts where there's equal population as possible. The reason for this, of course, is that it would better enable the citizens of the County of Cook to



better know those who are representing them on the County Board instead of having them run countywide. I think it's an excellent Amendment and I move to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill #93."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell moves to adopt and I'm sure in support, Representative Elmer Conti from Cook."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to be very brief. I wish I could be a lot more brief on this subject but it seems as though I can't sleep at night. Everytime I turn around I find this Amendment. This is about the third Bill now. He tried it twice on House Bill 2728. He tried it on another Bill, but I'm still concerned about the reapportionment we had in the State here in 1972, whenever it was that they reapportioned the State. The only elected officers that the Republicans have in Cook County today is the County Commissioners and that's the only representation we've got on the Board. We've got a nine Board Members of the Sanitary District and the only time we get maybe once every ten years we get one Member elected to that Board and if we allow the President of the County Board or the County Board to reapportion the County, we're going to have some bowling alley Districts and we're going to really see some real gerrymandering that make Bob Blair look like he's walking backwards."

Speaker Matijevich: "Keep alert. There's still Conference Committee Elmer. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield for a short question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Would this allow for these borders to be both in the.. have one of these legislative districts that would overlap the city of Chicago and part of the suburban areas?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell."



Yourell: "To answer that question I would have to be of course be a Member of the County Board and be privy to the discussions . . . that is their Resolution of the matter. I can't tell you how the districts are going to be reapportioned. It's up to the 16 Members of the County Board presently to make that determination."

Leverenz: "Well, do you think it could be?"

Yourell: "Well, I, again, Representative Leverenz, I, being not a Member of that Board, I can't tell you what's going to happen, but it's their obligation. It's their responsibility to do what they think is right. There are Members of that County Board that presently serve from the city of Chicago and some from suburban Cook County. All of those individuals will have to make a determination based on a responsible judgement of the matter and I suppose anything could happen. I don't know. But I'm sure that they would act in the best interests of the citizens of the County of Cook and reapportion those districts according to the best interests of those citizens and to have them as contiguous and to .. as possible with an equal number of population. I have great faith in the Members of the County Board who served that Board and the County of Cook from both parties. I think that they would act responsibly and I, again, I can't answer the question.. the answer to your question simply because I don't sit on that County Board."

Leverenz: "Well, I know the Members of the County Board are ultimately fair and would be fair in this case. Does this provide for some type of prohibition that it would not have an overlap like that?"

Yourell: "No, it does not."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

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



the cynicism that gave birth to this Amendment is matched only by the Sponsor's answer to the last question. The reason for this Amendment is obvious. It's obvious to everybody in this House. The present Majority fearing the population from the cities of the suburban area is afraid that at some time it may in the future .. the reapportionment or legal decision would require the County Board to be apportioned properly to represent the population as exists in the city and in the suburban area. As a matter of fact, I don't think I have to tell anybody in this House that there is a sixth Republican Member on the Board now, but only as a result of a court decision. Now, the same people who are offering this cynical Amendment are the very ones who beat Representative Macdonald's eminently fair Bill which would have allowed reapportionment on population in two separate areas. It would have reapportioned the city areas according to population and it would have reapportioned the suburban areas according to population and you would have had a Board that would have been truly reflective of not only the population in those areas, but of the political philosophy represented in those districts. But as I said, this Amendment would allow reapportionment to overlap city lines so as Representative Conti so properly said, the County could be gerrymandered so that even though the population has shifted there would be no shift in political control, nor would there be any change in political control and that's the only reason for this Amendment. It's a bad Amendment. We have beaten it countless times before. And I say in these closing days of the Session, let's put this to death once and for all and bury it."

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

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevid: "Representative Van Duyne has moved the



previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair.. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; and everybody will have an opportunity to explain their votes don't forget. Those opposed by voting 'no'. I'm supposed to be up in the Chair here so we get home some time this week. I hope. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this there are 84 'aye', 65 'nay', 1 'present', and the motion fails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I had the experience fortunate or unfortunate, whatever the case may be, to live through and take part in the legislative reapportionment at the last decennial census. And let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this Amendment is beyond a shadow of a doubt a precursor to a legislative gerrymandering of the County Board Districts up in Cook County. Since 1970 the courts in a number of decisions I understand have let up to some extent of the constraints which they put upon us in 1970. That is the amount of deviation we could have from district to district regarding population. The largest single complaint that we had after the 1970 reapportionment was the fact that Legislative Districts overlapped areas of common interest. The Majority party through the power they possess saw to it that districts from the city of Chicago overlapped into suburban area and yet, saw to it that the population weight, that the power in those districts remained with those residents in the city. And Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is exactly the plan which Amendment #2 sets forth to Senate Bill 93. This Amendment if adopted, would simply allow the Majority party to extend their power out into the suburban area, out into area whose problems are not necessarily in



common with those of us who live in the city. This is a blatant attempt . It's a power grab. It's a political power grab on the part of the machine to protect themselves as they see the population diminishing in the city of Chicago and the population rising in the suburban area. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, any Legislator, any Legislator who opposes political gerrymandering ought to oppose Amendment #2. Any Legislator who is fair-minded and independent ought not vote for this Amendment. This Amendment would simply deny the rights of people to have common areas of interest represented on the County Board from the districts in which they reside. I say to you again, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mike Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, the rhetoric, as usual, has been very interesting. We've heard from A-1 from the Assistant Minority Leader. We've heard the Notre Dame screamer. We've heard from Elmwood Park, but the simple essence of this Amendment is, 'Shall the people of Cook County on the County Board be represented by people who are elected from districts, single Member districts, or shall they continue to be elected from multi-Member districts?' If we change the system, if we reform the system, if we provide for single Member districts in Cook County, then each and every voter in Cook County, whether they live in Chicago or in suburbia will know first-hand who is their Representative. If they have a problem with County government, that Representative will be close at hand. He or she will maintain a district office. They will be available to answer questions and provide constituent services. On the other hand, if we continue with the current system of multi-Member districts, we will continue with the same lack of knowledge on the part of



voters whether they're in Chicago or suburbia. They don't know who their County Board Commissioners are; They don't know where to reach them and they are striving every day to talk with these people, to learn who they are and to bring their problems to these Representatives. It's amazing that all of the proponents of reform, all of the independents on the other side of the aisle who masquerade as independents for local purposes, are now opposed to this very obvious reform that ought to be enacted by this legislative Body. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "the Lady from Cook, Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, there's one more contingency to hear from and that's the northwest suburban area of Cook County. And I would like to say to you that I think that this is one of the most damaging Amendments that has been offered and continues to be offered in terms of unfairness. Quite the contrary, this will not make the constituencies know their Representatives better. There is a difference of problems in Cook County with the city versus the suburban areas and I say to you that when there are ten city Members and six suburban Members, I think you can tell, as well as I can, as Representative Leverenz asked, how the reapportionment would be affected. I urge you to vote this Amendment down for the third time this year. I had a very fair Bill that I think would have done the job much better and I will continue to bring that one back in the next Session also. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Now that I have finished my lunch, I'd like to be heard on this. I think this is the third time this matter's been up, it's been



defeated twice. I hope it will be defeated again, defeated on its lack of merits. You know the Majority Speaker indicated that very few people know who their County Commissioner is. And I'm sure that's true in the city of Chicago. Very few people in the city of Chicago know who the Chicago County Commissioners are. They can't name them. But on the other hand, most suburbanites know who their County Commissioner is. And they're very careful in the selection of those County Commissioners. Now if we were to adopt this Amendment and if this Amendment were to become law, you know what's going to happen. We're going to have gerrymandering, an overlapping of districts. You're going to dilute the Republican strength in the suburbs and have the County.. Board of County Commissioners lead and be under the jurisdiction of the power and authority of the Cook County Democratic machine. That is not truly representative government. The people of the suburbs are Republicans and they're entitled to have Republican representation on that Board. What do you want? Another city of Chicago? We have 50 wards without one Republican on the city council? That's what you're aiming for and I hope you don't get it because the people are certainly entitled to be represented, those who live in the suburbs and they are overwhelmingly Republican."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I live in the suburbs. I live in the north suburbs and I've been trying to remember who those people are that represent me in the suburbs and I don't remember who they are. And I'm in politics sort of. I'm sort of in politics and I don't remember hardly any of them. I think I've got one from my township. I don't know where her district office is and how you get a hold of her. I don't know how you get a hold of any of the rest of them if you have a problem. They don't exist anymore in the suburbs than they do in the city."



They're sort of phantoms, unfortunately . Now, the reason why the suburban Republicans are getting tight stomachs over this is cause they know we're coming. They know that there's a Democratic presence in the suburbs. They know that there's a building Democratic party that's in the suburbs and is working hard in the suburbs and they know that they're going to lose those offices if they were fairly, fairly apportioned. We're coming whether this passes or not. We're in the suburbs. A Democratic party's there and we're there to stay. And I think this should be supported because I think it gives Democratic voters an opportunity to be represented in their suburb... in suburbia. We're coming."

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

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the fair-minded people and also the suburban Legislators, and by the way, the last Speaker, he knew it was a her and there's only one woman Member on that County Board in the suburban area and he happens to know ^{that} /too, so he's not as naive about this Cook County Commission as he wants you to think. You know this is the first step for metropolitan government. This is.. You suburban Legislators on that side of the aisle, this is the first step in metropolitan government. And not only is it that, you're reducing the Board Members from 15 down.. from 16 down to 15. You're reducing it one Member, so you're going to lose one Member of your suburban area to Cook County city of Chicago. So, this is totalitarian government. This is the move. The Sponsor of this Bill has got to be for totalitarian government because we only have a measly six Republican Representatives in Cook County, in all Cook County including the city of Chicago. Is that fair to try to eliminate the last 6 Representatives that we, the poor Republicans in the Minority



They don't run from districts as you know is the purpose of this Amendment. They don't have district offices. They don't do anything. People from one end of the county do not know who they are. I'll bet you that most of the people sitting in the General Assembly cannot name today the 6 suburban Members or the 10 city Members of the County Board. What is wrong with single Member Districts ? Many of the arguments proposed against this for the Cook County area are for single Member Districts for the General Assembly. Now make up your mind. Either you're for representation... representative government, or you're not. I think it's a good Amendment. Let the people decide who they want to represent them. Let them be closer to the people. Let them have districts. Let them have offices. Put their names in the telephone books with the numbers so we can call them. You can't even reach these people by phone. I think it's a good Amendment and I move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill.. or Senate Bill 93."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Hit your own switch. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, to explain his vote. One minute."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, hearing Representative Yourell explain the lack of knowledge of people of knowing their own County Board Members, I would say that is not unique in Cook County. I would guess in the County of Winnebago and most downstate counties, most people don't even know whose on the County Boards. So I really don't think it's a regional problem alone in Cook County. It's all over the state and for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no'."

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



party have? Do you want to completely do away with the Republican party in the State of Illinois? Is this what you want? You want.. You want Hitler back here again, Representative Greiman? Is that what you want? Or you want Hitler in the city of Chicago? Then if you do, vote for this Bill. If you don't, think about it. Be fair about it."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous suburban...the question."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The question's.. Ladies and Gentlemen. I really am amazed at some of the speakers here in reference to opposition to this Amendment who said that the presentation of the Amendment was strictly a political issue. Well the arguments that were raised by the opponents of this Amendment reiterated in their rhetoric, in their articulation, was strictly political because they're fearful that the Republican party in the suburban area of Cook County might lose representation on the Board. One speaker said that the Majority of the people in suburban Cook County are Republican and should therefore be represented. They are. I don't know what they're afraid of. There are 6 County Commissioners that supposedly represent the Cook County Board today. There are 4 out of the 6 do not have any phone numbers in any of their phone books in Cook County. The County Commissioner that supposedly represents my part of the county cannot be reached by phone. His phone number is not in the book. His name is not in the book.



Deuster: "Well, some of the speakers on both sides of the aisle have indicated to all of us that we know this is in some ways a partisan issue. If it does.. If the vote develops that way, why of course, it would ^{probably} wind up 89 to 88. But it.. and it would be vetoed by the Governor. So that if the proponents of this idea really wanted to make some progress and I do think the idea of dividing Cook County into districts is a good idea...." (Time)

Speaker Matijevich: "The.. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Who's that? Kornowicz back there? Oh, that's Huskey. I am sorry. I thought... I saw him waving something. On this issue there are 82 'aye', 86 'nay', and the Amendment is adopted. Lost, I'm sorry. I thought Collins would correct me. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "Yes. I'd like the poll of the absentees and a verification of the negative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. He has that right. He has a right to ask for a verification. Alright. Representative Katz asks leave to be verified. Leave. Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I want a verification of the affirmative."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think we're aware of that. Would the Clerk poll the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Skinner wants to be verified. Verify Skinner as a 'no' vote. Deuster 'no'. Balanoff . Balanoff. Change Balanoff from 'no' to 'aye'. One moment. The Clerk's got to keep up with this. Terzich. Leave to be verified for Terzich. Leave. Friedrich 'no'. Have you finished the poll of the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Gaines. Klosak. Mautino. Mugalian. Schoeberlein. and Woodyard."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Emil Jones to be verified as an 'aye' vote. Leave. Well they will be. Alright. The Clerk will proceed with the negative vote. Leave for Simms to be verified. Leave. Well this is making it tough for the Clerk, isn't it? Leave for Hanahan and Ewell to be verified as 'aye'. Leave. Proceed with the negative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kempiners. Kent. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margulas. Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Pete Peters to be verified as a 'no'. Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. Waddell. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. No further."

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

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded. May I be recorded as voting 'nay'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Why is it when you should nothing, you say it anyway? 'No' for Klosak. Questions of the negative vote by Bus Yourell. Yourell."

Yourell: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"



Speaker Matijevich: "88 'no', 83 'aye'. Bus Yourell."

Yourell: "Representative Stearney?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Stearney? He's right up in front."

Yourell: "Representative Davis?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Jack Davis. Oh, yes, he's in his seat."

Yourell : "Representative Ralph Dunn?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Ralph Dunn. I don't see Ralph Dunn. Is
he in the chamber? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'.. 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Yourell: "Representative Ebbesen."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ebbesen. In the back.

One moment. Mr. Kempiners, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kempiners: "Could I have leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Bill Kempiners to be verified.
Leave."

Yourell: "Leave."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gene Hoffman is in his seat."

Yourell: "Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leinenweber is over here on the side."

Yourell: "Representative McBroom?"

Speaker Matijevich: "McBroom, is in his seat."

Yourell: "Representative Meyer."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ed Meyer is in his seat."

Yourell: "Representative McMaster?"

Speaker Matijevich: "McMaster is in his seat."

Yourell : "Representative Piel?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Piel is in his seat. Leave for Vinson to
be verified. He's right in front. Leave."

Yourell: "Leave. Representative Winchester."

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester.. I don't see Bob Winchester.
How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."



Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Yourell: "Representative J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "J.J. Wolf is in .. at his seat."

Yourell: "Representative Epton."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Epton, I don't see him
in his seat. Representative Epton, is he in the chamber?
No. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Yourell: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him in his seat. Is he
in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Yourell: "Representative Abramson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Abramson is.. sort of half standing by
his seat."

Yourell: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bianco. Is that Phil back there? Yeah,
that's him. He's in the back."

Yourell: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kucharski's in his seat."

Yourell: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mahar is not in his seat. Do I see Bill
Mahar on the floor? I don't. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Return Winchester. Winchester.
Return Mahar."

Yourell: "Representative Bower?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bower is in his seat. Are there any further
questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien,
for what purpose do you arise?"

O'Brien: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Matijevich: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman is.. You're voting 'present' "

O'Brien: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record O'Brien as 'aye'. Record Mugalian as 'aye'. Mugalian 'aye'. That's just from absent to 'aye'. The Gentleman.. Mautino. Return Epton. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mautino."

Mautino: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're not recorded."

Mautino: "Then I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mautino 'aye'. Stuffle from 'no' to 'aye'. Schneider from 'no' to 'aye'. Stuffle 'no' to 'aye'. Alright. We'll get to him. Schneider. One moment. The Clerk's got to catch up. We'll get to you Ralph. Schneider 'no' to 'aye'. And return Ralph Dunn as a 'no'. Have you completed your investigation, Representative Yourell?"

Yourell: "I have no further.."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions of the negative vote. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 88 'aye', 85 'no'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, has asked for a verification of the 'aye' vote. And.. with leave to be verified as 'aye' are Terzich, Katz, Emil Jones, Hanahan, and Ewell. Proceed with the affirmative vote, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Somebody says it's no fair to have Elmer up here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bill Harris, for what purpose do you arise?"

Harris; "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Clarence Darrow is ill. I don't



know whether he'll be back or not. He has some kind of illness."

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove Darrow from the Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Emil Jones..."

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

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified as voting 'yes' please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Carol Braun to be verified. Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the affirmative vote. Who's the quarterback over there? Collins or..Elmer, did you want to be recognized now or later? The Gentleman from.. Alright. Collins on the affirmative vote."

Collins: "Alright, yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Balanoff? I don't see her for the moment. She's not in her seat. She's not in the chamber. Take her.. How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take her off."

Collins: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "E.M. Barnes is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Collins: "Birchler."

Speaker Matijevich: "Birchler? Oh, he's way in the back."

Collins: "I've got Bowman on my list. I can't see if he's over there or not. Yes, he's hiding behind a newspaper."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's there. Even Sparky's here."

Collins: "Representative Braun was verified was she not?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right."

Collins: "You took Darrow off?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Took care of whom?"

Collins: "Darrow, you took him off?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We took him off, yes."

Collins: "A.."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wonderful, I mean Jaffe, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jaffe: "Would you change me to 'aye' please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Jaffe from 'no' to 'aye'."

Collins: "Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley is in the back."

Collins: "Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that Phil?"

Collins: "Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hannig? Hannig is over in the aisle... middle."

Collins: "Well, I think he's in Emil Jones' seat."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for McGrew to be verified. Leave.

Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you say that Representative Darrow was removed from the Roll Call?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "I thought he had leave of the House to be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, he didn't."

Collins: "Not at all."

Speaker Matijevich: "No. No. We were not aware he was ill until after.



Lechowicz: "He's making a quick recovery."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'll bet. Alright. Leave... That was quicker than that airplane trip. Darrow's back again. Return Darrow. He looks healthier than Collins."

Collins: "Most anybody does."

Speaker Matijevich: "Return Balanoff to the Roll."

Collins: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Matijevich: "Emil Jones is verified."

Collins: "Kane."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hannig?"

Collins: "Kane."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kane is in the right aisle."

Collins: "Kosinski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kosinski is over in the middle."

Collins: "Who's he showing for?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't know."

Collins: "Laurino's back. McClain."

Speaker Matijevich: "McClain? He's got to be there. His coat's there. But, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off, but Madigan's on the phone talking to him."

Collins: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mulcahey. I don't see Mulcahey over there. How.. Oh. Here he comes up the steps."

Collins: "Patrick."

Speaker Matijevich: "Langdon Patrick? He's in the back."

Collins: "Schisler."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gale Schisler? He's waving."

Collins: "Schraeder?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Schraeder is also waving. McClain is here and wishes to be verified. McClain leave."

Collins: "Sharp."

Speaker Matijevich: "John Sharp is in his seat."

Collins: "We could see much better if people weren't standing



in front of them. Terzich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Terzich?"

Collins: "He looks like Mr. Lyons to me."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's been verified. That's right."

Collins: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Von Boeckman is in his seat. You ought to know when Kozubowski's here, we're all here."

Collins: "I made that observation in the Elections Committee this morning. Sam Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "Sam Wolf is way back there."

Collins: "No further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions? How's the count, Mr. Clerk? 88 'aye', 84 'no', and the Amendment is adopted and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me be the first to congratulate Commissioner Bus Yourell from Cook County."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Here, here. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Back to the Priority of Call Calendar the next Bill is Senate Bill 574, Terzich. I don't see him in his seat. Oh, here he is. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 574, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move Senate Bill 574 back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to return Senate Bill 574 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment? Leave. The Bill is on Second Reading. Read the Amendment"



Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Terzich, amends Senate Bill 574 as amended by deleting all of Section 506 and so forth."

Terzich: "What the Amendment does, Mr. Speaker, it cleans up the language of the Bill to clarify the intentions of the Act. It provides that a license to act as an insurance agent or broker to sell property and casualty insurance shall not be granted to bank holding companies and cities, villages, or incorporated towns where the population exceeds 5,000. The Bill would not permit.. prohibit, I'm sorry, bank holding companies from selling credit life, credit accident and health group insurance, mortgage cancellation life and group mortgage accident and health insurance and I would move for adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 (sic). All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. One moment, the Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Representative Terzich, I just got the Amendment and do I understand that this Amendment will now permit insurance agen.. bank holding companies to sell credit life, credit accident and health, and group mortgage cancellation life insurance, or group mortgage accident and health insurance, but not other types? Is that the effect of this Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevec: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, that's exactly what it does. What it is it just clarifies the intention of the Act. It just permits them to sell the credit life, etc. but not the casualty insurance."

Schuneman: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"



Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Terzich, what is the position of the various banking groups with regard to this Amendment?"

Terzich: "That's a good question. We will find out very shortly."

Stuffle: "Is this the Amendment that we discussed in the Committee?"

Terzich: "Well, that's .. basically it is. It's just a clarification of the Amendment we adopted, more or less to give out explicitly the intent. This was suggested after a meeting with the small bank.. whoever the heck they are.."

Stuffle: "Do you know if the Illinois Banker's Association supports or opposes the Amendment?"

Terzich: "Do I know? The Illinois Banking Association does not support any Bills that deal with bank holding companies other than their own."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there are no further questions, all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Next Bill, Senate Bill 154. Katz. Is Harold on the floor? I don't see him. Senate Bill 257, McClain. I don't see Mike on the floor either. Senate Bill 375, Stuffle. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave to return this Bill to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 375 to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Leave, the Bill is on Second Reading. Read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Terzich, amends Senate Bill 375 on page one, line one.."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on Amendment #1.. 2. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, I believe what we want to do is withdraw Amendment #1? One stays. Alright. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment #2."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, is that a Committee Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No."

Terzich: "No."

Speaker Matijevich: "Floor Amendment."

Totten: "Well, how was it adopted then? Oh, has it been adopted?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's withdrawing it."

Totten: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Leave to withdraw? Leave. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill..."

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

Stuffle: " I'd like leave to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw. Alright. Leave to withdraw Amendment 3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 4, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 375 Section 16-133 Subsection B2 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representstive Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Amendment #4 is in conjunction with ^{Committee} Amendment #1 effectively the Bill, Senate Bill 375. What Amendment #4 does, it's been worked out. Basically Representative Terzich and I had some disagreements over this Bill and he is the Chairman of the Pension Committee. What this does with regard to the early retirement Bill that we're dealing with is provide specific percentages of employer



so on. The Chicago Board however, did not want that. They wanted an optional program and in this Amendment we agreed to make it optional in Chicago to suit their wishes."

Ebbesen: "Could I ask you, who are the people that are supporting this.. the basic concept of this legislation?"

Stuffle: "The people supporting the Amendment..."

Ebbesen: "Not the Amendment, the Bill."

Stuffle: "I'm sorry. Would you ask that again, Joe?"

Ebbesen: "Those who are supporting not only the Amendment, but the concept of the Bill in general.."

Stuffle: "Okay. First of all, the Amendment. The Amendment is specifically supported by and Representative Terzich can correct me if I'm wrong, I understand it is supported by the Chicago teachers, the downstate teachers, the Chicago Board. There are.. We have tried to reach a compromise that will affect everyone here in a way they can buy it. Everybody's not completely happy. They've given a little. In terms of the concept of the Bill, Representative Ebbesen, all of the Board groups support the concept of the Bill and all of the teacher groups in this state support the concept of the Bill as well."

Ebbesen: "Of course we can't get into the concept of the Bill or could we through the Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No. I'd hope not."

Ebbesen: "We'll just have to.. If they want to put the Amendment on I guess we.. I'd like a Roll Call vote. I'd like a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "You'd like a Roll Call vote. Alright. There's been a motion to adopt Amendment #4. Those in favor of Amendment #4 signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'.. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 'aye', 20 'nay', 1 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"



Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further Amendments and there's been a request for a pension impact statement by Representative James McCourt. Try to work that out. The next Bill is Senate Bill 450, Katz. I don't see Katz on the floor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 725, Daniels. One moment. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I have in front of me Amendment #5 for this Bill. What happened to that? Did he withdraw that or..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Apparently the Amendment was printed twice and numbered twice and I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #5. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw 5? Leave. The Gentleman from.. Read.. Daniels, are you ready to go with that Bill? 725. Out of the record. 762, Van Duynes. I don't see LeRoy there. Is he here? Alright. Read the Bill, 762. No. Out of the record. Senate Bill 870. Braun is not here. 873, Catania. Read the Bill. We've got somebody ready to go to work."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 873, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 873 is a Bill to save Cook County Hospital and 40 other hospitals around the state which are sure to follow in its wake if Cook County Hospital goes down. What it provides is that if a hospital can demonstrate that it has provided 20% of its patient care days in helping the indigent and the working poor that it will receive special consideration from the Department of Public Aid in having those expenditures reimbursed. It further provides that the Department of Public Aid will vigorously undertake pre-registration programs to insure



that people who are not receiving public aid and therefore do not have a green card, but who are definitely in the economic situation where they require care at hospitals which serve the poor, these people will be pre-registered so that when they come to those hospitals there will be no question about their eligibility. In 1972 over 60% of the patient care days at Cook County Hospital were found eligible for reimbursement by the Department of Public Aid. Since then, the very strict requirements that have been made for proving eligibility which the Department itself admits have a great deal to do with paperwork snarl-up and red tape have reduced the eligible number of patient care days to around 30%. This has resulted in a severe financial problem at Cook County Hospital and this Bill would address the need that is now threatening to put Cook County Hospital out of existence. If this Bill does not pass it is quite straight forward and honest to say that by September 1st we won't have Cook County Hospital anymore. I ask for your support."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Catania has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 873. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Sponsor of this Bill has been very up front in describing what the ultimate effect of this Bill would be except the pricetag. Basically Senate Bill 873 would require the Illinois Department of Public Aid to establish an evaluation system to determine eligibility for impaction aid. It would increase the number of people and the types of people who would be able to be treated by the hospital who presently may not be covered by Public Aid. It would expand the scope of medicaid in the State of Illinois. There is no pay back provision in this Bill. All impaction aid would be granted on a no strings flat grant basis. The Section



dealing with income eligibility is somewhat ambiguous, but basically the formula provides for treatment of people whose salaries are at a specific level. The only purpose to be served by this Bill is to provide financial aid to hospitals supposedly that serve a high degree of questionable and I say questionably eligible people who may or may not be eligible for Medicaid. The Sponsor said that there would be 40 hospitals throughout the entire state that would be aided by this Bill. But I have a list of those hospitals and of the 40 there are 6 outside of Cook County. And of the rest who are inside Cook County there is some question as to whether they would qualify at all under the formula requested under this Bill. The bulk of the money that would be involved in this formula would be going to Cook County Hospital. Few of the other hospitals that would supposedly qualify are experiencing the operating revenue deficit that are typical of the Cook County Hospital situation. In addition these hospitals' experience would have to be evaluated by IDPA to determine if the high incidence case load had a direct bearing on any existing fiscal problem. What is the ultimate fiscal impact of Senate Bill 873? The Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Public Aid assuming that the Bill raises the standard by requiring proof of eligibility for those within 25% of existing standard estimate that the yearly added revenues that would be supplied under this Bill, that would be expended under this Bill would be 91 million dollars per year. I want to emphasis something about that 91 million dollars, that is not a one shot expenditure. That would be an expenditure that we would ^{be} mandating from here on in. Now, if you want to mandate that 91 million dollars for every other year, you can vote for Senate Bill 873. I, for one, do not feel that we, in the General Assembly, ought to make that type of a commitment. And I would urge the defeat of Senate



Bill 873."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question if I may. If she'll yield."

Catania: "I'd be happy to yield for a question."

Borchers: "As you probably know, ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mike Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you please admonish the audience to conduct themselves in a proper manner while viewing the proceedings?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The rules of the House require no demonstrations from the gallery and somebody here, the Minority Leader, reminded me that the House Members ought to so follow the rules too. No, the Minority Leader right here. Representative Borchers continue."

Borchers: "May.. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Borchers: "Well, I would like to know whether the 62% of ill birth on welfare as you probably know in this state are illegitimate. Does this mean that we would be paying for all of the illegitimate births in the State of Illinois that would go one of these hospitals?"

Catania: "Representative Borchers, I have no idea how many illegitimate births there are in your district. I really can't give you those kinds of statistics."

Borchers: "I didn't say my district. I said 62% in the State of Illinois are illegitimate."

Catania: "You said, would we be paying for all the illegitimate births by helping Cook County Hospital. I assume that there's a fair percentage of illegitimate births in your district too."



Borchers: "Oh, I'm quite sure there are. In fact is, in St. Mary's Hospital in Decatur, Illinois that where they opened a similar clinic meaning to try to help, every day they are.. at 10:00 o'clock they are overloaded with pregnant women, most of them illegitimate.. with illegitimate children. I was just curious do you know how much it's going to cost us to.. in the State or have you an estimate of the cost to the state just to take care of the illegitimate births on welfare?"

Catania: "Representative Borchers, I'm not sure if anyone keeps track of who's born of parents who are married and who isn't. But I think perhaps the Illinois Department of Public Health would be the appropriate place to go to ask that question."

Borchers: "I think you're right, but don't you have any idea how many billions of dollars it's going to cost to pay for these children?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Susan, you don't have to answer these questions if you don't want to."

Catania: "I'm trying to figure out what his question is."

Borchers: "In addition to the illegitimate children we would be paying for, in your opinion would we be paying for many other unnecessary and little stomach aches? Now, in our hospitals at home we discovered that through the type of welfare patients they often will go for no reason at all, just to shop around, you might say and gossip and in the hospitals. They enjoy going there and seeing a doctor, taking up his valuable time, and of course, the doctor gets paid out of this fund I'm sure in due time. But do you think we should encourage that kind of a thing?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair will say that has not been a question. Do you want to continue, Representative Borchers?"

Catania: "I did want to respond to that."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Proceed."



Borchers: "I feel very definitely that the Chair on the side..
on the side.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed..."

Borchers: "And therefore I'm sure the Chair doesn't want me
to continue the very many instances I could bring out in
relation to the misuse .. the present misuse of welfare,
let alone the future misuse of that welfare when we open
up you might say the purses of the entire State of Illinois
for the continuation of this kind of a program. I just
think we should vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, could I just respond as he did?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, one moment. Representative Vinson,
the Gentleman from DeWitt. You can answer that in close
Susan."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Spons.. Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield
for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She will."

Vinson: "Representative Catania, I presume you still will not
take the Bill back to Second to consider any o f the Amend-
ments I filed."

Catania: "We would like to consider it in the form it's in
right now, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, dreadfully that compels me to oppose the Bill,
Representative. Could you tell me what the salary is of
'Dr. Halton'?"

Catania: "As I recall it is.. I think you probably know and
I don't have the exact number. Do you have the exact
figure?"

Vinson: "Does the 80 to 90 thousand dollar a year range sound
appropriate?"

Catania: "Okay. I was going to say around 70 thousand dollars
a year, but I'm not sure exactly what it is."

Vinson: "Are you aware of any other official in the State who
makes more than that?"



Catania: "No, I'm not."

Vinson: "Can you tell me does that salary include the value of the emoluments of office that go with that office?"

Catania: "I suppose it does."

Vinson: "Does it include the price of his chauffeur?"

Catania: "I don't really know."

Vinson: "Is he allowed to practice medicine on the side?"

Catania: "He probably is. I'm not sure if he does. We've had State Department Directors who are also allowed to practice on the side."

Vinson: "Do any of them make an 80 thousand dollar a year salary?"

Catania: "No, but I don't think that they're responsible for 327,999 emergency rooms visits per year or 7,504 live births per year or 1,026 people treated each day, millions of whom are in danger of losing their life."

Vinson: "Is the.. Are the hospitals under the Governing Commission solely accredited by the Joint Accreditation Committee?"

Catania: "Not all of the entire physical plants that's why they are now trying to replace part of the physical plants."

Vinson: "Under your Bill am I correct in believing that you authorize a state subsidy for the state Governing Commission?"

Catania: "We're authorizing, but we're not specifying a particular amount in this Bill. This is simply the substantive legislation."

Vinson: "Is there a provision in the Bill which limits the hospitals which can qualify for that subsidy? Can every hospital in the State qualify?"

Catania: "The hospitals which have had more than 20% of their patient days determined medic-aide eligible would qualify and that's subject to further review by the Department of Public Aid. There are 41 hospitals that would be so qualified. I have a list of them here at my desk if you're interested in that."

Vinson: "Has anybody systemically and authoritatively for any level of government, be it Cook County or the State, analyzed



whether continuing Cook County or substituting for it smaller neighborhood facilities as the appropriate way to provide care in the area for the indigent people?"

Catania: "I believe there's been various approaches to that. There was a debate a week ago last Saturday on whether that was an appropriate step to take or not. And I think that the people who have lived with the problem in Chicago are probably better qualified to answer it than some of the people who may have done disinterested studies."

Vinson: "Do you believe that we will have a serious possibility of entertaining some other methods for providing medical care for indigent people in Cook County if we begin a state subsidy or do you believe that this will preclude such a possibility?"

Catania: "I would hope that we would continue to explore all the alternatives for providing good ~~decent~~ health care for all the citizens in the State of Illinois."

Vinson: "Are you aware of whether there's any problem with maintaining control with prescription drugs at Cook County Hospital?"

Catania: "I'm sorry am I aware if there's any what?"

Vinson: "Any problem in maintaining control of prescription drugs at the hospital."

Catania: "I believe that the hospital is doing everything it can to maintain proper control. That's a continuing problem for all the hospitals in the State of Illinois, as you know."

Vinson: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Vinson: "The Sponsor of this Bill is a very honorable, committed and dedicated Lady..."

Speaker Matijevich: "However.."

Vinson: "And there's no doubt in my mind but that she is trying to do something good for both the people in her district and in her mind, for all the people of the State. None of



my criticism of this Bill is directed at her or at the Senate Sponsor who is also an honorable Gentleman. The problem is that this Bill precludes any possibility, any practical possibility of really addressing the problems that we face in terms of providing medical care for poor people in Cook County. When we begin to create the authorization and then provide the money for a subsidy for Cook County Hospital we are writing off any possibility for looking at the real problem and finding a modern, efficient solution, a solution that would be much more humane, much more compassionate, and provide much better medical care. Beyond that, what we do is to ratify every mistake in management and structure and operation of that hospital. When we choose to subsidise something, we say it's good. And when we choose to say that Cook County Hospital is managed well or properly or efficiently, we're making a tragic error for the taxpayers of this state as well as the people it's supposed to serve. That hospital has no possibility of being managed efficiently under its current structure. They are paying an executive director some \$80,000 providing him with a chauffeur. They provide him with an apartment that I understand is very nice. They let him practice medicine on the side. We don't do that for the Director of Mental Health whom I would submit is every bit as important, has every bit of significant role, and is.. has a portfolio which requires as much confidence and compassion and administrative ability as the Director of Cook County Hospital. We don't pay him \$80,000. We pay him about half of that. They ask us to subsidise that kind of decision when they asked us to adopt this Bill. It's a mistake. It is a rip-off of downstate taxpayers and it's a rip-off of the poor people in Cook County. Admittedly there's..."

Speaker Matijevich: "There is one moment.. One moment. Repre-



sentative Catania, for what purpose do you seek attention?" Catania: "Well, I didn't want to interrupt the Gentleman. I did want to point out that Dr. Halton's a full time administrator and does not practice on the side. He does not have a chauffeur and I'm told that there are negotiations still going on on the subject of this Bill and so I'd like to take it out of the record.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Show's over. The next Bill. I don't see Representative Taylor on the 950. 1123, Vinson. Read the Bill. That's what you call timing. Vinson says he'd like to take this Bill out of the record. How wise do they get? Senate Bill 1268. Woodyard. Read the Bill. He's not here. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1357, Kelly. All I see is his coat. Alright. Senate Bill 438, Farley. He's ready. Read the Bill."

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

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

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill excludes work performance by a student in the employment of the school, college, or university at which he is enrolled and attending classes. This legislation exempts from the term employment in the Unemployment Compensation Act service performed by a student who is enrolled and regularly attending classes at such school, college, or university. I believe this exemption conforms to the basic intentions of the Unemployment Act and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Farley has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 438. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

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



Republican spokesman of the Labor Committee, I would concur with Representative Farley and I would urge that this Bill be passed by the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 438 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. I'll give you ten. Get back to your seat, Murph. Have all voted? Have all voted? Somebody take care of Totten. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'aye', 6 'nay', and Senate Bill 438, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 590. Ebbesen. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 590, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 590 is the as indicated the annual appropriation for the Dangerous Drugs Commission in the amount of..."

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

Getty: "I just have a question on this. I wonder if you could take it out of the record for a couple of minutes?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Leave to take it out of the record for a few moments. Leave. Senate Bill 487, McMaster. Out of the record. Schneider are you ready with 508? Proceed. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 508, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



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

This is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Treasurer's Office. FY '79 had a total of 225 million 923 thousand dollars expended in the areas of ordinary and contingent. Of course, most of this relates to the principle.. payment of principle interest on bonds that are processed through the Treasurer's Office. The FY '80 year represents 258 million dollars, 220 thousand. That is an increase of about 32 million. If I'm not mistaken, the Digest is correct. We accepted Amendment of a reduction of 51 thousand from the Senate below request that conforms to their 7% guideline which is being applied I believe to most of the appropriations measures and I would move for the passage of 508."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schnieder moves for the passage of Senate Bill 508. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "By the analysis that I have operations will increase a bit over 9%. Has that been changed by Amendment?"

Schneider: "Did you say 9?"

Schlickman: "Nine."

Schneider: "The..I don't know what the precents are. That dollar amount that I gave you earlier, Gene, is what we had. Let me see. FY '79 estimates were 2 million, 100 thousand. The Senate and House Committees 2 million, 391.. Is that about 9%?"

Schlickman: "Nine point three."

Schneider: "Yeah. I guess that's the increase then. That includes not only personnel, but EDP as well as contractual services. So that's electronic data and contractual separate from personnel."

Schlickman: Debt service has been increased or would be increased by 14.5%, is that correct?"



Schneider: "I'm.. That's correct."

Schlickman: "Can you tell me what accounts for the significant increase in debt service?"

Schneider: "Did you say decrease?"

Schlickman: "Increase.."

Schneider: "Increase in debt services?"

Schlickman: "Increase of 14.5%."

Schneider: "Well, I could read the lists of those payments out of the various .. various accounts, if that would help."

Schlickman: "Well, obviously, it results from action by the Legislature."

Schneider: "Oh, obviously . Yes. I didn't know if you wanted me to incriminate all of us or not. That's what I.. I think that's probably part of our new awareness that if you're going to extend funds on bonds, you.."

Schlickman: "You're going to pay for it."

Schneider: "That someday we're going to have to pay the price."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Schneider: "You're right, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all I know is that this Bill appropriates 258 million dollars and I'd like to hear this monologue carried on between the two. I wonder if we could have some order ."

Speaker Matijevid: "Alright. I think they've concluded now. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 508 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. It's appropriation Bill for the Treasurer. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'aye', 2 'nay', and 6 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 508 is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 864. I



don't see the Sponsor. Out for the moment. Senate Bill 47. Kelly. I don't see him yet. Senate Bill 50, McPike. Are you back there? No. Senate Bill 244. O'Brien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 362. Stuffle. Read the Bill. Leave to return Senate Bill 362 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment. Leave. The Bill is on Second Reading. Clerk will read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended by House Amendment #1 with reference to page and line numbers of that Amendment on page 28 and so forth."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. All Amendment # 4 to this Bill does is clean up the language in a prior Amendment by striking the word, 'the', which was the Amendment necessary because we made a mistake in the drafting of an earlier Amendment. And I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment # 4. Is that 4? Yeah. All in favor.. If there's no discussion, say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the 'aye's have it. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended by deleting all of Section 4-118 of the Illinois Pension Code and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle on Amendment 5."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #5 provides for along with .. pardon me a second."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, did you have a question? Ebbesen, are you seeking recognition on this Amendment or not?"

Ebbesen: "I didn't hear an explanation .."

Speaker Matijevich: "What?"



Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, I missed the explanation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, we might return here a moment. It's my understanding that a motion is filed with regard to Committee Amendment #1 on this Bill and that that should have been read initially. There is a motion to table Committee Amendment #1 that was filed the other day."

Speaker Matijevich: "Did we move on that motion, did you say, on the Committee Amendment?"

Stuffle: "We did not move on that motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Did we have a motion on the Committee Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion.. Motion to move to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 362, Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Stuffle has moved to table Committee Amendment #1. Any discussion on that? If not, all in favor say.. Oh. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I wonder if the Gentleman might explain what Committee Amendment #1 did?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Representative Wolf. Representative Terzich and I agreed to put the Amendment in Committee. We were lead to believe it was an Amendment by the Department of Insurance Pension Division with regard to cleaning up the statutory provisions for police and fire Acts down-state. As we looked at the Amendment after we were told that we think that there's a possibility there's some substantive language in here and it's not a clean up and at the request of the Municipal League we're asking that the Amendment be tabled."

Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of the Amendment to table say 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and the Amendment's is tabled. Now we're on Amendment 5. Is that true, Representative Stuffle."



Stuffle: "Yes. We should .. I made a mistake on this one.

I apologize to the Membership. Amendment #4. These Amendments had to be renumbered because of some mistakes in the Clerk's Office so, we accidentally a moment ago adopted #4, which is no longer necessary having tabled #1. So at this time I would ask to table the Amendment #4 that we just adopted."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright.. Leave..."

Stuffle: "Table in fact, Mr. Speaker, if you would on one motion to table 4,5, and 6. We will return to those issues subsequently...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do we have leave to withdraw 4,5, and 6? Leave. Amendment's 4,5, and 6 are withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Williams, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following.."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams, on Amendment #7."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That Amendment was actually introduced to perhaps aid some of the newer Members who might have an opportunity if they had served in some form of a trustee or Mayor that they would be able to transfer I.M.R.F. into legislative pension fund."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Williams has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7. If there's no discussion all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Stuffle-Terzich, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw? Leave to withdraw. Amendment #8 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Getty, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended... "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Getty, on Amendment 9."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #9 would permit a person at age 62 with five years service to go in and get a proportional to qualify for the minimum period for a proportional retirement annuity. I'd move for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And Amendment # 9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362.."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, on Amendment 10. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Amendment #10 spells out the financing provision in the downstate policemen's Retirement Article, to spell out the provisions that were made with regard to giving the municipalities in the state that are covered by the downstate Pension Act in effect an extension on the time to meet the 40 year amortization program that we provided for in this system some years ago. Senate Bill 1360 which we passed the other day, extended the time for the 40 years to take effect. What this Amendment does is provide and spell out what the funding standards are definitively, provide for actuarial reserves that we do now, and most importantly provide in as much as we've given the municipalities a break in 1360 by deferring to some extent their pension liability and reducing their tax burden over that 40 year period. This gives individuals in the pension system standing to sue if the municipality does not meet its legal obligations to the system. This is supported by the Pension Division of the Department of Insurance and I move for adoption of the Amendment. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Stuffle has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. On that the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative



Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, on this suggestion here where they have the option to sue as an individual, if they do not fulfill the actuarial funding. Now, Representative Stuffle, you know as well as I do that what you are saying to local government, not that I am not for more fully funding in a more optimum level, because these are very low at the local level in addition to the state, but here you have, if I'm not mistaken, in here where any court of competent jurisdiction shall have the right to receive and act upon any suit filed by the Board of Trustees, but you have said in addition to that, it shall be the duty of any Board of Trustees as a police pension fund to file against a municipality and you mandate that they have to sue, that .. and what you're doing is mandating that they, even with the 40 years, that they have to go out and increase the real estate taxes which is open-ended to every city council to generate that revenue?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman.. Representaative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "You know as well as I, Representative Ebbesen, how complex this question is and I'll try and be simple in my answer.. First of all, federal law, as you know, mandates already to have a qualified pension plan pursuant to the Internal Revenue Service provisions and law, that you have to have fiduciary right established by the Pension Board and they have to act. They don't have an option. They're mandated too to keep the system qualified. The second part of the question, I think, if I understood you correctly, is this, this does not increase the cost to the municipality that spells out what we've already been doing, what the actuarial reserves already are, simple gives standing here that says that that Board where it acts in the fiduciary position for the Members, is mandated, yes,



indeed, as they already by law federally, in the qualified system to act on behalf of the employees. We've already given the municipalities, as you know, a break in 1360 with regard to how much money they have to put in for pensions by extending the 40 year provision. This simply says that since they've got what they want in 1360, we're going to put some teeth in the financing provisions of law.."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to this Amendment.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Ebbesen: "And I want everyone in this House to pay very close attention to what we're going to be voting upon here in this Amendment because we, as Members of the General Assembly, listen and approve various pension benefits and we approve these benefits .. they cannot be diminished by .. in accordance with the Illinois Constitution. Now the more benefits that we give, that means that the local level, in this particular case, we have allowed these pension benefits to be increased, which means that the taxpayers at the local level and I might advise you if you will get the Department of Local Government Affairs or the Illinois Municipal League report and take a look at your own municipalities you will find that there are multitudes of these systems that are ten, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five percent funded, meaning that there's unfunded accrued liability of 75% or more. And if we were to adopt this Amendment, we are saying that they if the municipality fails, even though it's written in the State.. at the state level that it's mandated that we fund these pension systems. We are over with the local systems and the state systems, over 8 billion dollars underfunded in the accrued liability and what we're doing is saying to these local governments, you come up with some money. Sure they've got 40 years to do it. They had



40 years as of 20 years ago right now. You're saying with this Amendment that they failed to do so. We're going to drag you into court. I think it's a bad legislative proposal. You mandate the benefits, then you're going to force them into suits where they're going to force these municipalities to raise taxes when in some cases it's going to be virtually impossible to fulfill it. I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

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

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak on behalf of this Amendment. We've been talking about the unfunded liability, but once again, we're speaking with both sides of our mouths. One of the reasons we have this large unfunded liability is because the government has not put in their proper contribution. Right now, every individual participating in a pension plan does have the right to recourse to sue to make sure that his funds are protected, guaranteed, and that the money will be there for retirement. This is all this Bill does. At the present time, they can go to the Attorney General. Now the Municipal League we did have a consolidation Bill. They were yelling and screaming about all different items. We did ascend to their wish of giving them another 40 years to bring up this unfunded liability. It's more than adequate time. Let's make sure that these people live up to their dream and just the way the participants have by making their contribution and we're saying the governmental agency should make theirs. I'm sure that if you were a Member of.. or a trustee of any pension system and if the system was not adequately funded, that you would take every measure to protect the participants that you have available and the last measure is the courts of the United States and this is all it does. If the courts deem it's necessary that they come up with this money,



by all means, that they should have the right to do so and I would urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "It's not very often that I disagree with the Gentleman from DeKalb over here, but it just seems to me if I understand this Amendment correctly, that it is giving the municipality, you can nod your head if I'm right, Larry, the 40 years to properly fund the pension benefits which were granted by this General Assembly. Is that correct? Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think it would be a bad idea for local government to levy the taxes that they ought to be to fund these pension benefits which we, as the General Assembly, have been so generous in granting. Because I believe if the local governments really laid the tax on the people that they ought to be, there would be a great hue and cry coming from the general public against Members of the General Assembly who can't say 'no' to any pension benefit of any special group. I think we ought to properly fund the benefits that have been given. The participating Members, whether it be a fireman or a teacher or a state employee, have met their obligation by making their contribution. Local governments haven't met their part of the obligation by matching those funds which is done through taxes and I believe if they would do that, the general public might wake up to the fact that it's this General Assembly that keeps liberalizing those benefits and raising their taxes. So, I'm not so sure it's too bad of an Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Monroe Flinn in the Chair."

Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous pension."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye' have it. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative



Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it seems to me somewhat ironic at the same time to me, somewhat ridiculous that we can come in here and argue and argue and argue for paying off unfunded liabilities and that the same people who argue for that when we're giving them the opportunity to do so, when we're not increasing... we're not increasing the city's obligation, those same people stand up and oppose that effort. And I don't see how you can have it both ways. I don't see how either that you could diminish a benefit of an individual and that's what you'd be doing if they don't meet their mandate here, that's already a mandate, I might add, Constitutionally and legally, to pay for the pensions enforced and the pensions that have already been granted and did you... I don't see how you can do otherwise than to support this if you really believe as Representative Wolf very well articulated the need to pay for what we've done. And I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted to Senate Bill 362?' 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. Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Bluthardt, you've got your light on and I overlooked it. Representative Bluthardt to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know I have mixed feelings. I think that, you know, municipalities ought to levy the tax necessary to properly fund the pensions that are mandated by this General Assembly. On the other hand though, to provide by law that any individual may have an interest including trustees of the Pension Board, shall have the duty to .. to file litigation and if successful shall be reimbursed the cost in attorney's fees for doing this I think is going a little too far."



You know, many municipalities in Illinois are because of the mandates of this General Assembly are now levying taxes as much as 40% of their general tax, corporate tax, for the purpose of paying off levies. Forty percent, some even higher than that to pay off those benefits that this General Assembly has mandated be paid. Just today in Amendment #9 we again increased the cost to local government be bringing in those who would otherwise be overage and not eligible for pension funds.."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close? Your minute's up."

Bluthardt: "And that's an example of the way in which we mandate local government and increase the taxes. Then you turn around and say local government, you ought to have your taxes frozen because you're taxing the people too much. They're not taxing the people too much, you're mandating them too much."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', and Amendment #10 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #11, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended by deleting the title..."

Speaker Flinn: "Amendment #11 is withdrawn at the request of the Sponsor. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #12, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended in the introductory clause of Section 1."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #12 incorporates House Bill 515 into this Bill. House Bill 515 was approved by the Pension Laws Commission. House Bill 515 passed out of Committee overwhelmingly, but House Bill 515 was caught in the crunch of the deadlines on Third Reading with regard to House Bills. What the Amendment does, #12, is provide for vesting the pension credit



of those downstate firemen who have ten years or more of service, but less than 20. We have already provided this for the downstate police in 1977. I reiterate that this Amendment.. this Amendment which is the same as 515 is approved by the Pension Laws Commission and in fact, this formula was drafted by its actuary. I move adotion of the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm not really rising in opposition. I'm just going to say that what Representative Stuffle has said is true and perhaps we just ought to hang ahl of these Amendments on here and I've got a note filed for a fiscal inpart statement and when we get a look at that, maybe the numbers will be overwhelming enough."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor of Amendment #12 say 'aye'; 'aye'; those opposed. The 'aye's have it and Amendment #12 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #13, Terzich-Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker FLinn: "Representative Stuffle. Amendment #13, Representative Stuffle. You're on the air here."

Stuffle: "Representative Terzich is the principle Sponsor along with me, but all 13 does is the same as the Amendment... this Amendment does for the downstate firemen in terms of the financing provisions I mentioned for the downstate police, the same thing as the Amendment we just adopted a few moments ago. I move adoption of Amendment 13."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor of adopting Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 362 will say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye' have it. Amendment #13 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Kane, amends Senate Bill 362 as amended in the introductory clause and so forth."



Speaker Flinn: "Alright. Representative Kane, I don't see him. I don't see Representative Kane anyplace. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "There is a fiscal note requested then the Bill will remain on Second Reading. Senate Bill 380."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 380, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations and reappropriations to the Board of Trustees University of Illinois..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Wikoff. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the operations and contingent expense for Fiscal year 1980 for the University of Illinois. Total budget is 330 million 475 thousand, 672 dollars. This does include approximately 7½% salary increase and there is in there some 2 million.5.. almost 2.6 million dollars to provide additional funds for the Division of Crippled Services and this will since that's been transferred, this will go along with that. This is..."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, under what provisions of the House rules does Dr. Haughton have leave to be on the House floor?"

Speaker Flinn: "Repeat your question. I didn't hear you."

Vinson: "Under what provision of the House rules does Dr. Haughton have leave to be on the House floor?"

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion on the Bill? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 380 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 133 voting 'aye'; 6 voting 'no' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 381."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 381, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 381 provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1980 of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Edwardsville. The total appropriation calls for 138 million, 187 thousand, 325 dollars. I respectfully ask for your support for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the ... Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Bruce, what's the increase over last year?"

Richmond: "The.. it's about an 8% increase from 128 million, to 138. That's the estimated expenditures of two years."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "Referring to Senate Amendment #2 which adds 200 thousand dollars to pay the prevailing wage for laborers at S.I.U., can you explain the need for that and what's being done and why we had to tack on nearly a quarter of million dollars for prevailing wage?"

Richmond: "Thank you. I will attempt to explain it. I know that situation.. that the laborers there in the maintenance are not being paid the prevailing rate and this.. these funds would bring them up to that point so that they would be on the same footing as other crafts who do work at the University and are accorded the privilege of working at the prevailing wage rate by their various crafts."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."



Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 381 pass?' Oh, Representative Waddell, I overlooked you. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "What percentage was built in for employees' increase this year?"

Richmond: "Seven and a half percent. That goes along with what the Governor added for that purpose."

Waddell: "And that's across the Board?"

Richmond: "That's an average."

Waddell: "But not across the Board."

Richmond: "No. It's my understanding it's not across the Board. Some would participate at a higher level those on the bottom of the scale."

Waddell: "That has been the problem and I would go on record right now that next year I'm going to go through these the same way to see that the little fellow gets as well a funding .. as good a funding as we can have rather than have the percentages go to those in high salary brackets that really don't need it and that's going to be for everyone of the colleges and the universities."

Richmond: "I would join you in that, Representative Waddell."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 381 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 117 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 383."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 383, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative E.M. Barnes."



Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Community College Board. This appropriation was originally introduced. The request was 155 million, 824, 900 by Senate action was 143 million, 613, 070.. 700 . The House.. The Bill now reflects 103 million, 252.4 for the credit hours, 17 million, 200 thousand point zero for equalization, 4 million, 700 thousand point zero for disadvantage, for a total of 125 million, 152 thousand point 4. This Bill as I indicated is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Community College Board. The estimated expenditures from last fiscal year is 134 million, 184. So in fact, from the estimated expenditures to the amount of money that is now being.. being voted on here, is a proposed decrease in the funding of this agency."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 383 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 134 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'nay', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 542. I don't see Representative Tim Johnson on the floor. Take that out of the record. Senate Bill 659. Representative Hannig is ready to go. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 659, a Bill for an Act relating to the disposal of hazardous wastes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hannig."

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

I offer to you today Senate Bill 659 as a means of protecting Illinois citizens from the indiscriminate dumping and siting of hazardous wastes. In a small town in the district that I represent, Wilsonville, Illinois, the



Illinois EPA a few years ago granted an EPA permit for hazardous wastes dumps. This dump is located within the city limits. It's located above an abandoned coal mine. There was no public input on this and we believe that these provisions in Illinois law should be changed. This Bill addresses those problems. Under Senate Bill 659 the definition .. the Illinois definition of hazardous wastes would be in conformity with that provided in federal law. Furthermore, this Bill provides for a .. prohibits siting of hazardous wastes land fills within a mile and a half of a nonmunicipal, non home rule municipality without the permission of that municipality. This provision is necessary to give non home rule municipalities the flexibility currently enjoyed by home rule units under existing Illinois law. In addition this Bill would prohibit the siting of hazardous waste land fills over a fault zone, over an abandoned coal mine, near..within 1,000 feet of a public or private water supply currently in use. This Bill would also call for public hearings in the county where proposed EPA land fill is to be sited. In addition, this Bill calls for a fee of \$2.02 per cubic yard, or one cent per gallon to be charged to the operator of hazardous waste land fill. This fee is to be put into a contingency fund, an emergency fund if you will, not to exceed 25 million dollars for the purposes of a clean up if such a thing should occur or for any emergency situation. And since the disposal of nuclear waste.. of hazardous waste, since the disposal of hazardous waste by burying it is the least acceptable method of disposing of hazardous waste, this Bill provides that the EPA be satisfied that under current economic conditions and taking into account the technology, that we insure that hazardous waste cannot be recycled or incinerated before it is buried. This Bill passed the Senate. It is a bi-partisan effort. It passed out of Com-



mittee 13 to nothing.. 13 to zero and I would ask for your favorable support. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Hannig, I believe there's a mistake in Amendment #4, lines 17 .. 12 to 17. Staff has pointed it out to me. It has to do with the home rule or non home rule provision. If you could take it out of the record, for a moment, we'd like to talk to you about it."

Hannig: "Is that Amendment #4?"

Meyer: "Four."

Hannig: "I believed we've tabled Amendment #4. Is that not correct?"

Meyer: "It's in Amendment #1 and in.. relates.. No, it's in Amendment #1."

Hannig: "This is applicable to non home rule units. Is that not.."

Meyer: "If you take it out for a second, my staff person will come over and talk to you about it."

Hannig: "Could we take this out of the record, for a second please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor."

We're going to back up now and pick up Senate Bill 590. There was a problem with that. I understand it's been ironed out. And so would the Clerk read Senate Bill 590?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 590, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 590 as indicated is the Dangerous Drugs Commission annual appropriation in the amount of 16 million, 202 thousand, 564 dollars. Last year it was



14 million, 459 thousand, 700 dollars which is an increase of 1 million, 742 thousand, 864 dollars or a little bit over ten percent and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 590 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 131 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'nay', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now we're going to also back up and pick up Senate Bill 487. I understand that Representative McMaster has requested leave to take this back to Second for the purposes of Amendments. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no question about it, the Bill is back on Second Reading. Read the Bill a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Van Duyne-Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 487 as amended by inserting after the last sentence in Section 4 the following. Section 4.1 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Van Duyne on Amendment #9, Senate Bill 487."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a grant of \$500,000 to the Department of Local Government Affairs for the city of Lockport who have formed a *troika* up there in the township in Lockport Township in Lockport city in Lockport Park District have taken over central school grounds and the buildings and are now fixing it up so it'll be their townhall and etc. Now they're putting in the best they can possibly do. The Lockport Township is putting \$270,000 into this. Lockport Park District is putting 230 and the city of Lockport is putting 210 thousand, out a total of 1.2 million dollars to renovate this beautiful old school buildings and the ground. So I would ask for a favorable vote."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am opposed to this Amendment, but let me explain something. Yesterday when this Bill was moved to Third Reading I made a promise to Wyvetter Younger that I would bring the Bill back from Third to Second so that she could correct an Amendment that she had that was not proper in order to give her an opportunity to present that Amendment. Since that time there have been 3 other Amendments including Amendment #9 by Representative Van Duyne, that were prepared for this Bill. I am not in support of these Amendments, not am I in support of Wyvetter's Amendment. But nevertheless, I'm a man of my word and when I told her I would bring it back, I would. This is a departmental appropriation. I do not want to see a Christmas tree made out of it. There are other Bills that can be used for that purpose. And I certainly feel that it's unfortunate that Representative Van Duyne is trying to amend this Bill, the departmental appropriation, and I would hope that the Amendment can be defeated."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield for two questions?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Representative Van Duyne, you.. how do you feel that the Department of Local Government Affairs is the proper place to put this? Shouldn't it be in CDB?"

Van Duyne: "Well Ted, as you know, the CDB budget is gone and there really is no vehicle. But truly though in the sense of government.. state government participation with the local governments you know we stood up here many times. In fact, two years ago I carried the Department of Local Government Affairs Budget and stood up here in my seat and..Oh, I should say on the floor in front of my seat and told about all the good things that the Department of



Local Government Affairs does in concert with smaller governments. Now, this, if I can just address a little bit further, is government as I spoke before a ~~troika~~ but really it's a four part system. You have the state government and all three departments of your local government trying to participate and is doing something for small towns such as Lockport. This has been sorely needed for many, many years and I, you know, in short answer the Capital Development budget is already gone."

Leverenz: "Would this appropriate all the money or is there any local monies to half a million dollars to repair a school and why would you be giving it to part township, part the Park District and part the city of Lockport?"

Van Duyne: "Well, actually the vehicle would be the city. You would be making the grant to the city and they would add this 500 thousand dollars to already raised 700 thousand dollars by the 3 entities of government, the Park District, and the city and the township."

Leverenz: "Wouldn't it go to the School Board instead of the city?"

Van Duyne: "No. They already own the property."

Leverenz: "Thank you. That's very confusing."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McCourt. Declines. Representative Van Duyne, you wish to close?"

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've already closed. I think. I just want to try to emphasise that this is a small town and all 3 governments have entered into this troika in the spirit of good government and to try to do something for their township, their Park District and their city and I think we can all identify with that and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. And Harry, you're supposed to help out."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 be adopted to Senate Bill 487?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'no's have it. The



Amendment lost. You desire a Roll Call. Okay. All those in favor of Amendment #9 vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "At the request of the Sponsor of this Amendment I certainly would arise and support this. This is \$500,000 well spent for .. to renovate a building which the city of Lockport which is right smack in the middle of the 42nd District bought a few years ago to abcon-demnation and rather lengthy court proceeding, and I would certainly urge all kinds of support for this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 50 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'no', and the Amendment lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Braun, amends Senate Bill 287 as amended by inserting after the last line, in Section 2 the following; Section 2.1 and so forth. Senate Bill 487."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendments 10 and 11 relate directly to the park district scandal which many of you have read about. However, in light of the Spansor's objections to Amendments on this agency Bill and in light of the fact that it might be more appropriate to put it elsewhere, I have been convinced that it is now appropriate to withdraw these Amendments from House Bill... Senate Bill 487." "I ask leave to withdraw the Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady wishes to withdraw the Amendment. The Amendment's withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, Braun, amends Senate Bill 487 as amended..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."

Braun: "Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to withdraw Amendment #11 from Senate Bill 487."



Speaker Flinn: "The Sponsor.. the Lady from Cook wishes to withdraw Amendment #11. The Amendment is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Younge, amends Senate Bill 487 by inserting after the last sentence and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge, on Amendment #12."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #12 would provide to the Department of Local Government Affairs one million dollars that would be used as matching money for federal urban Park Recovery Act funds. The Congress of the United States has passed the Federal Urban Park Recovery Act making available to the State of Illinois nine million dollars for the renovation and the renewal of urban parks. There are 13 cities in the state of Illinois that are entitled to those funds. And I'd like to read those cities off to you. They are the city of Chicago, Cicero, Cook County, Danville, East St. Louis, Evanston, Kankakee, North Chicago, Oak Park, Quincy, Rantoul Village, St. Clair County and Urbana. These 13 cities and counties have been deemed eligible under the law for matching grants. If the state participates in this program it would mean that 85% of the urban parks recovery money would come from the federal government and only 15% would be a local match. Most of the municipalities that have been mentioned of the 13 that are eligible do not have the local match and that is why the deterioration in the park buildings and the park programs has occurred. These areas are located in the areas that have the highest poverty, have the highest crime rate, and rather than spending money on new prisons, we should spend money on renovating our urban parks and putting personnel out there so that there can be recreation for teenage and minor children. I urge you to make it possible for the needed federal funds to come into this



state and by providing a way for the state to assist these 13 municipalities to be eligible for these Urban Park Recovery Acts. And I move for the passage of this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, let me say, I must oppose this Amendment. I told Representative Younge in the first place that I would... I even pointed out her.. to her some errors in her first Amendment to help her. Let me say that this appropriation for the Department of Local Government Affairs has been worked out and is in complete agreement with the other side of the aisle in Committee, with the Department. We have worked together all the way along. As far as this departmental appropriation is concerned I do not think that this Amendment .. this amount of money belongs in this departmental Bill. I would suggest that it be offered in some other piece of legislation if it is the desire of Representative Younge. But I do not think that the Department of Local Government Affairs appropriation is the place to have this Amendment put on and I will have to resist the Amendment."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, the reason..."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute. You're not recognized. Turn her off. Representative Wolf. J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an identical Amendment to one which was technically incorrect yesterday and one which was technically incorrect when offered in the Appropriations I Committee. I believe there may still be some deficiency in this. First of all there's no provision in here as to how they're going to distribute it. Who is going to receive this money? If it's anticipated that it will go to East St. Louis then all I can say is that's a home rule unit, why hasn't this home rule unit applied for this money on its own for



these grants. It just seems to me like it's another million dollars. I have to compliment the Lady. She's always having a lot of Amendments for a million, a million and a half or two which seems to be a general rule of thumb, but I think we should defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. It's too bad that the Amendment was not prepared in time to be offered appropriately through the Appropriations Committee, but we all know that in the final days of the Legislative Session a number of things turn up that still need to be addressed. I think this is far different than the other types of Amendments that were offered on this piece of legislation. This indeed is to capture federal monies so that we can assist the areas that have a special need for urban development that where they can utilize this money to capture an 85% federal grant. I think it would be well spent on the part of the State of Illinois to be able to capture that federal money. We all know that construction dollars that are utilized in Illinois are good for the economy of our state. I thought it was the purpose of this administration to try to capture as much of the federal dollars as possible because that can be an advantage to our state. And I urge your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Any.. No further discussion. The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge, to close."

Younge: "Right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The director of the Department of Local Government Affairs helped me to redraft this Amendment so it would be applicable to the 13 cities and counties in Illinois that are eligible for the funds. The reason why the funds are asked for of course, is that most of the places that are eligible for



the grant of the 13 like Danville, like Kankakee, like Oak Park, like Quincy, like Rantoul Village, do not have the 15% local match and this will bring in 85% federal funds under the Urban Park Recovery Act which has as its purpose rehabilitating the businesses... the buildings and the programs in these urban parks. These are the same areas where the high crime areas are and to have viable urban parks in that areas would.. in those areas would create a quality environment and I ask your and urge your support for this measure."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 be adopted to Senate Bill 487?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Van Duynes to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Van Duynes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to answer one of the previous speakers when he said he didn't think that this was any place for these Amendments to be on the Department of Local Government Affairs budget. Now, I don't know. I've only been here five years and I've got a lot to learn, but I've heard a lot of people get up on this floor and say that that's the justification for the Department of Local Government Affairs. They say that they have always tried to do all these great things for local governments, when local governments have been trying to help themselves and my Amendment was just defeated which was a terrific effort on the part of local government... local governments to help themselves and I don't think there's a thing wrong with trying to put Amendments on this type of thing and if they don't want these Amendments, why do they go around telling everybody how good they are and what great efforts they make for local government affairs. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Younge to explain her vote. One minute. The timer's on."



Young: "The grant opportunity under this federal program is an excellent example of why the State of Illinois does not get more federal funds to correct its problems. The Congress has made an effort to help urban parks, where the urban parks are located, the municipalities don't have the local match, don't have a local match, therefore can't buy the supplies, can't buy the equipment, can't hire the personnel, and cannot correct the problem. This Amendment gives the General Assembly an opportunity to help units of local government that have serious recreational program problems by bringing into the state the federal funds that have been appropriated. We are of a state that are number 5 from the top in the amount of money that we pay into the federal tax system and we are number 5 from the bottom from the amount of money that..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently something I said earlier has been re-referred to but I understand this Amendment was already put on in the House in the Department of Conservation's budget. It is there already and it has... the Bill has passed out of the House, so we already have this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill has not passed the House at this amount. There was an Amendment placed on another Bill for \$500,000. This particular Amendment asks for one million dollars. You have to realize that there are matching money that is available for this type of legislation, up to 85% to develop those parks in what is so badly needed. This is



for all over the state, not just for East St. Louis. We need it there in Cook County. You've got five million people in that area. We don't have any urban parks there. I suggest that this is a good Amendment. You ought to support it."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 voting 'aye', and 79 voting 'no'. And the Amendment lost. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Woodyard's light is voted 'present'. He's not here today and hasn't been. Nobody pushed the button. It's broken. But he's not here and I wanted to"

Speaker Flinn: "We'll try... I'll ask the Clerk's Office to ignore that. Thank you. Further Amendments? Representative Taylor? Oh, Representative Younge, you wish to.. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Flinn: "There's a request to poll the absentees. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "If she polls the absentees, I'll be forced to verify."

Speaker Flinn: "You wish the absentees polled.."

McMaster: "She's already moved the Bill. You've declared the Amendment lost."

Speaker Flinn: "I think that's right. I'm sorry, Mrs. Younge. I... You should.. Your request is not very timely. Your light was not on. I checked to see and you did not have your light on. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Since there were no Amendments adopted, we'll move this back to Third Reading. If the Sponsor wants to have it heard now, we'll have it heard now. Third Reading. Is that... Representative McMaster, you want it read a third time? Read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 487, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Local Government Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sorry we had to go through this exercise that we've just been and take up your time. This is the annual appropriation for the Department of Local Government Affairs. It is in the amount of 202 million, 823.9 thousand and represents a 6% increase over last year. You all know what this department has done. This increase over last year's appropriation it within the guidelines and approved by the Democrats side of the aisle. We are going along with all of you people in an attempt to maintain the Department of Local Government Affairs as a viable department. I would urge a 'yes' vote on this departmental appropriation."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 487 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The next Bill will be 864. We're going to back up and get Representative Lechowicz's Bill. 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 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 864. The next one will be 362."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 864, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 864 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Secretary of State for fiscal 1980. The



appropriation request is at the total of 117 million, 686 dollars.. four and twenty... Let me repeat that. 117 million, 686 thousand, 424 dollars. This is approximately 1.6 million dollars less or 1.31% less than the total appropriation for fiscal 1979. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, and as a good friend of Alan Dixon, I never said a word about this Bill in the Appropriations Committee, but I want to say here and now and I was waiting to say it here and now, there's all kinds of vacancies in that Secretary of State's Office and we all know that because he's running for the U.S. Senator he wants to make that impression to the public that he is saving all kinds of money by this appropriation. Well, he's not fooling me. We have all kinds of vacancies. I just had a regional superintendent in my Lake-McHenry County area and they have not even informed me that there's a vacancy and I say, as a citizen first, as a Legislator second, as a County Chairman third, he'd better get off his duff."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Lechowicz, you wish to close."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that this is 1.31% less than the fiscal appropriation for fiscal '79. I'll be more than happy to go through the General Revenue fund. It's at 49 million, 863 thousand, 642 dollars. The road fund is at 58 million, 814 thousand, 983 dollars or 4.28% less than last year. Capital development bond fund at 3 million, total state funds, 111 million, 678 thousand, 625 dollars. Federal funds in the amount of 6 million, 7 thousand, 800 dollars. I believe that the Bill as it's presented to the Members of the General Assembly is less than last



year. Let's have your support."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 864 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 139 voting 'aye', and 8 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 362 there was a fiscal note request and it has been withdrawn and that makes it eligible for Third Reading and the Sponsor now requests to move on with it. Senate Bill 362? Yes, Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you arise?"

Borchers: "There's no use rising now. I wanted to make a comment on the last Bill. But it's now passed."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'm sorry, Representative Borchers. I'm blind in that eye. You know I can only see on the Democrat side. That's about all I can do, see. Senate Bill 362. Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ebbesen: "Well, I withdrew that request for a fiscal note and you're moving it to Third. Is that it?"

Speaker Flinn: "It is on Third Reading. We can move it to Third now."

Ebbesen: "But you can move it from Second to Third, but you are not going to hear it. It's been amended."

Speaker Flinn: "I.. Alright. Third Reading for Senate Bill 362."

Ebbesen: "That's right."

Speaker Flinn: "That satisfies the legal requirements, right? Read the Bill."

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

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker.. Mr. Speaker.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 362, a Bill for an Act to amend the downstate teachers' retirement system Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, to alay hopefully Representative Ebbesen's fears. We can't hear this on Third Reading today unless we suspend the rules. I'm not intending to do that. I'm going to leave it there till tomorrow at least."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. I misunderstood. There was a request to go ahead and hear that Bill because the objections had been removed...the request for fiscal note rather. Alright. It's on Third Reading. Now Representative Johnson was off the floor when I called Senate Bill 542. So read the Bill 542."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 542, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "This is the ordinary and contingent expense of the ISSC, a total of 95 million, 686 thousand, 300 dollars. This represents a 2 million dollar decrease over the last fiscal year. And I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 542 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 126..7 voting 'aye', and 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now we're back in the regular order. 687. Representative McBroom, is he back there? Out of the record. Senate Bill 756, Representative Cullerton, you're on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 756, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act requiring compensation for causing death by wrongful act, neglect or default. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to bring this
back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked leave to move the
Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment.
Any objections? Hearing no objections, the Bill is on
Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Cullerton, amends Senate
Bill 756, on page one by inserting after line..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. This Amendment assures that in a wrongful
death action that one cannot be brought on behalf of
an aborted fetus when the abortion was lawful and when
it was lawfully performed by a doctor. It also protects
the doctor who may have caused a fetal death when he
had no reason to know the woman was pregnant. This
Amendment is supported by the Illinois Medical Society.
It's also been approved by various right to life groups
as well as the American Civil Liberties Union. I would
ask for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question
is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted to Senate Bill 756?'
All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed. The
'aye's have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 760. Out of
the record. You're on Third Reading, Representative
Cullerton, and you amended the Bill and therefore we
cannot hear it today. You're back on Third Reading with
the amended Bill. The rules provide that if we amend
the Bill, that it cannot be heard on Third till the
next day. Alright. We're going to go to page two on
the regular Calendar and there were a number of Members
off the floor this morning. On Third Reading, Short



Debate. Senate Bill 565."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Is Representative Marovitz on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 617. Representative Cullerton, you're on deck. 617. Out of the record? Take it out of the record. Representative Bower. I don't see him out there. Oh. 628 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Looks like I made a bad decision here. We'll try a couple more. 651, Representative Lechowicz. Out of the record. Let's get back on the Priority Calendar. I.. Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you're still on the Short Debate Calendar, if I'm assured that Representative Schlickman is gone, maybe I should.. maybe I should try again on this House... Senate Bill 263."

Speaker Flinn: "I'd rather get back on the Priority of Call. We're not doing any good where I went. It turned out to be a mistake. Representative Barbara Flinn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I thought since we seemed to be in a pause, I'd make an announcement. The announcement is to remind everybody that we are scheduled according to Mr. Speaker to be in Session on Sunday, which means that.. I didn't expect to get booed for making... The announcement is that the Mr. Wonderful Contest and party sponsored by the women Legislators is still on, 7:30 to 10:00 o'clock at the State House Inn, Sunday evening. Tickets are still available but today is the last day, Gentlemen of the House, that you can enlist yourself as a participant, as a contestor for the title of Mr. Wonderful. I hopw we'll have more of you joining the contest and I'll hope that you'll all come to the



party. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one of those who foolishly committed himself to participate in that, I might as well tell you that if we're here both Saturday and Sunday, I'm not going to participate and I ask all other Members to join with me in that. If they call us... The reason I say that I was on the podium and I think we're going through the fifth time that we are going through the Calendar of House Bills.. Senate Bills on Third and Short Debate. Now if we come back.. leave tomorrow and come back Sunday, I'll participate. But I'll be damned if I think we ought to stay here on the weekend to accommodate those who have taken their Bills out of the record, five times just to participate in social activities."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich. Give the Gentleman order."

Friedrich: "Well, I'd like to inquire. I have Representative Winchester entered in two categories and I'd like to know how he's running."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright. We're back on Priority of Call. Senate Bill 775. Representative.. Representative Polk."

Polk: "And this is in all sincerity. Sir. There have been quite a few people come by and ask exactly what our schedule is in relation to motel accommodations and I really believe that the Speaker has the responsibility to share with us, Mr. Madigan, whoever is going to make the decision, but if they would share with us so we could at least let our families know whether we are going to be here or not, it'd be appreciated this afternoon."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, let me say this. Don't cancel for tonight."

Polk: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "And tomorrow we'll try to see how we've done



and by that time we'll let you know where we stand.

But if we don't do better than we did today, keep it for the weekend. Senate Bill 775.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 775..."

Speaker Flinn: "Wait a minute, Clerk. Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to announce some support for Mr. Matijevich's position and say that the policy of advancing Bills to Third Reading and then just granting leave to bring them back for the purpose of Amendment, takes the Membership by surprise and it does a lot of injustice to the parliamentary system. And I think we would be better off if Bills go to Third Reading just let them stay there. In other words, period, because the process of just continually bringing them back does nothing but put them in the line ahead of everybody else's Bills and when Sponsors constantly take the Bills out of the record, over and over and over again, all we do is run down and look for the Sponsors, look for the people with Amendments, and look for private deals. Everybody talks about the Sponsor's Bill, my Bill until it comes time for it to become law. But when it gets to be law, it's my law. And I object to that. So in other words, I wish we would follow the process of them saying this is either our Bill and we're going to do what we want to by the will of the House, or let it be your law when it comes into existence. And so I would like to express the objection to bringing all these Bills back constantly for another private deal and private Amendment. Because we are dividing ourselves between those who do and those who are done onto and after while since we can't get a great convention of all the faithful to understand the gospel, or maybe we should have a... as they say, all of Gaul is divided into 3 parts, the do'ers, the do'ees, and those who follow



the gospel. But I think perhaps the do'ees, perhaps ought to have a conference and decide what we want to do."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Ewell, let me remind you and Representative Matijevich and anybody else within the sound of my voice that each time we move a Bill back from Third to Second we ask leave of the House and only one Member can get up and object and it will not be moved back. Now, we have, to my knowledge, we have not moved any Bills back without leave of the House. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 775, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This is a reasonably simple Bill. It requires that school districts with populations less than 500 thousand will be required to keep their voter affidavits for a period of one year. Today the School Code does not speak to that and what this Bill would do, it would require them simply to keep their voter affidavits that are used in voting in a School Board election for a period of one year. It passed out of the Education Committee by a vote of 18 to nothing. And I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman. I'm sorry, DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions. Number one..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hoffman: "Number one; the year time frame, is this a common time . frame for other election districts?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stanley please."

Stanley: "Yeah, can you repeat that question please?"



Hoffman: "Well, in other words you say they hold the affidavits for a year. Is this a common time frame for holding affidavits on the part of counties, or cities or..."

Stanley: "Okay. Counties I understand are required to keep the affidavits for 3 years, Gene, so this is, you know. The code doesn't speak to that now and they can throw those affidavits away as quickly as..."

Hoffman: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, to close."

Stanley: "Thank you very much. And I'd request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 775 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 137 'aye', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 883."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 883. A Bill for an Act to create the Problem Pregnancy Health Service and Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones."

Jones: "883 and 884 are companion Bills and it leave to have heard at the same time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has leave to have Senate Bill 884 heard as a companion Bill. Any objections? Hearing none, Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 884. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones on Senate Bill 883 and 884."

Jones: "Yes sirs Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 883 creates a Problem Pregnancy Health Service and Care Act which grants the Department of Public Health. Now on the synopsis it says that the Department of Children and Family Service but that's been amended to the Public Health Department. The authority to administer and make grants to aid community service primarily concerned with the unwanted pregnancies of, and their prevention. The Bill seeks to establish a better range of comprehensive care for problem and unwanted pregnancies or their prevention. It is felt that current types of care are scattered within the various agencies and women with problems or unwanted pregnancies are shifted from service without getting the necessary care. The Bill authorizes the Department of Public Health to make and give grants to non-profit agencies and organizations that coordinate necessary services provide they do not refer their counsel for abortion. The Bills seeks some guidelines for determining the amount of a grant and requires that certain information be given when applying for a grant. This is a Senate Bill sponsored



by Senator Davidson and Senator Rock and I would appreciate your green vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out to the Membership that I think I'm going to support this Bill. It's sort of sad to me that what started out as a really excellent Bill in the Senate has been watered down, almost gutted from its original intention. I don't know why Senator Davidson submitted the amendments he did in the Senate to delete the word ~~unwanted~~ as far as unwanted pregnancies. I gather we are never to acknowledge from now on that any pregnancy is unwanted. We not only have problem pregnancies which really is a medical term, originally, but we know what we're talking about. But with the way the Bill has been changed, I will tell you this; the agencies that will get the money to take care of women who have a problem pregnancy, i.e. unwanted pregnancy will be those agencies that cannot talk about abortion that's fine with me. But it limits them to very few indeed. It limits them to a religious affiliated by and large the Catholic Church and Catholic people who are starting these agencies, these clinics up, the social counseling groups and that's OK because they do do a lot of good, but don't pin your hopes on reaching millions of young women or thousands or even very many hundreds. I know of a couple that have opened up in the suburbs and they're doing good jobs. They certainly can use the money. But they're not going to... the women of the city of Chicago, unless the church sets up more, are really not going to be helped by this. I think you ought to know that the money will be going to religiously affiliated sinners of one kind or another and those that are non-sectarian won't be getting any of this money by the very nature of the Bill and if, you know, that's OK with you fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."



Greiman: "I... I served on the Committee that heard this Bill and it had the prohibition as far as abortion was concerned and none the less I voted for the Bill. Voted to get it out of... out of our Committee because it struck me that if, if I put my own philosophy ahead of care for people who are in crisis, of people who are in problems then I would be no more sensitive, I would be as cruel as some of the, some of the extreme people who are on the other side and that I could not, in good conscience, say to myself that I would turn my back on the young women who have these problems. But I'm concerned with what I've seen happen to this Bill which, as Representative Willer pointed out, was a very exemplary and a very significant Bill. The amendment that we put on, that we could not get off, I should say, given by the gentleman from East Hazel Crest that says, that says that all of these terrible problems are to be ignored if any word of this is held unconstitutional. That was so disturbing. Such a cruel thing to say that we turn our backs on them if, if we, we do anything that would indicate that maybe there's a word of unconstitutionality, but I think we should know just statistically the kind of problem that we have in this case. There were 177,000 births last year in Illinois. 30,000 of those births were by teenage mothers. 16, 17,000 were illegitimate children. That gives you some idea of the scope of the problem. There were, I have the breakdown by counties. County by county it's a very significant problem and yet we tend to trivialize it, we turn it within ourselves and we allow our program which good... was good in its inception to be totally destroyed. I guess I'll listen to the debate and decide what I'll do. I'm not really sure, but I think this is the kind of Bill that should disturb a lot of people no matter which side of the aisle, which side of this issue they're on. It's just disturbing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones



to close. Your light was on and then went off ma'am.

Mr. Jones to close."

Jones: "This Bill attempts to cut across the red tape caused by a lack of cooperation, unnecessary services other than abortion and that's the purpose of the Bill and I think it's well thought out and it fills in the gap that is not covered by present services and I move the passage of 883 and 884."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House pass Senate Bill 883 and 884? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did, did have my light on. I don't know who turned it off, but I wanted to ask a question before I cast my vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed ma'am."

Dyer: "I wonder if the sponsor could answer this question if ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sure he will."

Dyer: "With the amendment that we adopted last night, could you name at least three kinds of organizations that will still be eligible to receive these grants?"

Jones: "There was only one amendment that was adopted. That was the amendment #5 by Mr. Deuster and it says, 'by inserting after the word need, however no person shall under the authority of this Act dispense oral concept... contraceptives or other birth control devices or medication'. That's the only... There's a House amendment on the severability clause, I mean the Committee amendment and this amendment's all in the past."

Dyer: "But what organizations will be eligible then to except..."

Jones: "That will be decided by the Department of Public Health."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a cruel hoax to perpetrate on women at the most vulnerable



time in their lives. We're pretending to take an action that is going to be helpful to pregnant women who need our help, but actually, in the shape that this Bill is right now it is likely that if the Bill is signed that very few and possibly no women in this state will be eligible to receive help. Even though there are thousands in this state who need it. Thousands of young women, particularly often unmarried, often under the age of 15 who will not be able to finish their education without help. Who's babies are more likely?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 ayes, 19 nays, 16 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed... these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 918."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 918, a Bill for an Act to amend the Forest Products Transportation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey. There's been a request for the T.V. camera lights to be turned on. Hearing no objection, the T.V. camera lights will be on. Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I request 918 and 939 be taken out of the record. We have some Amendments to work out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "918 and 939, Mr. Mulcahey? Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 942, Mr. Vinson. Mr. Vinson in the chamber. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. You're right, John. Senate Bill 983, Mr. Pierce. Mr. Pierce. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1146, Mr. Steczo. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1150. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the



Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there's an Amendment offered. If they're not going to offer it, I'll proceed with the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any Amendments filed with this Bill? You want to bring it back from Third to Second for the purposes of Amendment."

Dawson: "I want to find out if they're still going to follow through with it. Otherwise, I'm going to go. Call their attention to it, Mr. Speaker, maybe we can get going."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe that Mrs. Alexander's Amendment. Does the Lady proceed to adopt the Amendment?"

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this Bill back...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, first... alright. One moment ma'am. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's back on ...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, it's hard. I promised the objection. I'm making it. I object to bringing the Bill back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised."

Dawson: "Okay, then let's proceed with the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes the following changes to the recovery provisions of the Minimum Wage Law of the state. First it gives an employee 3 years to recover any underpayments. Number 2; it permits an employee to recover civil damages equal to the amount of under-



payment. 3, it authorizes the Director of the Department of Labor to supervise repayment schedule and to initiate legal action to the amount of the underpayment. Number 4, it requires the Attorney General to prosecute any action requested by the Director and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1150 raises the Illinois minimum wage for adults from 2.30 per hour to 2.90 an hour immediately and to 3.10 an hour on January 1, 1980 and to 3.35 on January 1, 1981, which would make the same as the federal minimum wage. The minimum wage for persons under 18 years of age will be raised from 1.95 to 2.50 immediately and 2.65 on January 1, 1980, 2.85 on January 1, 1981. With Amendment 1 the special 1.95 per hour exclusion for student employees, the motion pictures theatres has been removed and also the 50% set aside for employees who regularly earn gratuities is being phased down to 40% by January 1, 1980. It should also be noted that the effective date of this Act would be October 1, 1979."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 1150. I rise in opposition to it reluctantly because I do know that there are people that are in need of minimum wages. But the people that we are trying to help are probably the ones that we hurt the most. In addition to increasing the minimum wage to bring it up to the levels which the respected Gentleman from the County of Cook indicated it has provisions that would require an increase in the state minimum wage for adults over 18 years of age who are not full time students to be in line with the federal minimum wage and for children under 18 increases to \$2.85 an hour by January 1, 1981. And very frankly, that this is, in my opinion, trying to hurt the small employer."



It's going to hurt those individuals that very frankly are the ones that are marginal employees.. the people that are probably the last hired and the first fired. There's no question about it that people do need additional income but the thing of it is I think that we also look.. that we must look at the economy of our state. The decrease in this allowance would hurt the small business person who must pay state minimum wage and will have to pay a compensation increase that would be a large percentage of the smaller pay roll. It may cut down on confusion between the federal and state minimum wage, the provisions that were made that were identical. But frankly, this is going to hurt the small employer in the State of Illinois and this is one more nail in the economic coffin of the small businessman, the small employer in the State of Illinois. We are hurting the people that we ...that most of us are trying to help. You're going to eliminate the marginal employee, the employee that is in a marginal position, that is there because of the convenience of the situation and if it goes up to the federal standards, that employee is going to be replaced by the mechanical mechanization that does take place. So if you want to drive people out of positions, increase the unemployment rolls in the State of Illinois, and increase the type of inflationary tactics that have been the product of the Illinois Legislature for the past few years, then I would suggest that in order to preserve the integrity of the free enterprise system, that we not pass 11... Senate Bill 1150. And for these reasons I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones."

Jones: "Will the Sponsor respond to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson. He indicates he'll yield."



Jones: "The question is; Is this in concert with the federal Wage and Hour Act that has a provision for students to be employed at 85% of the scale?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you repeat the question?"

Jones: "Is this state Bill in concert with the federal Wage and Hour Act which provides for students, whatever the age, be employed for 20 hours during the school year and 40 hours in the summertime at 85% of the scale?"

Dawson: "It is very similar, but it is not identical."

Jones: "Well that would create large confusion for most employers because they'd be working under two different sets of rules, one by the federal Department of Labor and one by the state Department of Labor and I would recommend that it be in concert with the federal Act, then there would be no opposition to it."

Dawson: "In Illinois a student under 18 is paid bascially by the 85% law."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just I believe it was yesterday we considered a Bill which was designed to off-set the shameful unemployment for the young people, those people between the ages of say 16 and 21 and it was to provide a subsidy from the state in order to make these people employable so that the employer could have the minimum wage off-set by the ... from the amount they were really worth to the employer and the amount that they had to be paid. I suggested at that time that this House had previously with House Bill 2741 and others made a decision that we would favor unemployment and we should therefore oppose the program to try to lessen unemployment because we had made a policy decision to encourage unemployment. Now, this Bill, Senate Bill 1150, is fully considerate with our previous decisions where we encourage unemployment for this class of people, that is the young



people of this state of Illinois. I notice with interest for example that Amendment #1 eliminates the exception for full time students to be employed in motion picture theatres. Thus, as I understand it, the students would have to be paid the minimum wage now if they're going to be employed in the motion picture theatre. Well I can remember when I was young we used to have... we'd go to a motion picture theatre. There would be about four or five, six or seven employees depending how big the theatre was. You had ushers, you had ticket takers and you had the people behind the candy counters. Now I would suggest to you that that Amendment isn't going to make any impact at all because if you go to a movie... motion picture theatre now, usually there's one person employed in addition to the person who runs the projector and that person sells the tickets, takes the tickets, and dishes out the popcorn. So there really aren't any jobs at the minimum wage or below the minimum wage because we have just priced this type of work out of existence. Now the same people who are going to be voting for this Bill and voting to put young people out of work are going to get up and cry and scream about how 50% of the young people in their district don't have employment. Well the reason they don't have employment is because there are no jobs at the minimum wage at which anybody is willing to employ these people. There are a lot of jobs. There are a lot of things that could be done in this state, in the employment of young people to do a lot of different, useful work if we didn't have this Bill. I just ask you to consider for yourself are the young people better off unemployed or are they better off employed at a slightly lesser amount of money than the state's mandated minimum wage. This is an .. absolutely insane Bill unless you're in favor of unemployment. And so many people in this House have



said that unemployment is terrible, but you seem to be for it cause you vote for goofy Bills like this one." Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine." Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, if I could I would like to bring to your attention some numbers that the Sponsor of the Bill mentioned that are worthy of attention. Effective immediately upon passage of this Bill the minimum wage for our youths would go from \$1.95 to \$2.50 an hour. \$1.95 to 2.50, that's a 55¢ increase immediately. You're raising the minimum wage for these young folks better than 25%. Now in a lot of companies the cost of wage is your principle cost. If you have margin employees, if you have marginal jobs and all of sudden you boost the cost of that 25%, what are you doing? You're going to drive these, either the jobs out of existence or remove any possibility of those jobs coming into effect. I suggest to you that people in the.. who represent areas in this state who have high youthful unemployment should look upon this as something that's only going to exacerbate that problem. Secondly and lastly, I will simply bring to your attention two other numbers, that being that from 1976 to today if we pass this law, the minimum wage will have been increased 80%. That is 80% from 1976 to this year. Now admittedly we've had inflation, but it has not been at that rate. I suggest we vote against this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's always odd about how people are worried about unemployment especially in the areas where exploitation could take place. I suggest very simply that we ought to put our priorities in order and talk about what we're going to do for people who can't help themselves. The alternative to a minimum wage and a decent employment, the alterna-



tive is welfare. And it seems almost.. almost impossible to deliberate with people who in one breath say that we shouldn't have a decent minimum wage and have a decent employment picture and decent job protection and decent job opportunity and those same people get up on the floor of the House and berate and do everything in their power to defeat welfare programs and the payment to those who need assistance. Now you can't have it both ways. There's no such thing as a free lunch. You are either going to have a high welfare state, or you are going to provide decent working conditions at a decent minimum wage for the people who work in Illinois. You can't have it both ways. Long before I was born decisions that were made were found in error. Long before I was born there was exploitation in a work place, sweat shops, child labor, and all the other kinds of ills in our society that were corrected. Having a state minimum wage meet in 1979, meet the expectations of what people need to purchase goods from the business community is the very least we could do as a considerate General Assembly. I suggest very strongly that when you vote on this issue you consider that those of you who easily take your \$25,000 salary and say that even that don't meet today's high inflationary prices ought to consider what it's like to make \$2.30 an hour in today's society. You ought to consider what it's like to have to go hungry and not be able to buy that pork chop or that steak and still be working. We're not talking about dole. We're not talking about a handout. And we're not just talking about children. We're talking about in this Bill coverage of working people willing to go to work who need some help. Now these people don't belong to a union. They don't have contracts to provide them decent wages and decent working conditions. Generally these people are the poorest of



the poor. But they're proud enough to go to work. They're proud enough to try and believe in the American's dream that says that every man and every woman has a right to live in dignity. Now if you deny to those people the very minimum, the very minimum on the floor and wages of what we call a minimum wage, you're turning your back on people who have very little hope in our society now. I ask in their behalf that you consider to have a little charity, to consider what you earn and what your children earn and what your wife earns at home or what your husband earns at home in comparison to \$2.30 an hour and how far it goes. Try and buy a cup of coffee today. Try to buy bacon and eggs and earn \$2.30 an hour. Be reasonable. We're not asking for the moon. We're not asking for something that most workers in Illinois are already protected under the federal Act. We just want some equity for those few employees that do not have a floor on wages based solely because they don't come under the federal provisions of the Act. I plead with you in their behalf because they can't afford to have a lobbyist here at a high fat salary representing them and asking for their support. In the name of charity I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

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

Dawson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am not that fortunate to come from a district that doesn't have to worry about the working men and women. I'd be willing to say that about 95% of the people of my district work in industry and factories and every penny that they can get I believe they deserve. I would also like to say that this pertains basically more to the women than to the men because there are so many women who are not paid the right amount due them and I'd hope to



see the women on this issue vote for this here even though we are not able to bring it back for their Amendment and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1150 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I'll try to keep my remarks within one minute. I don't want to be turned off again. I hope.. I hope that the Sponsor of the Bill will put this on Postponed Consideration and that Mr. Ewell will relent and we could bring this back to put the Amendment on this Bill that really belongs on it and that's an Amendment that applies to minimum wage for domestic workers. This is part of the Bill and I reluctantly vote 'present' on this Bill until we can put it in the proper shape."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, in regards to me bringing it back, I think we've played around with this Bill long enough here and I would continue to go with this Bill and if it has to go down, let it go down and see what they can do with it then."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we passed a Bill out of this House, House Bill 2741, which include the household workers. I know that Representative Dawson fully intended to take this Bill back to Second Reading to include the household workers and I would hope that he would continue to be willing to do that and I, too, reluctantly vote 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have.. I think I'm missing



something here. I think someone else is too. In fact, you know, one of my children, you know, my daughter works for minimum wage and she works for \$2.95 or \$3.00 an hour. It would seem to me that if we don't pass something like this, we're just setting up another tear system that is below the federal law that all employers have to comply with anyway. It would seem to me the smart thing to do and I think the answer to Representative Jones's question is, yes, it's basically federal law. Almost every employer with the exception of motion picture operators in family businesses with less than 5 employees pay this now. There has been no opposition to the Bill that I know of and I think that it's got to be passed because it's.. there are.. the employers are already paying it now. And many people are saying you know, are we paying right or are we paying wrong? But the federal law says the same thing so why not put enough votes up on the Board and solve the problem right off the bat? Don't have the employers in your areas coming back to you and saying...."

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wish that the Sponsor of the Bill would attempt to give consideration to concerned Members on this side of the aisle who have a legitimate concern. I don't think there's any need to rush this Bill through today. There are people that have sincere concerns on a procedural matter. The Bill was not brought back. And it certainly does not do justice to all of the people in the trade union and the labor union for this Bill to be defeated today because we did not have cooperation and I would hope that the Sponsor would reconsider and not allow this Bill to die for want of the Constitutional number of votes. The Bill is too important for that."



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

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the last speaker and to some of the concerns of those who are voting 'present', I would just like to point out that we did bring back the House Bill, attached this Amendment that some people have some concern over. The Bill then passed this chamber I think it was by a 91 votes and went over to the Senate. The Bill did not even go out of the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee because of this Amendment. The Bill over in the House.. or over in the Senate right now, I am told by the Chairman of that Committee and others, that it is in real trouble because of this Amendment. I think in all fairness to the workers and to the people that have tried hard and to the Democratic philosophy of giving workers their due, we should in fact pass this Bill out in its present form. And I would suggest more 'aye' votes and get this Bill out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand that there is a problem here in that this Bill does not have what I consider a very important protection for household workers that the Bill had that was sent over to the Senate. That has come about through no fault as I understand it of the Sponsor of this legislation. Before I was a Member of this Legislature, there was a debate here in which issues other than the merits of the case clouded the fact... clouded the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. I would hope that in this instance we would look at the merits of this case, not cloud it with things that should have been or could have been, but rather deal with this legislation in the form in which it is before us and give it



the necessary votes to pass. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm changing my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Still want a verification? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson, wants a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Capuzi. Davis. Gaines. Hallstrom. Kane. McBroom. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney. and Wikoff."

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

McCourt: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no.'"

McCourt: "My conscience says this is an 'aye' vote. Please record me according to my conscience."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McCourt as 'aye'. What's. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Taylor: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Taylor as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please change my 'present' vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Huff as 'aye'. Mr. Pouncey as 'aye'. Mrs. Alexander as 'aye'. Mr. Patrick as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White as 'aye'. Mr. Ewell as 'aye'. Jesse, you want to shut your light off? Have all voted who wish? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Alright. Kindly record Mr. Kane as 'aye'. On this question there are 95 'aye'. Wait a minute. Put Mr. Davis as 'aye'. 96 'aye', 57 'no'. This Bill,



having received the Constitutional Majority... Mr. Simms, you want a verification? Verification has been requested. He withdraws his verification? On this question.. You do not. Clerk will proceed... The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "A verification please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks for a verification. Would the Membership kindly be in your own respective seats? All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the chamber. And I believe a pair of glasses have been left on Representative Friedrich's desk. Anybody need a pair of glasses? Looks like Jake Wolf, my running mate, Leon. The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, please record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schisler as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "'Aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Kindly record Mr. Schraeder as 'aye.' What's our count now? And put Mr. Bradley on as 'aye'. Now on this question there are 99 'aye' and 56 'no'. You want to withdraw your verification? Proceed to verify the affirmative vote. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, could we have the Membership sit down?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I already asked the Membership to sit down."



Simms: "Ted, what's the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "One hundred. What's the count? Is it 99 or 100? 99. The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this question there are 99 'aye', 56 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1183. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having moved.. voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which this last Bill passed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson, moves that that motion lie on the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. The motion prevails. Senate Bill 1183."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes in St. Clair County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill (sic) 1183 as amended is a combination of easements that were introduced at the request of the Department of Transportation and passed out of this House earlier. I.. The Department has asked that they be combined so that they won't lose track of these easements and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1183 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? If Mr. Laurino is in the hearing distance of my voice would he come up to the rostrum, please? Mr. Laurino. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye', no 'nay', 10 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby



declared passed. Senate Bill 983."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 983, a Bill for an Act to enact the Emergency Conservation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was one we had the controversy on Amendment #1 late yesterday. I moved it back to Second and we reconsidered and tabled that Amendment. The Bill as it exists now is noncontroversial. It's a... It's a permissive Bill that allows the local governments to develop standards for energy conservation on a voluntary basis and to meet the federal energy policy and Conservation Act and has the Institute for Natural Resources assist them in that program and they're directed to assist in that program. They support the Bill as originally introduced as is now before you. The Bill no longer contains the controversial bonding program. It's strictly a voluntary program to assist local governments in meeting the standards of the federal energy policy and Conservation Act of 1975. The Bill was overwhelmingly approved in the Senate and the House Environment Committee was on Short Debate and so it was amended and therefore I move the passage of Senate Bill 983."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Question of the Sponsor please. What is the fiscal impact of this legislation?"

Pierce: "The Institute for Natural Resources is willing to undertake the Bill and is not.. has indicated they have the facilities now to .. to administer this Act... They're not asking for any... At least for fiscal '80 they're not asking for any additional funds to administer this Act."



Pullen: "What do you think they might be asking for next year?"

Pierce: "There's no actual money that will be spent to.. for local governments. There will be assistance given for the expertise that they feel they have within their present 1980 budget."

Pullen: "So you think that this agency can provide assistance to local governments without spending any extra money over and above what we'd already be spending on them if this Bill didn't pass."

Pierce: "Other than what they have in their 1980 budget. That's what... That is what they tell us, anyway."

Pullen: "You indicated that this Bill was permissive, that it allowed local governments to set up energy conservation standards and that sort of thing. Can't they already do that?"

Pierce: "There are things in this Bill that they can already do. What this Bill attempts to do through recommendation of Senator Nimrod and the Vice Chairman of the Energy Resources Commission is to.. is to direct the Institute for Natural Resources to assist local governments in meeting the standards of the.. of the federal energy conservation Act and the.. and the energy conservation thermal and lighting standards in that Act. Possibly it could be done without the statute but Senator Nimrod maybe wanted to help Representative Leinenweber in creating the fifth volume of the Illinois Revised Statutes. We feel it is a needed direction to the Institute. The Institute feels that it is and they're in support of the Bill."

Pullen: "I'll bet. Thank you."

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

Pierce: "Yes, I believe this Bill is now a noncontroversial measure. It was amended in the Senate by Senator Nimrod to take out the mandatory portions of it, make it per-



missive. As the Lady pointed out, that now makes it something that perhaps could be done under present law. We still feel the Bill is needed to set a direction for the Institute for Natural Resources to assist local government. It's a kind of a federal-state-local co-operation that I think is quite helpful in the energy conservation field. In my opinion, the Bill is now noncontroversial and I urge the passage of Senate Bill 983, which Senator Nimrod and I have worked on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 983?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Lee."

Unknown: "God bless Mayor Byrne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? They must have heard you. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye', 1 'nay', 9 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1217."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1217, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Laurino: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1217 as was explained yesterday is a very simple Bill. All it does is request.. require that a circulator of a petition be a registered voter of the state or a subdivision in which he is circulating the petition affecting that subdivision. I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1217 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 149 'aye', 2 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the



Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Senate Bill 1277."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1316.

Mr. Marovitz on the floor? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1316, a Bill for an Act to create a new Act prohibiting pumping gasoline from a storage tank containing excess water or sludge. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much. Yes, this is the same Bill. This is a new Act which would prohibit the pumping of gas from a storage tank that contains a level of more than 1 inch of water or sludge. This will be enforced by the Department of Agricultural who has said publicly that they've had more complaints this last year than they've ever had and that the Legislature should act, needs to act in order to remedy this situation. It takes about 30 seconds to test the level of water that you have in your.. in the storage tank and the problem is that if there's too much water in the storage tank it will ultimately get into your tank and there will be testimony, I think. Representative Matijevich can tell you what happens when the water or the sludge gets into your tank. The car comes to an abrupt halt and has to be overhauled at a rather substantial expense. And this is particularly important in view of the energy crisis and the gas shortage that we're at now because of the low levels of gasoline that are in the storage tanks. New York City has this legislation. It's worked very, very well there. It's no cost to the gas station owner whatsoever. Takes 20 seconds to test to see how much water is in there. It's very simple to clean out the tank



when there's too much water and sludge and it's important to every driver in the State of Illinois that we provide them good, wholesome, clean gasoline for the dollar or more that they're going to be paying for gas now. And I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

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

Borchers: "Would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Borchers: "I would like to know what... just exactly how you describe a dirty tank? Now remember this is underground. Some of those tanks are 8,000. Some 6, some 4 thousand gallons. Some 10 thousand. How...."

Marovitz: "I understand, Representative..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "... The Gentleman respond to your question. We know the various sizes of tanks."

Marovitz: "We went through this exact same dialogue in Committee. You asked the same questions in Committee and got very substantial answers from the Senate Sponsor, Senator Chew, about the sludge in the tank, how to test for the amount of water in the tank. You take a stick and you put some glue on the end of it. You stick it down to the end and how much red is on the end of that stick depends on how much water is in the tank. The Department of Agriculture has said it's a very simple test. It takes about 30 seconds to administer."

Borchers: "I might like to take up that one point, if you don't mind, a moment. Now some of the tanks have the pipe that carries the gasoline out of the tank and into the pumps, some are 4 some are 6 inches. Also if there is accumulation, now you take last winter. When you have snow on the ground, these ... the entrances in tanks are not always waterproof. Anything going in from melting snow and in some cases it's weeks that we have it, you have build up in just the area where the opening is. So when you open up, there you have a dirty tank."



Possibly in that one spot. It isn't necessary to have it.. that you can tell it's dirty throughout. Now, this is automatic. \$1,000 fine, there is no less, no judgement relationship to it. It's automatically a one thousand dollar fine. Now I'd like to bring.. ask another question. Now you request a daily check. Now you take again the snow, for weeks we may have snow. In Chicago you have more than we have down in Central Illinois and so on. But nevertheless, the daily checks that you have to open up a tank and.. which carries off even more water into it if it's raining or snowing or melting.. melting snow running in. Now would you think that a Bill like this is logical, to have a daily check of whether a tank is dirty with the accumulation we do have in the winter time? I asked a question. Could I have an answer?"

Marovitz: "Well, I'm not sure what part of the dialogue was a question. Of you'd repeat..."

Borchers: "My question was that since we have snow, ice, rain, melting snow, rain sometimes running in torrents, do we... and you have these openings where the water gets in, do you think this is fair that say if you're going to fined automatically a minimum, no maximum, minimum-maximum is the same amount, \$500 if you don't check it every day and yet you might have in one hour enough water go in to say that if a man.. an inspector comes an hour later, he is saying you're fined \$500? Now do you think it's fair that a man should be fined \$500 when you have a continuation of rain for days?"

Marovitz: "The Department of Agriculture testified that they would only be doing inspections upon complaints. There would only be a complaint substantially after a violation. All in individual has to do is test a tank and record the amount of water that's in the tank. And if there's too much water, just clean out the tanks so that



the people who get gasoline get clean gasoline. Very simple...."

Borchers: "Now I'd like..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman please bring his remarks to a close?"

Marovitz: "The court is going to determine what a violation is and all this stuff that you're talking about..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sponsor I believe you responded to the question."

Borchers: "I would .. I would like to speak to the Bill a moment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've got two minutes."

Borchers: "I can tell you it's not as easy as you may think to clean out a tank. You have to get special equipment. You sometimes have to call the owner of the .. not the station, but the Shell Company, for example or the Texaco Company or others who specialize in this. You cannot in heavy rain.. you cannot expect that tank to be clear and in fact, in a couple of hours, you could have enough water to put an inch of water in the tank. And there.. I do not think it's a good Bill that you can get fined \$500 because you happen to have a heavy down pour rain and have that kind of water in the tank. I just don't think that this is a good Bill. I think it's unjust. And I think it should be defeated."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last Gentleman speaks as though he may own a gas station."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Or one or two."

Matijevich: "I think. However, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me tell you my personal experience. About a month ago I was driving to Springfield and my car ran like a top halfway down to Springfield and halfway down I filled up with gas. And from then on, the thing was dragging and I knew something was wrong. But I didn't know what. I checked into my motel and boy,



I'll you, I didn't think I'd make it. I left there and I almost came to a dead stop just as I pulled into old friendly Bob McCucthen's station down the road. And he took care of my car and he said, you know what you've got for gasoline? He say, you just.. you must have got just plain pure old sludge. And I was so mad I called the Attorney General's Office. I usually don't complain against anybody because I can get along with just about anybody. And the Attorney General wasn't in and I talked to one of the investigators and he said, well, we'd have to put somebody on it and we'd have to do this and we'd have to do that and I'll tell you, I know how consumers feel when they've got a problem. And I almost felt like, oh, the hell with it. But I said what do you do when you have a case like that? The poor consumer does nothing but put .. digs in his pocket, pays the bill and that's it. So, the way I look at it, there's two things that the people are complaining about all over the country and one of them is the high cost of gasoline, which in Illinois for example is increased by 20c since the first of the year. The other thing that they've complaining about and I didn't realize it as much as since that happened to me that they are convinced that they are receiving a poor grade of gasoline, that there is sludge, that there is water. Now if that's true, and I believe it to be true because I know it to be true, we, as the Legislature, have got to do something about it. This is a consumer Bill and I'll tell you when that last Gentleman says that there's a problem of getting that.. the water.. emptying the tank, he's saying, he's admitting there's something in there but it's hard to get the tank drained out, the poor people you've got to drain their tanks. Now, isn't that too bad? Isn't that too bad that they're feeding us a bunch of junk as gasoline



and we can't do anything about it. Yes, we can. We can vote for this Bill. Then we're doing something about it. If you believe as I do in the consumer, you're going to support this Bill. It is good and it helps out other people who are going to be in the same predicament that I was and all I could do to solve it was reach in my pocket and pay and pay and pay. Let's stop that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "Under this Bill, does it provide any exemption under home rule or is this mandatory throughout the state?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz please."

Marovitz: "This is mandatory throughout the state. There is an Amendment on the Bill that says that the department may authorize a unit of local government to enforce this Act within its own boundaries, but it enforceable throughout the State of Illinois. And this was done at the request of the Department of Agriculture."

Ropp: "Alright..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "May I speak to the Bill? Actually as I read this Amendment I don't see where it says anything about preempting home rule. The fact is, I think the concern that you have probably is in some large metropolitan area and the Department of Agriculture does not provide that service right now. City sealers do that, and in many areas, the fact is, even here in Springfield the Department of Agriculture does not inspect the gasoline stations. What they actually inspect is the metering devices and I think that what we are real concerned here is, we're trying to pass a law that is totally unmanageable and that really if the individual gas station owner is a reputable kind of individual, probably he should be doing this right now to make sure that he



doesn't have water in his gas tank presently. And as a consumer I can guarantee you if I stopped in a gas-line station and found out that I had been pumped water like Representative Matijevich said that he thought he was, my.. the pure fact of supply and demand, I wouldn't go to that gas station anymore. And I'm sure that that is the best way to take care of the situation since it is almost unmanageable and I don't think that it's really going to solve problems that the Department of Agriculture in fact will not be checking many of these places where a lot of customers go into buy gasoline in major cities throughout the state."

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

Epton: "Thank you, 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. Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much. Well I know that the individual who first spoke on the other side of the aisle is an expert since he owns gas stations and we did have this dialogue in Committee. But it's very simple to measure how much water is in your tank, contrary to what anybody else says. You just put your stick in there, your dip stick and determine.. This is a serious Bill, Mr. Ronan. And determine how much water is in there and if there's too much water, sludge in there, it's very simple to drain. There are companies that do that. The Department of Agriculture said that many complaints were from downstate Illinois, from Springfield, not from Cook County, not from Chicago. Representative Matijevich's example wasn't from Chicago, Cook County. He was on his way down here, in downstate Illinois. Sure it's fine not to go back to a gas station once it happens to you. You haven't got a car anymore. It's broken down. It cost



\$250, \$300 to get it.. to get the carburetor fixed. We're not trying to deal with problems afterwards. We're trying to deal with problems beforehand and if the reputable dealers are going to do this by themselves, that's fine. What about those that aren't reputable? Let's take care of them. That's our obligation in the State Legislature, to take care of those people, to save the drivers, to save the citizens of the State of Illinois from a problem where they're paying over \$1.00 for gasoline. This Bill will provide clean gasoline for all the citizens of the State of Illinois and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1316 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I drive about as much as anybody. I drive about 30 or 40 thousand miles a year and in the last 25 years I've never had any gasoline stop my .. I mean any water stop my car. Number 2, I'm surprised at the Gentleman from Lake, being an attorney, that he didn't sue this station because almost every garage or filling station has garage liability to cover such things as this and I'm sure that John could have recovered and I predict that he probably already has. Now, you practice law all the time, I thought you were. Now, finally, the Department Agriculture has inspectors now who go around on weights and measures to filling stations. The one in my area has 14 counties and they're lucky to get around to every 6 or 8 months. Now if you think that's going to solve the problem, you must.. you're more optimistic than I am. But as far as I'm concerned, there is no problem that can't be solved by the individual...."

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



plain his vote. Timer's on."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, if they're going to go around through the State of Illinois trying to measure for one inch of condensation, any gasoline station, they'd better shut down everyone of them. Cause almost every tank that contains gasoline has at least one inch of water on the bottom and that dip stick they use with the colored chalk will not tell you the quality or the octane of the gasoline. Is that octane is not high enough your car will not run on that and it has nothing to do basically with the water."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am supporting this Bill because yesterday I heard of an experience of a Lady who is a lobbyist in this General Assembly who was driving to Springfield on Monday and she stopped at a gas station on her way and all the rain that we drove down through and she did get her gasoline tank with watered down gas. It has ruined her car. She had to have it towed and I understand that there were 3 or 4 other people that had the same thing happen. Now I think if this is going to happen that this is a good Bill and I think we should support it."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to inquire of the Chair how many votes it will take to pass this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Eighty-nine."

Vinson: "The home rule thing that Marovitz indicated doesn't require 107?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Sir. No home rule on the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote. Timer's on."



Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been in the automobile business most of my life. In nearly every car there is a filter to compensate for any gas (sic) that you may take from gasoline. But this.. this is one of the.. one of the.. another way to hammer at small businessmen. A gas station operator in nearly all cases, it's not the big oil companies you're hitting. You're hitting the little neighbor down the block that's trying to seek his living out working 12 to 18 hours a day selling gasoline. This is another shot at the poor small businessman and he's probably hiring four, five of your neighbors to help him pump that gas. So, so all you're doing is hammering me and that's number one. But number two, the Department of Agriculture, let me tell you a little bit about that Department of Agriculture and the weights and measures division. I had a gentleman come in to my place of business...."

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

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't normally vote for this type of legislation, but last week end it took three gasoline filters I had to buy a screwdriver and a wrench to change my own filter on the way home and it was because of that gasoline. And if this helps then I'm certainly in favor of it."

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

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this legislation is unnecessary. I think it's just going to clutter up the books. I talked to the Department of Agriculture and they say it cannot be administrated and they don't have the equipment to do it or the time to do it and they say the way the law is written there, it would not



be administered. So what we're doing here is putting a piece of legislation on the books just trying to kid the public again, put a little more regulation. Yet it isn't going to accomplish anything."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote. Timer's on. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in opposition to this Bill. I think mainly based on the comments presented by Representative Dawson. There were several questions that I had of the Sponsor of the Bill and I wasn't recognized to ask them. But I'd like to know why in the legislation he doesn't define what an operator is? An operator...a service station operator and I think of this Bill as enacted into law it's going to cause a tremendous amount of problems in enforcing it. I also would like to know what the fiscal impact is going to be. I'm of the opinion it's going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to enforce this type of law. Where's the Department of Agriculture going to get this money? Out of a hat? They're going to have to have inspectors, additional inspectors, and besides that I think it's just another downstate rip-off because when the smoke is cleared the city of Chicago isn't going to be involved. It's only going to be the rest of the downstate part of Illinois and I would ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, I've been trying very hard to vote for this Bill. It's my Senator that sponsored the Bill, but I do want to say one thing about it. You're taking a cylindrical tank and most of the tanks that they put in nowadays are cylinders. They



lay in the ground the long way. When they lay in the ground, you're testing at the very bottom of the cylinder. Now you talk about the problems that you have to the motorist cleaning out a filter, you tell me how the station owner then gets the pump 2,000 gallons or better of gas out of the ground into what? What does he pump it into in order to filter it and when he puts it back, he's still in the same proposition. You are taking out of the bottom of the cylinder, the very bottom of the cylinder and one inch, natural condensation is naturally going to come into any tank anytime you open...."

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

Deuster: "No, Sir. Not to explain my vote.. but just to indicate that I want to be recognized to seek a verification on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I reluctantly did vote for this in Committee. I think I made a bad mistake. I'm going to change my vote now. As I look at it, first of all it does mandate \$1,000 if some poor guy, it rains the night before and didn't get the water out of his tank, he's going to get fined \$1,000. And secondly the Sponsor indicated that the Department of Agriculture may authorize a local unit of government to make inspections. So unless they do, that means that the city of Chicago isn't in the Bill anyway."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would suggest to the Sponsor of this Bill that he might better achieve his aim if we would outlaw condensation and outlaw sludge. That way we wouldn't



have the problem in the first place. I would suggest to the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House that this would be a law that is unworkable. There are about 8,000 gas stations in Illinois. How do you manage to police 8,000 gas stations? Additionally, the gas tanks that we're getting our gas from, these underground tanks, are refilled twice a week. It is standard procedure for those tanks to be tested for water prior to being filled. We're telling the station people that they have to check the tanks when they're already being checked at least twice a week by the people who put the gas in. I think we're .. we're going after a problem in a bad way. This reminds me of the Bill that says we have to have air available at every gas station. I think it's a mistake. I urge you to vote against it."

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

Marovitz: "Well, I'd like to save the House some time. There's a lot of people who are not in their seats and if there's going to be a verification, I'd like to save people some embarrassment and put this Bill on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'aye', 69 'no'. The Gentleman asks leave to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. He has that right. The Bill is on Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 1412, Mrs. Catania. Temporarily out of the record. Senate Bill 58. Mr. Yourell. Where did Bus go? Wait a minute. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 58, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Intergovernmental Cooperation 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 58 is a Bill that Representative McMaster and I with Senator Grotberg and Senator Sangmeister considered in the Counties and Townships Committee of the House and because we did not have a letter that indicated that Representative McMaster would be the Sponsor we, as you know, got leave of the House to put this Bill on the Calendar and I would now yield to Representative McMaster to explain Senate Bill 58."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would Mr. Matijevec come up here please?"

Mr. McMaster, please continue."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Exactly... This didn't work out exactly the way we figured. I was going to announce it and then Bus was going to explain it, but I'll go ahead. I think really the .. Senator Grotberg did get a letter and then transferred it over to my name, but I'm very glad to have Representative Yourell on as a Co-House Sponsor. All this does is amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act I guess I swallowed a little gasoline or something. It amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act to provide that counties ^{amend} ~~and engage~~ in an intergovernmental agreement notwithstanding the absence of specific authority under state law to perform the service involved. Provided that the unit of local government contracting with the county has the authority to perform the service. And the Senate Amendment adds that the authority of the county shall be limited to the territorial limits of the local governmental unit with which the county contracts. I think the Bill is alright and I would urge the support of it."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the



record. On this question there are 150 'aye', 5 'nay', 2 voting as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Carol Braun on the floor? We want to bring Senate Bill 870 back, Carol? Alright. It's Stuffle. 375. He request that the.. Senate Bill 375 be returned.. Oh, it's on Third Reading? Has the fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Pension impact note has been filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Now then we will move the Bill, Senate Bill 375, to Third Reading. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, arise?"

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of adjournment. I'd like to move to Constitutional Amendments Second Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "You weren't recognized for that. On page 6, Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 10. Mr. Huskey."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was tabled. Amendment #2 lost previously. Floor Amendment #3, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 10 on page one by deleting line one and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr..Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 simply provides that for the purposes of enforcing the parental responsibility law any victim of the willful or malicious acts of a minor shall have the rights to learn the identity of the minor from the custodian of the court or police records and the identity of the minors means his full name and last known address...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman... Pardon me, Sir. The Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Katz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Katz: "To question the germaneness of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The Gentleman from Lake keeps adding this in every kind of way on Bills, on motions, every time you turn it's back again."

Speaker Bradley: "It appears that the Amendment's beyond the scope of the parental responsibility law when you're entering into the juvenile court action, so we're going to have to rule that it's not germane. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 10 on page one by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz, you have the same..."

Katz: "The same parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we're going to have to rule.. out of order for the same reason, Mr. Deuster. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 10 on page one in line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz, same question. Let's see Amendment #5. Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Amendment #5 is a lot different."

Speaker Bradley: "It appears.. it's number 5, Mr. Katz. If you'll look at it, I think number 5 is germane. Alright. The Gentleman from ... Have you read the Amendment? Okay. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Desuter: "Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the other Amendments were ones that really should be considered, but that's the ruling of the Chair and this is not the time to quibble about that. The problem with the Parental Responsibility Act is in many cases the victim of the willful or malicious acts of a minor have no way of finding out who the minor is because if you go to your local police, they'll tell you I'm sorry even though you are the victim of this crime, we've arrested somebody and we can't tell you who it is because they're a minor. That's too bad



for the victim. So, the person will say.. you will say to the police, what can I do? Okay. You can go hire one of our fine lawyers. Go over and get a court order and then the court will let you have .. learn the identity of the person that did you in and caused this property damage. I don't like that. My preference would be to say that you would have the right to find out from the police who caused you the damage. However, since that apparently is the present law Amendment #5 says that with respect to determining the damage that you've suffered, which does include court costs, that court cost shall include all necessary and reasonable costs incurred by the victim of the willful or malicious acts of a minor in order to ascertain the identity of the minor. It seems to me that this is .. it's unfortunate we have to do this but it's an expense that the victim of juvenile crime must incur on some occasions where he doesn't know the identity in order to find out the identity and in order to exercise his rights under the Act. This Amendment is very important to help people who find that they must go to court, not only to recover damages, but in the first place, to find out who it is that hurt them even though they are taxpayers, paying their taxes, supporting the police, supporting the courts, but they're not entitled to the court.. or the police records telling them who the person was that was arrested. I think this is a good Amendment. I would urge its adoption and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would say to the Gentleman from Lake that he is entitled to his views with regard to legislation. He has put in legislation to try to do directly what this



Amendment does. He failed to secure the legislation. He failed to discharge Committee on the legislation. He has offered an Amendments on various Bills and I think what that results in is really an abuse..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me. Mr. Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"

Deuster: "Oh, I think Mr. Katz is clever enough and intelligent enough to comment on the merits of the Amendment without going in to the legislative history of this House or what other Members might have done. He can comment on the merits and I wish he would confine himself to the merits of the Amendment whether he thinks it's a good change or a bad change."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz I think maybe was doing that. He... I'm sure he will confine his remarks to that area."

Katz: "That's absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. I was getting to that and I wanted simply to take a look at the Amendment and point out that the Amendment really doesn't give any indication as to what kinds of costs can be incurred. It could be a lawyer's fees. It could be investigator's fees. It could be a detective's fees. It could be renting a bloodhound for the purpose. There's absolutely no limitation in the amount involved in this. There is no indication as to whether it makes any sense or not. For example, it maybe be perfectly clear that you can't find out through this means and yet, you may incur large sums of money. I believe that in that sense this kind of Amendment really encumbers the Bill in question, would raise serious questions as to its fairness to parents. Remember you are now preceding as I understand it in this Bill, against a parent, not against a child and I believe that the wide open nature of this which would permit detectives, bloodhounds, a lawyer, anybody else's expenses involved is really out of hand and I would oppose Amendment #5."



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

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Is there any stated dollar limitation in the Amendment with regard to the amount of costs that can be assessed?"

Deuster: "Yes. The law itself has a dollar amount. Right now it's..."

Brummer: "No. No. With regard to the costs. You didn't understand the question.."

Deuster: "Yes I did. Yes I did. Let me give you the answer, Dick. The.. this defines court costs which is included in the paragraph that says you can recover up to a limit of so much. That includes the actual damages, plus your costs. This Amendment simply defines costs. So it falls within that limit. Now we have adopted legislation as you know either out of the House or out of the Senate raising the limit from 500 to 1,000 to 1,500. But this falls within that limit. So there's a cap on this."

Brummer: "Okay. And the Bill as written without the Amendment .. the cap is being raised to \$1,000, I believe?"

Deuster: "I'm looking. I forgot. We have so many Bills on the subject. It's Representative Huskey's Bill. I'm looking for the basic body of the Bill here. I think it is 1,500. It's 1,000. I'm sorry. Senate Bill 10 says the limit is 1,000."

Brummer: "But you're sure.. you're certain that the \$1,000 includes all... includes the costs?"

Deuster: "Yes. Existing law, Representative Brummer, says no recovery under this Act may exceed \$1,000, actual damages for each occurrence of such willful or malicious acts by the minor..."

Brummer: "Excuse me. I have the Bill in front of me.."

Deuster: "Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, I'm sorry. In addition to taxable



court costs. Court costs."

Brummer: "So your prior statement is erroneous then. This is the.. the costs are in addition to the \$1,000 amount."

Deuster: "That's right."

Brummer: "So there is no cap with regard to the costs that could be assessed under this Amendment if it were adopted."

Deuster: "If you are vicitmized by a minor and the legal system as we have it now forces you to go out and find..whether it's either.. as Representative Katz says, rent a blood . hire a bloodhound, whatever you have to do, what is our system ..."

Brummer: "..."

Deuster: "The malicious juvenile."

Brummer: "My original question was, is there or is there not a stated dollar cap with regard to the costs recoverable? I think that can be answered yes or no."

Deuster: "Okay. It's up to the Judge. It's necessary and reasonable costs, it can't be unreasonable.. It would have to be necessary. So that's entirely up to the Judge. They have to be reasonable."

Brummer: "I suppose as a lawyer I ought to stand up in support of this Bill because it would appear that you can incur all costs necessary to ascertain who the minor was that was involved and that would be a great item for lawyers so that they could charge all the costs necessary to ascertain the identity of that minor. However, our system is generally not operated under a system of assessing attorney fees and I think this is a poor precedent for.. particularly since it contains no cap with regard to those costs that could be recovered."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Deuster is smiling in my direction. And I think he's smiling because he's putting over a terrible joke on everybody. This is probably the most unbelievable incredible Amendment



that I've ever seen. And it might even pass because of the mood we're in. What this Amendment would permit someone to do is to.. in a situation where his window was broken and may cost five dollars to repair, would authorize him to go to one of the big Chicago law firms that charges \$150 an hour. They would.. 120. Well if he hired Cullerton, it might be even more. He would then hire an investigator to track him down. He might use bloodhounds. He could run up expenses that would be reasonable under court decisions of about 3 or 4 or 5 thousand dollars and for a five dollar broken window, stick a parent of some child for that amount. I mean I can't believe that even a layman would introduce a Bill like this, but I know that the distinguished Sponsor of this Amendment has passed the Bar of Illinois. But he's playing a joke on us, I'm sure he is."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster to close the debate."

Deuster: "Well, as a Member of the California Bar and the Illinois Bar, but one who is not interested in lawyers, but is interested in helping the victims of malicious acts of juveniles, I think this is reasonable and a good Amendment. It simply says that if some minor willfully and.. or maliciously hurts you, causes property damage to you, and you have to go to court or go somewhere else to find out the identity of that person because of the veil of secrecy on the juvenile court records that the reasonable costs as a Judge would determine them and the necessary costs that you've got to incur in order to enforce your rights, that you ought to recover those. I would.. I think the Amendment has been well discussed. I think it's good. I would ask your favorable vote for Amendment #5."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #5. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair.. In the opinion of



the Chair the Amendment fails. Alright. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3. Senate Bill 870. It's on Second Reading. It's been read a second time I believe. It's been read a second time, have we checked? Oh, it's on Third Reading. You want to move it... The Lady wants to move it back to Second. Hearing no objections, we'll move it to Second Reading. Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Braun, amends Senate Bill 870 as amended on page 6 by deleting line 4..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 makes certain changes regarding the receivables to be collected in the Bill. It's been requested by 'Mr. Kronsin' and I move for its favorable consideration and adoption by this House."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 870 as amended in the House and..."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. Vinson here? Take it out of the record. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman's not here. Take that out of the record. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Vinson..."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Vinson..."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Braun, amends Senate Bill 870 on page 7..."



Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendmant #6 deletes the requirement that the Commission file an audit with the Comptroller's subject to audit by the Auditor General. This has been requested by the Auditor General on the grounds that it would require him to do something that he is already prohibited by law to do and I move for its favorable adoption by this Body."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Lady's Amendment. All in favor singify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. On page 6, Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 80. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, arise?"

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of personal privilege. Before you start, if you'd come down here I think we can work it out."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Secõnd Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley."

Stanley: "Mr. Speaker, there was a motion I believe relative to Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. There's a motion filed on Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien on the floor? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we've got a motion there that has been filed to table the Amendment.."

Speaker Bradley: "That's the point where we're at right now, Sir."



O'Brien: "The reason for the motion, Mr. Speaker and Members, is because the Amendment took out the funds that were necessary to pay the Judges for the work for that extra hour and Representative Stanley and I both feel that if the Judges are going to be required to be working 13 hours with the polls open and possibly some, in some instances, another 5 hours in opening up the polls in the morning and closing them and counting the ballots that night, that we ought to reciprocate and that those Judges which are very hard and difficult to get, especially qualified ones, ought to be compensated for that extra hour and I move the motion, Mr. Speaker." And ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stanley?"

Stanley: "Yeah, I support this motion. What it does is provide that an additional 10 dollars of compensation for Judges of election, registrars, and canvessors. It's important to point out that this is paid for by the state. The Governor has agreed to sign this Bill and I think it's the right thing to do if we're asking Judges of election to stay an additional hour. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, on the motion."

Bluthardt: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill, in my opinion, would never have gotten out of the Elections Committee unless it had this Amendment attached to it. And it just barely got through. And the Amendment did take out the fund for the extra compensation for Judges. The amount as I recall was in excess of \$600,000 and then for the first time as far as I can recall in the history of this state, the state would be required to pay the compensation for the Judges of the election, only for that extra hour which is as I said, amounts over \$600,000. I think it's a bad principle



to follow to start having the state pay for the cost of Judges of all the elections because it's only going to be a matter of time if this does become law that there'll be a Bill in here and probably pass that the state will pick all costs of the Judges of the election and that will run in to millions and millions of dollars. I don't think it's quite fair and I don't know whether the Sponsor of this Bill is ever going to learn, but I don't think it's quite fair to now to move to table Amendment that made it possible for this Bill to get out of Committee and when I say I don't think the Sponsor of this Bill will ever learn, you know there are other Amendments that are to follow this. He says he wants to keep this out of the Conference Committee. He has no ghost of a chance keeping it out of Conference Committee because if it passes, it'll probably pass with a seven to seven Amendment to it. If you have a seven o'clock to seven that night, there will not be the additional hour. There will not be the necessity for additional compensation for the Judges. I would ask you to defeat this motion to table."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the question is on the Gentleman's motion to table. I'm sorry. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was principle Sponsor of House Bill 1410 which was solved in the Elections Committee, primarily because keeping the polls open the additional hour the concern was whether or not what kind of compensation ought to be paid the Judges. The Elections Com. I'm surprised that Representative Bluthardt made the remarks he just did since it seemed to me that one of the questions that was of great concern to the Elections Committee in this House at that time was additional compensation for Judges if they were to be asked to serve one



additional hour at the polls. It seems to me that the Senate was quite right to pass the Bill in the form that it did. I'm surprised to learn that this Bill came out of the House Elections Committee with that part of the Bill removed from it and I would urge this House to table the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion. It seems to me only a matter of simple equity and justice that we provide for an appropriation to cover the increased salary of election Judges. The Judges perform a very important function in protection one of our most basic and fundamental rights as citizens of this United States and it seems to me that in this time of escalating costs and in light of the long and hard hours that they put in, that a ten percent increase is justified. It's fair and it is equitable and urge your favorable consideration on this motion to table Amendment #1."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the Members of the House are overlooking is the fact that the Bill that now extends voting hours does in fact include additional compensation for Judges. But the matter in question is who pays it. The Committee struck the provision that the State pay the costs which has been contrary to the traditional way of doing it in the State where the County pays it. What the motion to strike the Amendment does will be to force the State to pay the additional cost of the election Judges. Now at a time when we're strapped for money the estimated cost of paying the additional compensation for Judges out of the State Treasury is 961 thousand dollars. Now the question is shall the State pay the cost or shall the County which traditional has borne the cost for paying



Judges continue to bear them? I think the Committee action was right in striking this provision and the Amendment should stay on the Bill with the county paying the costs rather than the state. And I would urge the defeat of the motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bonn, Mr. Slape."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to close."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call and just reiterate some of the comments that have been made by some of the other Representatives in relation to the 13 hours of the polls being open. If we're going to provide election Judges throughout the State of Illinois for these important elections, we're going to have to provide for the compensation that's necessary. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'The motion to table Committee Amendment #1..' 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', 22 'no', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and Committee Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Yourell, amends Senate Bill 80 on page 1 and line 3 and 9 and so forth."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2, to Senate Bill 80, is an Amendment that deals with a problem resulting from congressional vacancies and elections resulting to that. It's not a problem of the counties in my judgment that the counties



should pick up the cost of those elections but rather the state since our congressional delegation in Washington has to do with the state in general and the funds that we receive from Washington and that we can not saddle the counties with the cost of those elections. We have to provide that the state shall provide for the cost of those elections for filling the vacancies that exist. We have a very peculiar problem in this area and I would suggest that you vote for Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 80 since this is a state problem and not a county problem and I urge a favorable Roll Call on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 80 "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge the defeat of Amendment #2 of the logic of my colleague's argument that the state should pick up the entire cost of special elections is that he just rose a few minutes ago and suggested that we could not pick up the incremental difference of the salary increase for Judges because it would cost too much money. Now he has filed an Amendment of his own suggesting that.. that the cost.. the entire cost of the election be picked up by the state. I believe, Sir, that this is a suspicious Amendment and it is filed with an attempt to defeat this legislation and I urge it's rejection by this Body. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "Mr. Yourell, you indicated that the Amendment pays the entire cost of special elections. I didn't hear you mention anything about the requirement in the Amendment that requires the state to pay for proportionate share of



all election costs. Is that in there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell please?"

Yourell: "No, that is not correct, Sir. This only deals with congressional elections to fill vacancies."

Totten: "It just deals with congressional elections?"

Yourell: "Pardon me, Sir?"

Totten: "It just deals with congressional elections?"

Yourell: "And as far as the special elections is concerned and the ~~pro rata~~ share of the salary for the Judges's etc... Judges salaries."

Totten: "Spec... Would that include special elections that districts other than congressional?"

Yourell: "Just general elections, Sir."

Totten: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Stanley: "I rise in opposition to this Amendment. It's dilatory.

It's an attempt to stop six to seven o'clock voting hours in this State. His Amendment extends further than just special congressional elections. It's all special elections. This Bill was heard a very similar Bill by Representative Hanahan in Committee, House Bill 1521. At that time, he could not place.. the Sponsor could not place a cost, an estimated cost, of what this.. how much this was going to be, so I'm rising and asking that we defeat this Amendment that's dilatory."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I supported the Elections Committee on the first Amendment, but it seems to me that we should not consider this to be an omnibus vehicle Bill for elections Amendments. This is a very, very important piece of legislation and I think we should send it to the Governor as cleanly as possible. I urge the defeat, not of just this Amendment, but all subsequent Floor Amendments which are being offered to this Bill. It is too important



to load up like a Christmas tree. Let's give it to him clean. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I. I really think this is a great Amendment and as Minority Spokesman for this side of the aisle I would ask that you support the Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that Representative Bluthardt hit the issue right on the head. This is a matter for the state to determine. We're talking about \$600,000. Many of the downstate counties, should a vacancy exist because of unforeseen circumstances it isn't fair to the counties to assume the burden and I would assume... I would suggest the state has the obligation since the state has the congressional delegation regardless of where it comes from in the state to support this Amendment and I urge a favorable Roll Call on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 80."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record... Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "I really don't understand why many of the downstate Legislators are voting against this Amendment because if this Amendment does not pass ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that we had moved to explanation of vote on this.."



Speaker Lechowicz: Pardon me?"

Braun: "I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell, please continue."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't understand why the downstate Legislators should object to this Amendment cause if this Amendment does not pass, if a congressional vacancy does exist they're going to have to be saddled with the cost of providing for the cost of that election. Now, this is a state problem. This is not a county problem. This is not a congressional district problem. This problem lies directly with the state because the state depends on revenue received from the federal government that our congressional delegation must provide the leadership in the Congress to provide. And I suggest that you reconsider that 'no' vote and vote 'aye' on this Amendment. It's a very important Amendment to Senate Bill 80 to provide for the cost of these elections to be borne by the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "'Aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Mr. Matijevich to 'aye'. Mr. McClain to 'aye'. Mr. Kelly to 'aye'. Mr. Leinenweber to 'no'. Yeah, let's dump this Roll Call. We're take another Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Eddie. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Poll the absentees please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."



Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes.."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Borchers. Breslin. Bullock. Campbell. Davis.
Gaines. Giorgi. Goodwin. Hannig. Harris. Henry.
Emil Jones. Kempiners. Mautino..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kempiners as 'no'. Mr. Henry as 'aye'.
Mr. Campbell as 'no'. Mr. Goodwin as 'aye'. Mr. Davis
as 'aye'. Mrs. Reed as 'aye'. Mr. Bullock. Mr. Bullock
please."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My leader is quite persuasive
I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Bullock as 'aye'. Mr.
Kane, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Kane to 'no'. Mr. Vinson,
for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "In the event that the affirmative appears to win, I'd
like a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You'll have that opportunity Sir. Mr. Wikoff
as 'aye'. Mrs. Sumner. Sumner as 'no'. Please proceed,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees.
Emil Jones. Mautino. McAuliffe. McGrew. Meyer.
Rea. Reilly. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeber-
lein. Schuneman. Slape.. Stearney..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Totten as 'aye'. Just in case Crane gets
elected, right?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Stuffle. and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sam Wolf 'no'. Mr. Marovitz? Okay fine.
What's the county, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are
77 'aye', and 76 'no'. And Mr. Vinson wants a verifi-
cation. Would the Membership kindly be in your own
respective seats? Please. Will all unauthorized per-
sonnel remove themselves from the floor? The Gentleman
from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom, for what purpose do you



seek recognition? McBroom please."

McBroom: "Vote me 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan, for what purpose.. We haven't gone to that area yet. Mr. Ronan asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Stanley, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Your light's on. Let's not be somewhere. Let's be accurate. What is it? On this question there are 76 'aye', 77 'no'. Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I thought it was 76-77 before Mr. McBroom changed his vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You'll have to argue with the Clerk."

Vinson: "What is.. What is the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "76 'aye', 77 'no'. Now, Mr. Yourell requests a verification of the negative vote. Clerk will proceed to .. Bus? You're requesting a verification of the negative vote?"

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk will proceed to verify the negative vote. Excuse me. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Might it be simpler, rather than for him to go through his verification and then if he wins, me, mine, for us to have an oral verified roll, Sir?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll proceed to verify the negative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Balanoff. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Braun. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Collins. Currie. Daniels.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Edgar, Mr. Woodyard, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Woodyard: "Record me 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'.



Proceed please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Greiman. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Kane. Katz. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Mahar. Matula. McBroom. Molloy. Mugalian. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rigney. Ropp. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Steczo. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Vinson. Waddell. Watson. Willer. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. and Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Macdonald: "Yes, I would like to change my vote from 'yes' to 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Please record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Meyer as 'aye'. What's the count; Mr. Clerk? We're starting with 75 'aye', 79 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. And wants to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Yourell, do you have any questions of the negative vote? Excuse me. Let's give a little order in the chamber. Please. Could we have a little order in the chamber please? The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" "How is the Lady recorded, Sumner?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to vote again, Mrs. Sumner? Okay. That's right. I thought you were recorded already. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, for what purpose... Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Do you have any questions of the negative vote, Sir?"

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Birkinbine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Collins wants to be verified. Collins wants to be verified. What's your inquiry, Mr. Ewell? Ewell? Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Verify. I'm sorry. Verify 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're trying to Sir. What's your question Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "Representative Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Campbell is in his chair."

Yourell: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman? She's here."

Yourell: "Representative Collins is verified. That right?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes Sir."

Yourell: "Representative Epton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Epton? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ewing? How is the Gentleman recorded? He's in his chair."

Yourell: "Representative Grossi, I see him. Representative Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Winchester's there. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "How am I recorded on this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Change 'present' vote to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change him to 'no'. Change Mr. Reilly to 'no'."



Alright. Record him as 'no', Reilly. Jim Reilly.
Please continue, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Katz? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz in the chamber? Remove him. Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Klosak?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Klosak? You know, Mr. Huskey, I don't appreciate that. It's pretty hard to see a verification from back here when you wave your own hand in response to Mr. Klosak's name. I don't think it's fair to the Chair of this Membership. And you know, they question the Chair a number of times and I don't think it's fair. Mr. Klosak? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh. Mr. Kucharski's here."

Yourell: "Representative..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz has returned to the chamber. Place him back on the Roll Call. Wake up. Please continue Sir."

Yourell: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mahar. He's here."

Yourell: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McBroom. He's here."

Yourell: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I see her back there, yes."

Yourell: "Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capuzi, how is the Gentleman recorded? I asked how he is recorded."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Skinner."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner's here."

Yourell: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stanley is here."

Yourell: "Representative Telcser?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Telcser's here."

Yourell: "Representative Watson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Watson is here."

Yourell: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Peters is here."

Yourell: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane? I think he's recorded as 'aye'."

Yourell: "Oh, I'm sorry.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, he changed it. No he's here. Mr. Harris wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Harris as 'aye' and Mr. Capparelli requests to be verified in case there's a question of the affirmative vote. Leave is granted. Mr. Rea, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Rea as 'aye'. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Yourell? Who? "

Yourell: "Representative Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jones, how is the Gentleman recorded? Oh, Dave Jones. He's here. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones. Kindly record him as 'aye'. Emil Jones. Mr. Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Record Mr. Davis from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. McCourt, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCourt: "Please record me 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McCourt as 'no'. Mr. Yourell, do you have any more questions.."

Yourell: "Representative Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Catania? How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see her. Oh, okay. Fine. Hi, Sue. The Lady is here."

Yourell: "Representative Neff."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Neff is back in the chamber. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Oh, do you have any more, Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "Yes, I do have Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright."

Yourell: "Did I verify or ask a question on Representative Chapman?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Chapman I believe has been removed."

Yourell: "Okay. Okay. .."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady is back in the chamber. She's been verified."

Yourell: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back there, Sir."

Yourell: "I have no further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Clerk? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Deuster: "I'm sorry. I asked to be recorded the wrong way. I'd like to be recorded 'no' the way my switch was here. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Deuster as 'no'. On this question there are 77 'aye', 80 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Amendment fails. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Davis: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

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

Davis: "I've been down here 3 years now and I've witnessed what I thought were some violations of Member's rights by the Majority party and by the person in the Chair from time to time and I didn't think it was right, but I've never been a victim of it until the last 3 days. And my point of personal privilege is simply this, I thought that a Sponsor and Member of this House had control of the course of his Bill and can do with that as he wished. And he could accommodate other



Members because he felt it was the right thing to do or the fair thing to do. I happen to be Sponsor of the Department of Law Enforcement's budget, Senate Bill 588. I've accommodated Members of this House for the last 2 weeks of leaving that Bill on Second Reading. There were 2 unfriendly and I consider unfriendly Amendments filed to the Bill and gave the people who came to me all the opportunity in the world to file those Amendments and get them in the shape they wanted and I asked on Tuesday that this Bill be called. I told.. I was told there was a hold on the Bill. What a hold is I wasn't sure and nobody would 'fes up' to what a hold was. I was told again yesterday there was a hold on the Bill and I was told again today there's a hold on the Bill and it's waiting further Amendments. Now either the Sponsor has a right to move his Bill as he chooses, or he doesn't. Now I would hope that tomorrow I'd... I've been I thought rather nice about the whole thing cause these Amendments are unfriendly. They're already filed. But I would hope tomorrow when we go to the Order of Second Reading, that Senate Bill 588 will be called first regardless of whose Amendments are waiting to be drafted in the Reference Bureau or whatever. And I think that's only fair that the Members of this House be accorded the right to move their Bill as they choose and that's my point of personal privilege."

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

Matijewich: "Mr. Speaker, if the rumors are true, tomorrow there's a Punch and Judy Show in town?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti. The Amendment was defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Laurino-McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 80 on page one and line 1 and 7 and so forth."



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

Laurino: "Amendment #3 is an agreed Amendment that inadvertently got into a jack-pot during the last days of House Bills and it's an agreed Amendment between Mr. McAuliffe and myself. And what it does, it doubles the signature requirements for the House and Senate races for the Legislature."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to announce to the Republican Members that there will be a conference in room 118 immediately after adjournment and we want each and everyone of you to be there."

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

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another dilatory Amendment. The Amendment and let me tell you, this is contained in House Bill 834 which is currently on Second Reading in the Senate. That's where it is now. It's another attempt, load, six to seven o'clock voting up here in Illinois and kill this Bill. And I respectfully request a negative vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I don't care to speak. I'm sorry."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the most insidious of all the Amendments with all due deference to my colleague on this side of the aisle. This Amendment requires that independent candidates file twice the number of signatures. Well I wouldn't mind my Democratic colleagues on this side of the aisle.. it would not... An Amendment like this.. It would be like.. It would be possible that Mr. Pouncey who gave us the Majority in this House



might not be sitting here if he were not able to collect double the number of petition signatures that everyone else is required to collect. I respectfully urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Yes, in spite of what the.. the last Lady indicated in her remarks, it does not double the number of signature required in independents' petitions. And I want everybody to understand that. This does not do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, to close."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the contrary, this does not ... this Amendment in any way does not mean to support this Bill. In fact, what it would do is probably indicate to the Governor that it's a good Bill. This only makes it stronger. It gives him another reason to sign it into law. I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Vote yeah. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in addition to his other shortcomings it appears to be unconstitutional because it sets up differential.. different requirements for independent candidates running in districts other than State Legislative Districts. It singles out State Legislative Districts for special attention and special signature requirements so I believe it probably fails the Constitutional test as well."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 'aye', 94 'no', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Getty, amends Senate Bill 80 as amended and so forth."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #4 would provide I think a compromise on the controversy. It would permit the hours of election to be from seven a.m. to seven p.m. That would make I believe a reasonable and meaningful compromise, not having the Judges of election work inordinately long hours. It would be the same length of time and yet accommodating those people who wish to have the time of voting extended to seven p.m. I would ask for your support in this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I speak against the Amendment. It seems to me the value of the Bill to which this Amendment is attached is that it offers more voters more opportunity to cast a ballot. To extend the voting hours one hour in one direction, at the same time we decrease them in the other, seems to me not to be serving the purpose. I'm in favor of those people who currently vote between the hours of six and seven a.m. being in the future still able to do so. I'm also in favor of encouraging those people who can't get back home to the polling places in time to vote now, when the polls close at six to be able to have that extra hour. But the point of the Bill it seems to me is to extend the actual number of hours during which time people may cast a ballot and I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In central Illinois, in the part of the state that I come from, the hour when the most voters



vote is between six and seven. When I go to the polls to check what the turn out is I want to know how many voted between six and seven in that period of time because that's when people line up to vote. I would urge the defeat of this Amendment."

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

Stanley: "Thank you Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I think it's important for all of us to keep in mind where Illinois is in terms of their voting hours. There's some 39 other states that have longer voting hours than Illinois. An attempt to move it from seven to seven hurts very much those people that vote early in the morning, those working men and women of Illinois, that are traveling whether it be from suburban to rural or suburban to urban areas. And I urge the defeat of this Amendment. It's another dilatory attempt to keep the voting hours where they are in Illinois and not to try to enfranchise thousands of voters in this state. Thank you."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is not a dilatory attempt. This is an attempt as the Gentleman knows to reach a compromise, I think a fair compromise, to extend the time. We have heard for an awfully long time that we need to extend these voting hours to seven p.m. We'd still accommodate our workers who work so hard and so long in keeping it at twelve hours rather than making it thirteen hours and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Kindly record me as 'aye' there Mr. Domico. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 40 'aye', 105 'no', and the Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Immediately upon leaving we would... the Democrats will have a conference in room 114. It's an important conference and I urge all Democrats to join us."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe that the Democrats immediately after adjournment will have a conference in room 114 and the Republicans 118. Is that correct, Mr. Mahar? On that question, the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I just came over from the Republican side of the aisle and I have an inkling over what their conference is about and I think for the first time in history we could have a joint conference."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John, in all honesty we'll all lose much. The Gentleman... The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief announcement. Please. I would like to remind the Membership of the Christian Fellowship Dinner this evening immediately after our conferences, I guess, at the Sangamo Club. Members have made reservations and those who are expecting to go please remember to go. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll do... There's an Amendment on a Bill. We'll call on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1412. Clerk read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1412. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act regulating currency exchanges."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The lady moves that the Bill be brought back from Third to Second for purpose of amendment."

Hearing no objection, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Conti - Lechowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to withdraw amendments #1,2, and 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has leave to withdraw amendments 1,2, and 3. Hearing no objections, the amendments are withdrawn. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Conti-- Lechowicz. Amends Senate Bill 1412..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. First of all, let me compliment the sponsors of the Bill for coming up with this Bill that's very much needed. Not only in Chicago but throughout the State of Illinois. Amendment #4 is the result of negotiations between the sponsors of this legislation, the Department of Financial Institutions, the Governor's Office, some civic organizations, and representatives of the industry. The amendment strikes the whereas clauses and incorporates those clauses as legislative findings. The findings recognize that the currency exchange provide important and vital service to the citizens in communities in which banking service are generally unavailable. It recognizes that citizens should be protected from being charged unreasonable and unconscionable rates from cashing checks and purchasing money orders. In January of this year, the Illinois Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a prior maximum rate law because that law did not provide guidelines for



the director. In its original, unamended form, this Bill provided that the director consider rates charged by the banks and grocery stores in cashing checks and issuing money orders. This Bill did not allow the directors to consider the fact that banks and grocery stores use these services in an effort to attract business. They provide check cashing service as a type of loss leader. They make their profits from other services and products and do not attempt to make income from cashing checks. The amendment takes these economic facts into consideration in the process of establishing maximum rates. The amendment also provides that in setting maximum rates the director considered the currency exchanges should make a reasonable profit in their operations. The amendment provides a procedure by which the director can periodically review the maximum rate. The amendment satisfies the interest of consumers who may be the victims of unreasonable and unconscionable rates for cashing checks and money orders. It... It satisfies the need of citizens in Illinois to have an industry which makes a sufficient profit so that it will continue to serve its communities where other financial institutions have historically refused to provide service. It gives the director legislative direction in balancing the interest of the consumer and the interest of the currency exchange operator. It recognizes if the operator does not stay in the community that the consumer will have no institution that provides these vital resources, services. It protects the poor from the unreasonable and the unconscionable charges and protects the right of businessmen to make a fair and honest profit. It provides the intelligible standards that Supreme Court decision requires. It also recognizes that we don't want the directory to set average rates, but we want him to consider these factors in setting the maximum rates. We don't want to prevent the success of currency exchange.



We want to prevent the unreasonable and the unconscienable and the gouging rates that we've been having in certain parts of the city. I move for the adoption of this amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye' aye, oppose. Amendment #4 is adopted. Lady from Cook, Mr. Catania."

Catania: "Well Mr. Speaker, he's just explained the Bill. Could we have leave and vote for it on Third and finish it all up tonight?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Leave. Hearing no objection, Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1412. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to definition of licensing regulation of community currency exchanges. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Conti has just explained the Bill. I'd like to thank him and Representative Lechowicz who were joint sponsors of the amendment and the Department and the people from the currency exchange for working together. This was an agreed amendment and I hope you'll all support the Bill which I think is needed and wanted in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The gentleman from Cook... Is there any discussion? dGentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "I thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question. I'm looking at amendment #4 on the third page and it indicates that the only way, or seems to anyway, says no petition may be filed pursuant to subsection A which is the, I guess is the one that changes the, allows for a change of the rates unless one forces the community currency exchanges join in the petitions. What does that... What does that mean? Do they have to decide that they



want to change their, their rates and if they do it then they can change it?"

Catania: "This is the method that they requested for petitioning the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions to institute hearings on rate changes if he doesn't do it on his own."

Greiman: "Well... Well where does it give him the, the authority to do it on his own that's... I guess that's what I'm not, what I'm missing and I'm wondering if subsection C is a... some kind of a limitation on his right to initiate his own hearing."

Catania: "In the first part of the Bill it says 'the director shall, by rule if adopted in accordance with the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, expeditiously formulate and issue schedules of reasonable maximum rates and this just provides that if he doesn't update them frequently enough that within nine months after a change they can petition to have it done again.'"

Greiman: "Well OK. And it sets the purpose of our, you know, dialogue to have some legislative intent in the records. Then this is not a prohibition on the director initiating changes but merely for the industry itself to. Right?"

Catania: "That's right. That's correct."

Greiman: "OK. Thank you."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall Senate Bill 1412 pass?

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. ... vote me as aye please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted that wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 ayes, 3 nays, 14 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "There's been a motion filed with the Clerk that we go to business of Motions. We're going to be going to the business of Motions. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, on this Roll Call, which is currently on the Board would the record show that Mr. Giorgi is not present in the chamber and that he ought not be recorded as 'aye' on that Roll Call?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's fine Sir. It's so recorded. Mr. Madigan, we're on the Order of Motions. Mr. Madigan. Would you read the motion, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion, I move to extend the deadline provisions of Rule 35-G relating to Senate Bills other than Senate appropriation Bills through June 27, 1979."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Mr. Madigan please?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the time that we postponed certain of the deadlines inadvertently by error the deadline for consideration of Senate Bills was not adjusted. This motion will move back the deadline for consideration of Senate Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any..."

Madigan: "I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved for its adoption. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Failure to pass this motion would mean that Senate Bills on Second Reading would be dead today except appropriation Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "So you're recommending that the motion be supported, is that correct?"

Friedrich: "Yes, I do cause Senate Bills on Second Reading would be dead as of today or they couldn't pass..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the motion be adopted?'"



All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Billie?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's
 135 'aye', 10 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This
 Bill, having... This motion having received the Consti-
 tutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Mr.
 Davis still in the chamber? Well just for the record,
 pardon me... Okay. I'll accept.... tomorrow. But at no
 time did I put a hold on his Bill or any other Bill
 and I thought that his direction of criticism was directed
 towards me. I ... The... I didn't want to disturb the
 comments as far as on the Bill that was on consideration
 .. the Amendment so I just wanted to wait until the..
 until the end. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Providing two minutes for a perfunctory Session I move
 that we adjourn till 12:00 noon tomorrow and remind all
 Democrats to please come to the conference immediately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves we'll have two minutes
 perfunctory and the House stand adjourned till 12:00
 noon tomorrow. All in favor signify by saying 'aye';
 'aye'. The House stands adjourned after two minutes
 perfunct till 12:00 noon tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports; Representative Matijevich,
 Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I to which
 the following Bills were referred, action taken June
 21, 1979, report the same back with following recommen-
 dations, 'Do pass as amended' Senate Bill 891. Message
 from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker,
 I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives
 the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint
 Resolutions in the adoption of which I'm instructed to
 ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to
 wit; Senate Joint Resolution #64, adopted by the
 Senate June 21, 1979. Kenneth Wright Secretary. No
 further business. The House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 21, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0018	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
HB-0096	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-0148	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	11
SB-0010	2ND READING	PAGE	173
SB-0058	3RD READING	PAGE	171
SB-0080	2ND READING	PAGE	181
SB-0093	2ND READING	PAGE	59
SB-0263	2ND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0291	3RD READING	PAGE	58
SB-0292	3RD READING	PAGE	57
SB-0362	2ND READING	PAGE	100
	3RD READING	PAGE	129
SB-0375	2ND READING	PAGE	83
SB-0380	3RD READING	PAGE	111
SB-0381	3RD READING	PAGE	112
SB-0383	3RD READING	PAGE	113
SB-0404	3RD READING	PAGE	42
SB-0407	3RD READING	PAGE	59
SB-0432	3RD READING	PAGE	27
SB-0438	3RD READING	PAGE	96
SB-0455	3RD READING	PAGE	29
SB-0487	2ND READING	PAGE	117
	3RD READING	PAGE	127
SB-0494	3RD READING	PAGE	39
SB-0508	3RD READING	PAGE	97
SB-0542	3RD READING	PAGE	130
SB-0574	2ND READING	PAGE	81
SB-0590	3RD READING	PAGE	116
SB-0659	3RD READING	PAGE	114
SB-0756	2ND READING	PAGE	130
SB-0775	3RD READING	PAGE	135
SB-0864	3RD READING	PAGE	127
SB-0870	2ND READING	PAGE	180
SB-0873	3RD READING	PAGE	87
SB-0883	3RD READING	PAGE	137
SB-0884	3RD READING	PAGE	137
SB-0975	2ND READING	PAGE	48
SB-0983	3RD READING	PAGE	156
SB-1038	3RD READING	PAGE	49
SB-1150	3RD READING	PAGE	141
SB-1183	3RD READING	PAGE	155
SB-1217	3RD READING	PAGE	158
SB-1232	3RD READING	PAGE	2

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 21, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-1237	3RD READING	PAGE	52
SB-1271	2ND READING	PAGE	13
	MOTIONS	PAGE	11
SB-1316	3RD READING	PAGE	159
SB-1364	2ND READING	PAGE	20
SB-1412	2ND READING	PAGE	203
	3RD READING	PAGE	205
SB-1423	2ND READING	PAGE	15
HR-0390	1ST READING	PAGE	47
HR-0393	3RD READING	PAGE	45

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 21, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. GAMBRELL - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. CHAPMAN - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	47
MOTION TO SUSPEND RULE 35 (G)	PAGE	207
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	208
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	208
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	208