

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

Krueger: " In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh, Lord, bless this House with Thy service this day. Amen. Thomas Jefferson said, 'In matters of principle stand like a rock. In matters of taste, swim with the current.' Let us pray. Almighty God, who alone hast created all things, and established immutable law to govern them, we, Thy sons and daughters do proclaim our obedience and our dependence upon Thee. Help us, Oh, Lord, to establish that which is right as we are about our tasks serving in this House of Representatives. Prevent us, Oh, Lord, from the expediency of compromise. Strengthen us, Oh, Lord, with determination to stand for Thy commands in wisdom and, Oh, Lord, enlighten our minds to discern that which is transitory from that which is intransitory that the people of this State of Illinois may being governed to their good as Thou would have them to be. This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar in the pledge of allegiance."

Mahar: "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. Use only your own switch. Take the record. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills, the following title to wit; House Bills # 2545, 2378, 2355, 2411, 2414, 2420, 2436, and 2500 together with Amendments in the adoption



of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House passed by the Senate as amended June 26th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, the following title to wit; House Bills #2159, 2160, 2185, 2191, 2193, 2200, 2212, 2273, 2280, 2284, 2344, 2352, 2360, 2412, 2413, 2416, 2417, 2440, 2446, 2450, 2467, 2473, 2484, and 2522, passed by the Senate June 26th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "... The Brigadier General of DeKalb County Regular Reserves is now in the uniform of the day. Brigadier General Ebbesen, will you please stand? In uniform of the day of DeKalb County. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution #39, Oblinger, Senate Joint Resolution 59, Ed Meyer, Senate Joint Resolution 63, Wikoff, House Joint Resolution 62, Leverenz, House Resolution 408, Executive Committee, 409, Skinner-Carania, 410 Beatty, 411 Yourell, 413 Pechous, 414 Collins and Dawson, 415 Collins and Dawson, 416 Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Oblinger, Senate Joint Resolution 39 requests a nutrition program from federal-state government, Meyers Senate Joint Resolution 59 asks the Governor to proclaim a special energy conservation month, Wikoff's Senate Joint Resolution 63 honors Dr. Korbolee, House Joint Resolution 62 by Leverenz honors the American Association Women League Women Voters Sangamon County, Retired State Employees Association, and the Supreme from the Junior League. 408 by Capperelli studies the closing of gas stations, 409 by Skinner urges the Speaker of the House to institute a paper recycling program, 410 by Beatty honors the 25th anniversary, Yourell's 411 notes a Mr. Baldermo Ayson



of Oak Lawn, 413 by Pechous honors Lyons Landmark Day, 414 by Collins-Dawson a 50th wedding anniversary, 415 by Collins and Dawson another 50th wedding anniversary, and 416 by Kornowicz honors Central Steel and Wire Company and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Any further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 412, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. We do the Agreed Resolutions again? Representative Giorgi, do you want to move the Agreed Resolutions again?"

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Objections have been raised. The question's on the motion. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could include HJRC 13 in the Agreed Resolutions then I would remove my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "They say HJR 13 is that an Agreed Resolution? Is it agreed with the Governor?"

Totten: "The Governor has changed his position on Constitutional limits. He's only for his and nobody else's."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday because of attending a funeral. I believe it failed to get in the record and I would like unanimous consent for the record to show it that that was the reason for my absence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, the record will so show. Now what do we do? Who's the Sponsor? Representative... Is somebody manning the portal? Will you man the portals, Sir? On page nine on the Order of Nonconurrence, appears Senate Bill 505. Representative Neff is recognized."



Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've run into a little problem on the Senate Bill on 505 yesterday which is sponsored in the House by Representative Polk and myself. And we would at this time like to recede to nonconcur on Senate Bill 505 and ask for a Conference Committee to be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Neff's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 505. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The motion carries. The Conference Committee will be appointed. Wonder who can do that now? Representative Peters, will you come to the podium? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Molloy requests to be excused because of a death in his family?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. Attention. At ease, at ease troops. Colonel Mahar says that's as you were. Representative Simms, for what purpose are you pointing at Representative Rigney?"

Simms: "To bring to the Body's attention, let the record show that officially that Representative Rigney is celebrating his 50th birthday today and I wonder if the rules could be waived for Representative Swanstrom to sing 'Happy Birthday' to him?"

Speaker Redmond: "Are you sure? Was he born in leapear? Representative Ebbesen, did you hear Representative Simms'? Brigadier General Ebbesen won't permit it. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "While we're idling in low gear, I have a couple of motions I wondered if we wanted to get to?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't want to unless it's necessary. I'm a little afraid."

Ewell: "Alright. Well, I though we might improve the perfor-



mance of the morning show and thereby stimulate the attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm a little afraid right now."

Ewell: "Alright."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell, will you discuss the matter with Representative Jones? He has a matter and I deputize you to discuss it with him. "

Unknown: "Mr. Jones is short on silver up there so he's not the person to talk to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement, up in the Speaker's gallery is the High School class from Urbana High School lead by Mr. Dave Lemons and Representative Helen Satterthwaite, Tim Johnson and Wikoff. Up here in the Speaker's gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 2, Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, 1342, Representative Peters is recognized."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1342 passed out of the Judiciary II Committee unanimously. It was introduced on the recommendation of the Judges of the Juvenile Court, Judge White and Judge Magury and what it would provide for is some latitude on the part of the court in dealing with children who are in need of some social service and it establishes a category. Right now we have a category of minors in need of service. It would also establish a category of family in need of service. It is the feeling of Judge Magury and the people at the court that this would make it easier for the court to bring the social service necessary to the children without having to get involved in a legal battle in which



there would have to be fault found on the part of the parents or on the children. The Judge then could order a social service agency or some kind of supervision for the family or assistants of the family without having to go through the legal requirements the evidentiary requirements of finding one party at fault and putting the minor against a parent or the parent against the minor in terms of testimony. We would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page, 6, let's go to Concurrence and if any of these concurrences are.. that I call are really controversial then I would expect that the Member would take it out of the record. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think I have the least controcersial of any and that's on page 9, 2485 which is a.. they found one other obsolete law in the Reference Bureau which was added in the Senate..It's a legislative revisory.. revisionary nonsubstantive changes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay on the Order of Concurrence, on page 9, House Bill 2485. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is one of the revisory Bills that the Reference Bureau does every year and there was one other Section that needed to be revised and cleaned up. It's nonsubstantive as was the original Bill and as far as I know, there couldn't be any opposition to it."

Speaker Redmond: "You desire the House to concur in the Senate Amendment, is that correct?"



Friedrich: "Yes, Sir. I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2485?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2485. Representative Winchester, will you come up to the podium please? Oh. Representative Peters?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, on page 7, the last Bill, House Bill 1968, Concurrences."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1968. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed..."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, asking for an explanation. Mr. Speaker, what the.. What the Senate Amendments would do, the Bill itself as some of you may recall requires the testing for syphilis and venereal disease of women who are pregnant in order to attempt to avoid at least the retardation in children and certainly the protection of the women. What Senate Amendments 1 and 2 do is strike the word, 'venereal' and include the word 'syphilis' or some technical change involved there and Senate Amendment 2 would provide that a person who, because of religious grounds, objects to some kind of.. such kinds of tests and those kinds of tests were contrary to their religious beliefs and practices that they would not be forced to have that kind of test performed. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1968."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1968. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



Representative Steczo?"

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call for concurrence to House Bill 1811 too if this would be appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let's get this one done first. Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'aye', and no 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. 1811. Representative Williams?"

Williams: "When you get to that I would like to move to nonconcur on 955. We've got the agreement worked out and we could get that into Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "What page is that on?"

Williams: "On page 9 on Nonconcurrence, the last Bill, Senate Bill 955. There was a House Amendment put on by Representative Neff and he has agreed to remove that and..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get to that."

Williams: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo on 1811."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, House Bill 1811 passed the House nearly unanimously on the no debate list and it concerns discrimination between franchisees by franchisors. The Attorney General's Office and the groups representing the franchisees and the franchisors got together and drafted Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1811 because they felt that this particular Act needed more clarification. And the Bill as amended passed the Senate nearly unanimously and I would move to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1811."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "That's all well and good but what does it do?"

Steczko: "The Bill as originally drafted provided that it would



be an unfair franchise practice for a franchisor to discriminate between franchisees. This Amendment with the six exceptions to that Act where discrimination would be permissible."

Waddell: "And what are they?"

Steczo: "Number one, would be if the franchises were based on 1. if the discrimination were based on franchises granted at materially different times, if there were franchises with insufficient capital, if they were related to local or regional experimentation, if there was any violation of anti-trust statute, if there were certain deficiencies that had to be cured, or if the discrimination was not arbitrary."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1811. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 12... 131 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1811. 1123. Representative Daniels, one of the Sponsors, advises me that the Senate Amendment was put on at the request of the Department of Transportation to convey some property to the Illinois Central Railroad at the appraised price which appears in the file. He advises me that he is willing to have the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. The question's on the House concurrence motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1123. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was the Bill that there was some question as to what the property was in the city of Chicago and what.."



Speaker Redmond: "No. No. No. Well it's something in Cook County."

Totten: "But nobody knew.."

Speaker Redmond: "I.. had the Department of Transportation discuss it with the Sponsors and it's something less than an acre and the appraised price is in there. They recommended the Amendment. The original Bill was for a sliver of land to the village of 'Bensenville'..."

Totten: "It's less than an acre?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Totten: "It's less than an acre?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, the Senate Amendment is less than an acre. That's my understanding though. If you have any question about it, we'll take it out of the record. I had the same inquiry and I asked the DOT to tell me about it. They came in and told me that Senator Philip put the Amendment on in the House and Senate. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1123. Representative Lechowicz, will you come to the podium?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 79, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. On Concurrence page 6."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Apparently we have some problems in the wording so I would move that we nonconcur with the Senate Amendment and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur.. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "Bob, what are the problems ?"

Terzich: "My good consort, Harry Leinenweber,..."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, there was a provision with the Law Revision



Commission felt ... There was a requirement in the Eminent Domain Act that a wife, when the state or any public Body sought to condemn the property of a man, if he was married his wife must be made a party. Well, they struck that out which I thought was a good proposal and supported it when it was on Third Reading because it's not necessary under Illinois law unless an individual has an actual interest in property to be joined in an eminent domain proceedings. The Senate for some reason... put it back on and that is not only the wife, but the husband and it's really..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Amendment #1 on House Bill 79. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. The House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 79. House Bill 1811, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo. 1811? You've done that? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, on House Bill 2041."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2041 as amended in the Senate takes care of the .. The Amendment takes care of a problem. On May 17th Governor Thompson signed into law House Bill 367 which provided that recorders collect a real estate transfer tax of \$0.25 per \$500.00 and allow the counties to levy the other \$0.25 by ordinance. Since then a serious problem has come up in the administration and this Amendment is intended to correct the problem. The problem centers around the changes which have to occur in the design of the stamp and the stamp machines. This Amendment was worked out by the Illinois County Clerk's and Recorder's Association and Representative Yourell and I would urge the adoption in the passage of.. and concurrence to House Bill 2041."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2041?'"



All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye's, no 'nay's, none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2041. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1470. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1470 permits the use of private property if consent is witnessed. That's the way the Bill went to the Senate. The Senate felt there would be some problems if you required always a third person in attendance and struck the word 'witness'. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Reed: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "If you strike the third party witness then what basis would there exist to show that consent had been granted?"

Reed: "Existing law allows for written consent and it was the feeling of the Senate that if there were only the farmer at home and the snowmobiler, the farmer would then probably go ahead without any reluctance to either sign or simply agree between the two of them."

Schlickman: "So it would be one person's word against the other."

Reed: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1470?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted



who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'aye', 4 'nay', 6 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1470. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Page left some orange juice and some coffee on my desk and seatmates and somebody's probably looking for it. But not only that, there's some change which I... "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the coffee warm?"

Wikoff: "Still is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 1782. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "1782 amends the Criminal Code to include paramedics and other fire department employees along with firemen among the class of persons protected by the aggravated battery. Senate Amendment #1 simply specifies that paramedics and other fire department employees included in protection by aggravated battery or those employed by a municipality or other governmental units and I move that we would concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1782?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye', 2 'nay', 5 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1782. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 828. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf. Okay. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 2357. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."



Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2357. This is a Bill that was recommended to us by the Comptroller and the Auditor General. Amendment... The Senate Amendment simply further defines that printing that would fall under the category of up to \$50.00 would fall within the purview of contractual services. I would move that we would adopt the Senate Amendment and concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? You want to correct the number up there, Jack? It's 2357."

Barnes: "2357."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2357?' 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 142 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2357. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2206. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment ... There's a Bill pertains to increasing the teachers annual certification fee from \$2.00 to \$4.00. This money is used for teachers in service training shops and this Amendment mainly gives the teachers more input into these workshops and I move for its .. our concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2206. 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 138 'aye', 3 'no', none recorded as 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2206. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2310. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2310. The Senate Amendment #1 provides that there would be a two year rather than a one year term for student members...the student member and Amendment #2 says the student member cannot be a recipient of a scholarship while he is... during his term of office."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor tell us what the Bill does?"

Keane: "The Bill adds two members to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, one of them to be a student. The Senate indicated that they wanted to have rather than a one year term, a two year term of office. They felt that the student would be more effective. That was Amendment #1. Amendment #2 stated that while the student was a member, he could not have .. be a recipient of a scholarship."

Totten: "Does the student.. The student has all the rights as another member?"

Keane: "That's right. That was in the body of the Bill."

Totten: "Well, well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill then."

Speaker Lechowicz : "Please procede, Sir."

Totten: "The Sponsor is very keen in trying to put this one over on us, but the Bill has become no better with the Senate Amendments than it was when it resided in the House. To allow.. This is a series of Bills that are allowing



participation in voting and matters concerning welfare of people by the recipients who receive the benefits and has been said so aptly by. .indicated by many Members of the House, this.. this practice really bears serious scrutiny and I think in most parts bears ⁵ bad fruit. And these ideas and these proposals ought not to be passed. We're on a concurrence and the best way to beat the Bill is not to support the concurrence. I don't know what we'll do once it goes back into Conference Committee, but I oppose the concurrence and ask other Members to join me."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I share the views of the Gentleman that just spoke on this matter. Voting student member on any Board it seems to me is the ultimate in being ridiculous. On the Scholarship Commission though it seems to me to be particularly sensitive. The Commission is just now pulling itself out of what seems to have been a difficult period. They're solving their problems I'm given to understand and I think we ought to give them that opportunity to continue to solve their problems. To put a student on who is a voting member and who is dictated to by his peers and could not be elected to the position he has, unless he were doing the bidding of the.. his fellow students, seems to me to be absolutely wrong. If we permit it on the Scholarship Commission, I don't know why we wouldn't permit it on the Board of Higher Education and on the various other Boards and when the question of tuition increases came before them, they would be there on what platform, say if this were extended to the Board of Higher Education, and that platform would be 'do not raise tuitions' and that is not right. And I submit to you that this is a very poor concept and this should



be beaten thoroughly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. The Bill that is under discussion passed out of this House with 100 votes. The Senate has passed it. The order of discussion now seems to me to be concurrence with Senate Amendments, rather than with the name thrust of the Bill. I think the Senate has done a good job in tightening up the regulations about the length of time that a student would serve on the Board and in specifying that they not be a current recipient of a scholarship grant. Those, I think, are desirable conditions to put upon this Membership, but the question of Membership itself is not at stake right now on this vote. That has passed out of this House with an overwhelming vote of support. And I urge you to support and concur in these Senate Amendments which make a good Bill even better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten. This is final passage, Ma'am, so the whole Bill is before us."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely right. The whole subject matter of the Bill is up for discussion. This is final passage. It's just not the Amendments. We should be... It's good to see that the Speaker is on the right side this morning."

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

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with your rule and we are discussing the whole Bill and I agree with Representative Satterthwaite that this Amendment tightens it up. But the idea of the concept as she pointed out got 100 votes. I don't know what my colleagues in the 6th District are so worried about. One Member is not going to change the ruling of this Commission or the opinion when it comes to increases in tuition. I don't



know why people are so afraid or so antagonistic to young people when if you're old enough to be in college, certainly you're sensible enough to serve one .. one voting member only on this whole Board. I think it's an excellent Bill and I think it's an excellent Amendment and I urge support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, to close."

Keane: "Yes, yes. I would like to correct some information that one of the... those opposing this Bill provided. The student, according to Amendment... Because of Amendment, Senate Amendment #2, the student who is a member of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission cannot be a recipient of a scholarship while he serves. This removes any kind of conflict of interest. The question of whether or not students should be.. voting students should be allowed on Boards and Commissions has been discussed previously in the case of the Illinois State Scholarship, it's history. And it's the.. The services that are provided for students have been very bad and we need a student on there to represent. It's one out of nine people and it needs to... We need them to represent the students' rights. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2310?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Your light's on, Sir. Okay. The Lady .. Alright. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. As a Member of the Higher Education Committee who heard this Bill originally in Committee, and heard the beautiful testimony of some very mature college students. I strongly support this Bill. Representative Willer is right. One vote is not going to prevail on the



Scholarship Commission. It is going to give insight into the kind of financial aid that is really needed, where it will really do the most good for the most students. And that's what we have to keep in mind. Some people are prejudice against young people. I think that's a disaster. This is one way for young people to get the experience of serving on Boards and maybe some day they will serve in the General Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gene Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it seems like we have the prerequisite number of votes..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll get to you, Mr. Yourell, in a second."

Barnes: "I believe it seems that we may have the prerequisite number of votes, but let me suggest to the Members of the House in the case of this Commission, who would know better the current concerns of students that are either or beneficial or not beneficial of the scholarship grants than those who are now participating within the system? One of the problems on many of the Commissions that we have here that address itself on various subject matters and I can say that with some.. with some concern since I will be going to one of those Commissions pretty soon, is that you do not have people that are actively participating within that system so that they know of the current concern, the pluses and the minuses relative to it. I think if nothing more, this will bring to that Board one aspect or one point of view that that Board should be considering relative to the problems of the students that are now currently attending the institutions of higher learning. I would urge the support of the House for this Bill."

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

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have any particular feelings



on this Bill one way or another, but I don't think people should be running around the floor pushing other people's switches that are not here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would agree with Representative Yourell. There's a lot of people that are running around pushing other people's buttons and if, you know, I would suggest that we wipe this out and start with a new one. If not, I want to verify."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we.. ? I didn't believe this matter was this controversial as it is. We'll just take the thing out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2184. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. 2184."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with House Bill 2184."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves that we nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 (sic) to House Bill 22...2184. Is there any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2184. House Bill 2240. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to concur with Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Want to explain it?"

Dawson: "Amendment #2 requires that every public agency shall give preference to manufacturers located in the State of Illinois first and if not manufactured in the State of Illinois, then the United States of America."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield? What do they mean by 'preference'? That means the same bid or do you have to take a lower bid or higher bid or what?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson."



Dawson: "This is just advisory and permissive, Larry... Harry. This is on a bi-American Bill where there was .. As long as the purchase price is not, I believe, 15% more than it should be purchased here in the State of Illinois or the United States of America before they go to a foreign country."

Leinenweber: "Well, I'm reading from the synopsis which was passed out and it says, adds that every.. Senate Amendment #2 adds that every public agency shall give preference to manufacturers located in this state when purchasing products and materials for construction, alteration, repair .. more than 15% higher, that they must buy from the Illinois even though it's 15% more."

Dawson: "That is correct. If it's not more than 15% cost they have to purchase it here."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think we ought to know what we're doing here. I don't.. I don't... I'm looking at the Bill. The Bill I don't think was all that good either, but we are trying to keep.. get a handle on governmental costs and I would suggest that one of the big areas of governmental costs is in the field of construction. Now if we're going to give 15% leeway to Illinois construction companies that are Illinois firms, I would suspect that they're going to make sure they're at least 10% higher than the out of state brethren who they are bidding against. This has got to lead to an increase in cost. It also probably caused out of state bidders not to want to come in and bid, thus leaving all the work here for our local people which may sound good, but I would suggest it's going to be very expensive. So I would certainly urge that the Membership think twice before they vote for the concurrence with Senate Amendment #2."

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



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in opposition of the concurrence as well as passage of the Bill. As the prior speaker had indicated the fiscal impact of this measure could be drastic. It's going to dry up outside suppliers coming in to bid. The whole philosophy of buy America may sound good, or buy Illinois may sound good, but the eventual price tag to the consumer can be tremendous. You can buy products out of state. You can buy services out of state, especially in the construction area where states have lesser.. some of your neighboring states have lesser employment costs and can compete more effectively in the areas of that this Bill addresses. We could be asking for increased burdens on taxpayers, increased costs in the way of having to increase appropriations for following this procedure. The idea has .. sounds good, but the idea has some drastic implications and I think to implement this would do nothing but increase taxes in the state and it doesn't deserve our support."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "House Bill 2240 as amended in the House and as proposed to be amended by the Senate Amendment creates a new Act. Is that correct?"

Dawson: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "How do you resolve the conflict that would exist between this new Act and the existing purchasing Act which requires competitive bidding and requires the effected agency to accept only that bid which provides for the lower price and the best quality?"

Dawson: "At the request of Republican Members on Labor of Commerce and Representative Birkinbine this is where we came up with the 15% limit. And the other Amendment for the \$500.00 expenditure Amendment, that was by Repre-



sentative Simms. Both Amendments that were put on this Bill were working together of the Committee and the 2 Amendments were proposed by the Republican party."

Schlickman: "Well, I simply suggest that if this Bill were to be passed as amended by Senate Amendment #2 and approved by the Governor, would provide for a conflict between this new Act and the existing Act and as other Gentleman.. Members have pointed out, the existing Act insures that the state and the taxpayers of the state will receive products and services at the lowest price and the highest quality. This Bill is in conflict with those basic principles that we oppose not only upon ourselves at the state level, but upon units of local government and with them, I would join in opposing this motion to concur with Senate Amendment #2."

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

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I reluctantly rise to oppose this measure because of the Sponsor who indeed, gave a lot of hard work to this. I think we're faced with the possibility and certainly great probability that this will have a great hindrance on the exportation of Illinois products either food growing substances or manufactured items. And as you take into account the fact that we are a great exporting state, we really can't support this, even though the concept is an ideal that we all espouse to agree with. But it will certainly restrict and hamper our exporting particular of food stuff. I'm referring now in the new policy in the United States that we have towards the Republic of China. The possibility of exports to that country is indeed immense. And I don't think that this beginning in this infancy stage of the trade with New China that we can afford to pass this kind of restrictive legislation. And while I sympathize with my America, I also



sympathize with the State of Illinois and exportation of our products and I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill passed out of the House with 143 votes before and the Labor Commerce Committee a lot of effort into this and I believe it's good for the State of Illinois an also the United States and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2240?' All in favor 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Ralph. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, until a few years ago we had legislation such as this on our books. When we appeared before the Chamber of Commerce in the Quad City area the 3 Representatives from the 36th District were urged to vote for this type of legislation. Contracts were going over to Iowa. People were going over there buying, hiring, things like that. We were losing business. Our people, our businessmen in the Quad Cities told us that they wanted this legislation, that they needed it and it would prevent the jobs from going over to Iowa. I would suggest that some of you Republicans and some of you who look toward business reconsider this. It's good for my area. It's good for the state. Thank you."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the concurrence of this legislation. Representative Dawson says this was worked out in the Labor and Commerce Committee. Both the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and the Illinois Manufacturers



Association urges testimony in favor of the passage of this Bill. They felt that this would help the economic interests of the State of Illinois. We placed these Amendments on this Bill to make it a little bit more workable and I think it's a good compromise and I would urge some more green votes get on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, to explain his vote. "

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm totally in support of the free enterprise system and certainly the passage of this Bill, as is, totally discourages that. It provides the opportunity that only people in Illinois should have this kind of business opportunity. And I think that in order, in looking out for the best interest of the taxpayer, at least we ought to have the opportunity to accept the best and lowest bid, if at all possible. As has been stated before this is going to increase possible exports and I think in any exporting situation it is a situation of give and take. And we.. if passage of this Bill becomes a reality, there's no giving. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff!"

Balanoff: "I think that everyone who voted for Representative Griesheimer's Resolution on the war against Wisconsin to stop raiding our state... take... luring away industry, should be voting for this Bill. All this Bill does is say we're going to try to keep jobs and industry in Illinois so what I would urge those people who voted for that Wisconsin Resolution to vote for this Bill also. Thank you."

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

Huskey: "Well, there's enough votes up there now so there's no need of me saying anything. I favor this Bill because at least it gives the... it may not be a mandatory Bill, but at least it gives the officials that would



-- vote on local.. on passing these contracts locally it gives them the grounds to stand under quote- 'the State Statutes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'aye', 52 'no', 4 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2240. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2204, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman please."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2204. House Bill 2204 was related to bonds for special education purposes. When the Bill left the House we changed some of the language to have it provided for 8 years, as it is in the present law. We changed that to 20 and then we changed it back again. What the Senate did was to change to 20 years for the maturity date to 8 years and I move for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2204."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Will the Gentleman yield? "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Walsh: "As I quickly read this it appears that funds accumulated for special education capital purposes are being diverted to be used in what way?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman please?"

Hoffman: "Thank you. The Senate Amendment puts the law back in its condition as far as the dates of maturity that it was in before we introduced the Bill. We had changed the maturity dates from 8 years to 20 years. The Senate moved those dates back to the original



position of being 8 years. This has to do with the accumulation for special education purpose in the sale of notes against the special education tax levy. It also deals with the relationship of the use of the Capital Development Board for the additional building and special education facilities or the remodeling of other facilities to put them in a condition for special education purposes."

Walsh: "It switches from the Capital Development Board to the local school district the responsibility for building these buildings and provides a levy therefore?"

Hoffman: "No, what it does, it provides that any special .. any school district which qualifies for a special education construction grant pursuant to the Capital Development Board Act may finance the construction projects by levying a tax which is authorized in Section 17.2 and it's been there for a long time and issue bonds in a manner to provided in this Section at a rate not to exceed 7% and the maturity date is not more than 8 years from the date of issue because the levy is only for 8 years. So it brings those into conformity. It did say 20. The Senate changed it to 8."

Walsh : "Wasn't it 8 before?"

Hoffman: "That's right..."

Walsh: "And then we changed it from 8 to 20 and the Senate changed it from 20 to 8?"

Hoffman: "Took it back to where it was. That's right."

Walsh: "Well, then, what does the Bill do?"

Hoffman: "The Bill provides that the tax ... that you may sell bonds against this tax levy for special education purposes, but those bonds which went out of the House at 20 years must mature within 8 years, which is a period of time that you have to make the levy. It just conforms it. It's not.. That's all it does."

Walsh: "Thank you."



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

Borchers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Borchers: "I was interested in the tax levy. Is this without a referendum? Or is it... Can this be done with a referendum? Is a referendum mandatory?"

Hoffman: "This tax levy has always been a nonreferendum tax."

Borchers: "I didn't understand that. Did you say, without referendum or with referendum?"

Hoffman: "This tax has always been a nonreferendum tax."

Borchers: "Nonreferendum. That's what I wanted to find out."

Hoffman: "It's a 2¢ levy."

Borchers: "Sir?"

Hoffman: "It's a 2¢ levy, 2% levy."

Borchers: "Nonreferendum. Okay."

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: "I understand what the Amendments do, Mr. Hoffman, but I'm still not sure what you've asked for an extension of powers in the Bill."

Hoffman: "The extension is to provide that this tax may be used as the local share for the matching grant for a special education project under the Capital Development Board Act. Had a problem in Kankakee, for example, in Representative Ryan's district and we have 10 million dollars in the Capital Development Board program specifically identified for special education projects. If you remember back in 1975 we passed the School Bond Construction Act which provided 400 million dollars worth of capital development bonds too and then a grant program, a matching grant program, with local school districts for the building program. This provides that the authority that the school... that the



school district had to levy a 2¢ tax for special education purposes to be used as part of the matching grant with the Capital Development Board for the building or remodeling of schools for special education purposes."

Totten: "Okay. Then this would allow them to obtain additional financing through the sale of bonds."

Hoffman: "Yes. The sale of bonds that have to be paid, you know, ties in with the 2¢ levy they have in a perspective manner, which we've done before."

Totten: "Okay. The other day we had Representative McPike come before us asking us to transfer monies out of this fund because they couldn't use them and there are other districts which are not using them and yet you're coming forward asking for an expansion of financing powers."

Hoffman: "Well, you're not expanding the tax."

Totten: "I know that."

Hoffman: "Now, what Representative McPike came to us with was a special circumstance in a special district and of course, we can't legislate just for a district. We have to legislate generally. This provides that they may use this tax levy that they have and sell bonds against it that tie in with their grant the CDB being."

Totten: "That's correct. I just don't think it's a good idea Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Hoffman, correct me if I'm wrong.

The Bill merely provides that there is a grandfathering in potentially of old special ed projects for which state bond money could be used and an elimination of any new projects under bond authority. Is that right?"



Hoffman: "I'm sorry. Run that one by me again."

Stuffle: "The Bill earmarks ten million dollars for projects started before '78-'79. Correct?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Stuffle: "It doesn't cover new projects."

Hoffman: "No, it does not."

Stuffle: "It does not provide for any increased tax."

Hoffman: "No it does not."

Stuffle: "It merely provides for bond proceeds to be used and for the money to be raised to the existing tax."

Hoffman: "That is correct."

Stuffle: "I urge support of Representative Hoffman's position."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me on this relatively noncontroversial Bill. I had hoped we would be addressing the Amendment which reduced the date of maturity for the bonds from 20 years to 8 years and that's what I'm asking that we concur in. The Bill has already passed the House and I would ask for your support in this concurrence motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2204?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Lee. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'aye', 5 'no', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2204. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. Winchester in the chamber? Is Mr. Williams in the chamber? Williams? The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentle.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2414.:"

Winchester: "And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill



2414 was defeated on Third Reading in the Senate on a ten 'yes', 42 'no' vote. It was inadvertantly sent back to the House from the Senate with a.. with a 'do pass'... with an instruction.. with instructions to concur on the Senate Amendment. But since it failed in the Senate and inadvertantly came back to the House by mistake I would ask that this Bill be tabled at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman tables House Bill 2414. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that I was recorded 'aye' on Mr. Winchester's motion to table?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Definitely. It was unanimous."

Madigan: "I supported that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's have a Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. I want to change some of those greens over there? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Pierce is excused because of the death of his father?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Madigan, I believe that it was also the case yesterday and I don't believe he was excused so would the record show... Was he excused yesterday? Alright. The record will so indicate. Mr. Ryan, do you have any excused absences? Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "It's taken care of already, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "For today? Okay."

Telcser: "Representative Molloy will be absent today because of a death in the family."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The record will so indicate. Clerk will take the record. On the Calendar in the area of Non-concurrence on page 9 appears Senate Bill 955. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let's see. I would move to nonconcur and



ask that a Conference Committee be appointed. Actually this is, let's see, all been worked out. Representative Neff had let's see, Amendment #2 which he has agreed to withdraw and Senator Schaffer is going to let him.

We'll say concur in that and we have a new language which has been agreed to by Representative Neff and Senator Schaffer. Let's see, IDOT in every one so

I would move that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on Senate Bill 955. All in favor... Refuse to recede. I'm sorry. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. And the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 955 and he requests a Conference Committee be formed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Order of Nonconurrence is Senate Bill 188. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 188 amends..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Elmer, I think it's worked out. Please proceed, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Amends an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sales on credit and lending of money. It provides parity with provisions regulating national banks while allowing state banks to receive and collect interest and charges at a rate of 1% in excess of the discount rate on ninety-day commercial paper in effect at the Federal Reserve Bank. The House put on an Amendment for a variable rate mortgages, the Senate had refused to concur. I now move to recede from House Amendment #1 so that the Bill can go to the Governor merely on the important point of allowing state banks to charge the same interest as national banks for personal loans. There were some rumors that this Bill was to be used as a vehicle. It is not to be used as a vehicle. Consequently, I am moving to recede and I would ask for favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Leinenweber is absolutely right. There were some questions that this might be used as a vehicle for another piece of legislation. He has deferred from that position and I would urge support of his motion to recede at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 188. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Final passage. Want to record me as 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the



record. On this question there is 135 'ayes', 0 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present' and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #...it does recede from Amendment #1 to Senate 188. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill...Since we're on that order of business, Senate Bill 289, Mr. Getty. Out of the record. Senate Bill 563, Mr. Yourell. Mr. Yourell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 769, Mr. Peters. Out of the record. I think our Membership is pretty well here. Let us go to the area of concurrence starting on Page 6, we'll work down the Calendar. First Bill is House Bill 666. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Could we take that out of the record for the time being, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to go to 1686, Sir?"

Kempiners: "Yeah, we can take that now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave. 1686."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1686. It is .. That Amendment is a Bill which did not get out of Committee in this House and it is not related to the purpose of my Bill. So for that reason, I'm moving that we nonconcur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that we nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1686. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1686. Okay. House Bill 676, Mr. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 676. House Bill 676 is the Bill that provides for permissive legislation permitting township collectors to deposit funds in savings and loans. All the Senate Amendment #2 does is make a couple of technical corrections and provides that



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

in counties of less than 150,000, the County Board upon request by the county collector may also deposit funds in savings and loans and I move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 676?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Mr. Hanahan, would you kindly press my button? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'aye', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur ~~in~~ Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 676. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 828. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move that we nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 and that a Conference Committee be set up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 828. All in favor say 'aye'.. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it when motions to nonconcur are made that we be given a brief description of the Bill and a brief description of the Amendment and the reasons for nonconcurring. I respectfully mention, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that when we do nonconcur, that is a communications to the Senate that it's the sense of the House that the motion... that the Amendment not be concurred with and if we are an intelligent deliberative Body, I think we ought to know what we're doing."

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

Wolf: "The Gentleman is absolutely correct. This is a technical Amendment and if you might recall, Mr. Schlickman, I don't know if you were here Sunday night. It may be



possible you were absent. I could not get enough votes to pass the Bill in this condition. That's why we want it back to a Conference Committee to try to straighten it out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. And the House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 828 and requests a Conference Committee be formed. House Bill 905, Mr. McGrew? Out of the record. House Bill 1098. Cissy Stiehl. Out of the record. House Bill 1196, Mr. Reilly. Mr. Reilly? Out of the record. House Bill 1260, Mr. Bradley. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. House Bill 1325, Mr. Robbins?"

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, they asked me to take that out yesterday. I don't know whether the other side is ready to go or not. Is Mr. Slape on the floor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is who?"

Robbins: "Slape. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "He should be. Proceed."

Robbins: "If there are no objections, I would like to have concurrence on this Bill. The Bill allows a road commissioner to post the roads and to im..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Better take it out of the record. House Bill 1461, Mr. Hoffman? Out of the record. House Bill 1478, Mrs. Catania. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1478. This is the Bill which would provide that insurance companies that write business overhead expense policies would make available to home-makers disability insurance policies. The Senate Amendment clarified that and put in a floor at the request of Dwayne Williams from Washington National and Mr. Watson that we make it clear that they would make available to people this kind of coverage and that



there would be a floor of \$300 per month. I move for concurrence with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1478?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye', 5 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1478. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1482, Mr. Katz? Mr. Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1482. The Bill requires .. provides that State's Attorney shall notify by first class mail complaining witnesses of the final disposition of the cases arising from their complaint. The Senate Amendment limits that to just cases where there's inditement on information. I would move that we concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1482?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'aye', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1482. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1526. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1526. This merely adds port districts and park districts to those entities which along with



counties and cities may jointly operate airports. All of these entities currently operate airports and it merely expands it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1526?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 125 'aye', 11 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1526. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1535, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider. Pardon me? Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. House Bill 1560, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to 1560. It's a clarifying Amendment which was drafted by the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement. It simply clarifies that when local police and sheriff's departments report on attempted crimes, or crimes they will check off an additional column which indicates whether it's a crime or attempted crime was committed in a domestic violence context. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1560?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jaffe, you're next. Have all voted who wish? Jaffe, you're next. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'aye', 9 'no', 5 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1560. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1576.



Take it out of the record, request of the Sponsor.

The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Robbins: "I move nonconcurrency on 1325."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What?"

Robbins: "I move nonconcurrency on House Bill 1325."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1325? The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins. The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur..."

Robbins: "They say the Bill as amended in the Senate will allow county road commissioners to set speed limits and sometimes where they drive over the roads I think that would be good, but since I can't get it out that way, I move nonconcurrency."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1260. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1325. House Bill...on page 7 in the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 1623. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duynes...We'll get back to you. House Bill 1681, Mr. Watson, out of the record. House Bill 1693, Mr. Giorgi. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. Want to correct the Board? 1693."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1693. All it says is that treasurer's funds must be in interest bearing accounts, and they must earn interest, and they can be in accounts that can be drawn in 30 days for the needs of the various units of government. I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1,... oh, I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment says 'must' on that Bill that the treasurer must deposit this, and what is the time... I want to ask a question on this. How soon must they put that money on interest? The next day?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "As soon as practical and they can take out what they think they might anticipate and need in 30 days. As soon as practical."

Robbins: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall that House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1693. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present', and the House



does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1693. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1769, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: " Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1769, first let me tell you what the Bill did. The Bill changed the definition of cooperative library systems and consolidated library systems to require at least ten rather than two libraries to be in the system. That's the way the Bill passed out. Senate Amendment #1 did not change the original provisions of the Bill, but rather added a new Section which provides for the creation of a Library Study Commission. The Commission is one that was endorsed by the Illinois Library Association and I understand the Secretary of State and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1769."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question!"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "With all the library legislation we've already passed in this Session to give it all away to them, why do we need to have a Library Study Commission for another couple of years of throwing Billssin on us?"

Yourell: "Well, I can't answer that question directly since I was not privy to the .. to the debate on the .. on the presentation of Senate Amendment #1. But I can suggest to you that this is not a new idea. We've been trying to create a Library Study Commission for many years and I see no reason why we shouldn't do that. The Commission is abolished on July 1st, 1981. It'll be in effect for two years and that's all I can tell you, Representative."



Pullen: "I'd like to speak to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

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

Pullen: "As the Sponsor indicates, some Members of this Legislature have been trying to create a Library Study Commission for years now, in fact, the Bill to do that very thing died in this House this spring and so did the appropriation for \$50,000 for this proposed Library Study Commission. We've done the right thing before. I suggest that we do the right thing again. Let's defeat this concurrence and tell the Senate we didn't want the Library Study Commission before and that's why we beat the House Bill. We don't want it any better when it's their Bill."

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

Yourell: "Well, just briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really don't know what the objection to the creation of the Library Study Commission. It's nothing new. I think it's necessary. I think it's needed and I again move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1769."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1769?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't get a chance to.. Is this another Commission again? Is that what this is? Another Library Commission?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "It's not another one. It's the only one."

Wolf: "One's enough."

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

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, previously introduced in this Session of the Legislature were 2 Bills creating the Library Study Commission. One was



Senate Bill 913, the other, House Bill 2764. Obviously neither one of those Bills were passed and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, an Amendment to a House Bill is not the appropriate way to avoid the process. If we kill Bills previously or for lack of merit they haven't succeeded, I don't think this should be the means by which to avoid the consensus of the Legislature. I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, each of those 2 Bills had an accompanying appropriations Bill. It's going to cost money. We don't know how much. We previously rejected by one means or another the proposal and I would urge a 'no' vote on concurrence."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'no' on this because 2764 came to the City and Villages Committee and it came so late that we were unable to really look at it in any great detail and a Subcommittee of Cities and Villages has already been appointed to study this matter over the summer and report back. So I think there would be a saving. It'd be a duplication of effort on the legislation because 2764 is a major codification of library law. Now there isn't any need for 2 groups to be studying it and I think the Subcommittee of the House is a proper place to study it."

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

Skinner: "Unless you want to take the record real quick.. All of the library legislation that you've seen in the past half decade has come from a Subcommittee of the House Revenue Committee during the '73-'74 Session on which I served and which about four or five other Members who are still in the House served. I think we did a more



than adequate job in charting the future of library financing in the State of Illinois. All those Bills have now been enacted. And it really seems to me that if libraries need additional funding, that a legislative Subcommittee, pick whatever Committee you want, is a more appropriate place to put it than in another Commission. We just don't need another Commission. We've proven that in the early '70's."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd urge some more 'aye' votes on this. I think the libraries are one of the most important institutions we have in our state. I think the fact that we did have a Subcommittee Revenue Committee to do some work on libraries, held hearings one summer and as Representative from Lake just said.. the Representative from wherever.. McHenry County said, it did do some good and I think a study Commission is necessary, I think it's good that we would have one. I'd urge some more 'aye' votes so that we can go about the work of finding out what libraries need and forming a study Commission made up of House and Senate Members. I'd urge some more 'aye' votes. I'd appreciate it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Let's try a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees. Kindly record Mr. Reilly as 'aye'. Mr. Mahar?"

Mahar: "Thank you. If this reaches 89 votes, I'd like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig. Kindly record him as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, as 'aye'. Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'."



Mr. Mautino 'aye'. What's the court now, Jack? On this question there are 92 'aye', and 55 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, requests a verification. Do you persist? The Gentleman persists. The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Oh, I'm sorry. Didn't we.. Continue to poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Campbell. Capuzi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Capuzi as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Currie."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Currie? Mrs. Currie? Kindly record her as 'aye'. Mrs. Braun. Kindly record Braun as 'aye'. Continue please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster. Gaines. Hoffman. Kane. Kozubowski. Kucharski. McAuliffe. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Peters. Pierce. Schuneman. Stearney. No further."

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

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, can I have leave to be verified now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman wants leave. Leave is granted. What's the count now, Jack? 95 'aye'. Mr. Gaines. Kindly record Mr. Gaines as 'aye'. Mr. Rea, leave to be verified? Leave. What's the count, Jack? 96 'aye'. The Gentleman persists in his verification? They're all here. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hoxsey: "To be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're a 'no', Ma'am."

Hoxsey: "Okay. Fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to change your vote, we can verify you. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi.



Chapman. Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr Vinson asks leave to be verified? Leave.

And Mr. Johnson. Mr. Leon. Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Williams as 'aye' please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Harris and Mautino want to be.. leave to be verified and Brummer. And Brummer. That's 3. Fine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from 'Grundy', Mr. Christensen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Christensen: "Could I have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijeovich. Mautino. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pouncey.."

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

Anderson: "Leave to be verified please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified? Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breston. Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. "

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

Henry: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified. Henry and Dawson. Leave."



Clerk O'Brien: "Steczo. E.G. Steele. C.M. Steihl. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vinson. Von Boeckman. White. Wikoff. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Beatty?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty?"

Mahar: "Beatty."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Beatty in the chamber? Beatty? There he is."

Mahar: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cappareilli, he's on the floor."

Mahar: "Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman. She's right by.. She's on the floor."

Mahar: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doyle is here."

Mahar: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley? Mr. Farley? Yeah, he's.. No. It's Farley, isn't it?"

Mahar: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him."

Mahar: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa is on the floor."

Mahar: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan's here."

Mahar: "Hannig."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hannig is in his chair."

Mahar: "Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Harris has leave to be verified."

Mahar: "Emil Jones."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Emil Jones is here."

Mahar: "Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz? Mr Katz? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz in the chamber? Remove him."

Mahar: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz? He's here."

Mahar: "McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McBroom? He was just here."

Mahar: "Is he here now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're going to get him. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. McBroom?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the chamber, right there^e in the back middle aisle."

Mahar: "Pouncey?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pouncey? He's always here."

Mahar: "E.G. Steele?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "E.G. Steele? He's right there."

Mahar: "Stuffle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stuffle. Mr. Stuffle? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's on the.. He's in the chamber."

Mahar: "Kent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Kent? How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mrs. Kent in the chamber? Remove her."

Mahar: "Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Steczo. He's here."

Mahar: "Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp. Mr. Sharp in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sharp? Remove him."

Mahar: "McClain.. McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain's in his chair."

Mahar: "Mr. Preston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is there."

Mahar: "That's... No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 93 'aye',
55 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment
#1 to House Bill 1769. This Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 1771, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House, House Bill 1771 as it passed out of the
House had to do with working cash funds for libraries.
And as you know, they're allowed a tax levy of 0.05
which is in addition to the corporate levy. This
amount, this levy, can only be for four years. But
the four years need not be successive. Now there was
a problem with the Senate, obviously, as to that kind
of authorization since it has been the practice of
some agencies to abolish the fund by transferring
the money and then start building up the fund again,
abolish it and building it up and abolishing it and so
on. This Amendment provides and I think it's a good
Amendment, that if a working cash fund is abolished
it takes referendum approval to re-establish the fund.
And thus, the tax in itself to levy supporting the funds.
The need for the referendum of course makes it less
easy to abolish funds and then start them up again and
should effectively limit the use of the working cash
funds for which..purposes :for which it is intended.
And I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 1771."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question
is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to



House Bill 1771?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 129 'aye', 11 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1771. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1790. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we nonconcur with the Senate Amendment on Senate.. House Bill 1790. It was supposed to be a technical Amendment, but I don't believe it's correctly amended the Bill. We'd ask for a Conference Committee to be appointed to get the Bill in proper order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1790.

All in favor signify by saying 'aye','aye'; opposed. The House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1790. Conference Committee is requested. House Bill 1802. The Gentleman from Cook , Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1802 as you know by your Digest, which is correct, is.. requires buses operating in any part of local mass transit system to be equipped with radio services. Senate Amendment #1 change... changes named therein relative to insuring that we're only talking about mass transit systems. It changes and adds a more definitive definition that intra-state carriers are exempted from these provisions and it changes somewhat the date in time that would be effective on the mass transit carriers. I would move that the House do concur with the Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 1802."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman



moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 1802. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye', 3 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1802 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1623. Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1623 has to do with making application for the health maintenance facility.. applications for operation of the health maintenance facility. And it strictly has to do with getting this certificate of authority and I move for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1623?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'aye', no 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1623. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1804, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Again, House Bill 1804 creates a mass transit training program. Senate Amendment #1 defines mass transit carriers and again exempts intra-state carriers from this provision which we were not attempting to address. Senate Amendment #2 merely clarifies some language relative to the program in which the training would be inclusive therein. I would move that the House do adopt (sic) Senate Amendment 1 and 2.. concur



with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 1804."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes, according to the Calendar there's only one Amendment, Senate Amendment #1."

Barnes: "I'm sorry. Well, it's listed here. You're right. Correct. It's two parts to Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1804.

Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 1804?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye, 2 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1804. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1805. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Totten please. Totten?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, on that last Bill, our LIS print out shows that there were two Senate Amendments adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Calendar shows one Amendment. The message shows one Amendment. Your analysis is wrong as usual."

Totten: "It's the print out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh..."

Totten: "Shows two..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1805. The Clerk only has one Amendment, Sir, from the Message from the Senate. We'll look it up. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, on 1805? We'll get back to you on the.. on your question Mr. Totten."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1805 amends the Metropolitan Authority Act to provide safety 'glazing' materials to be installed in windows of the ticket booths operated



by the authority. Senate Amendment #1 merely clarifies that. It adds that the Board teller shall establish a program relative to the installation and that priority will be given to the booth which agents are stationed on a 24 hour basis and I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1805."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to check to see if my light was working. I wanted to raise the same question on two other Bills, had my light on and I thought it wasn't working. Apparently it is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I had the Calendar over there, Dwight. Is there any discussion on House Bill 1805? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1805?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'aye', no 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1805. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk informs me that there is only one Amendment that was brought in by a message on House Bill 1804 from the Senate. We concurred in one. If there is another Amendment then he'll put it back on the Calendar. House Bill 1840. Mr. Steczo. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo. Put him on."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1840 originally stated that signature requirements for statewide new political parties and independent candidates in this state be one percent of the number of voters who voted in the last statewide general election. Senate Amendment #1 changed that requirement to one percent of the voters who voted in the last statewide general



election or 25,000 whichever is less. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1840."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would this mean 250 then? One percent of 25,000?"

Steczo: "No. It says one percent or 25,000, whichever is less."

Friedrich: "Or it could be 25,000, not one percent of 25,000."

Steczo: "Yes."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Larry, for those people who may be starting a new political party, the Larry Steczo political party for example, would that mean that since there have been no votes in the previous election that you would have to have 200... or 25,000 signatures on a petition in order to start a new party?"

Steczo: "Right. The Bill as originally passed said one percent of those voting in the proceeding statewide election. The Senate... This is only statewide. And the.."

Schuneman: "Oh. Only for statewide candidates?"

Steczo: "Yeah, and 25,000 would be the cap."

Schuneman: "Okay. Does this change the numbers for state Representatives or State Senators?"

Steczo: "No, it doesn't. It does not."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1840?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1840. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,



is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1841, the Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin."

Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, as you can see from your analysis, Amendment #1 is the Bill, House Bill 1841. This Bill does not deal with the subject of our indentation. All it does is that it requires that weapons be confiscated if they were used by a convicted criminal to perpetrate the crime for which he was convicted.

Senate Amendment #1 would exempt from that provision Amend... or violations of the Fish Code and the Game Code. I agree with the Amendment and ask that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1841."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1841?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, isn't this another gun control effort? Doesn't this deal with confiscation of weapons even though they aren't used in a crime?"

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

Breslin: "It .. That's .. What it does is it requires that the weapon be used in the commission of the crime and the person be convicted of that crime."

Brummer: "Well, it deals with the confiscation of a gun, does it not?"

Breslin: "Weapons.. weapons."

Brummer: "Well, isn't the gun a weapon?"

Breslin: "It can be, yes."

Brummer: "Well, the people that are concerned about gun control will probably be voting 'no' on this."

Breslin: "I doubt it. I doubt it."

Brummer: "Why not?"

Breslin: "Because I happen to be one of those people who's opposed to gun control. However, I think that people who opposed gun control would like to have guns used in



the commission of a crime confiscated. I don't think they want guns in the hands of the wrong people and I think that's one of the things that hurts their cause, our cause."

Brummer: "The ... Our analysis on this of the Senate Amendment says that the weapons that would be confiscated whether it was used or possessed by the offender. In other words, it may have not necessarily been used in the commission of the crime, but merely because the gun was possessed by someone who was involved in a crime that gun would be confiscated. And I would certainly think all those people concerned about gun control would be wanting to vote 'no' and nonconcur on this."

Breslin: "Your analysis is incorrect. It was amended on its face in Committee. The Senate Amendment says and I'll quote, 'The provisions of this Section shall not apply to violations of the Fish Code of 1971 or the Game Code of 1971 as now or hereafter amended. Confiscation of weapons for Fish and Game Code violations shall be only as provided in such Codes.'"

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

Kosinski: "Will Mrs. Breslin answer a question please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Kosinski: "Now if, in the event a person is picked up on the street carrying a weapon, is that considered a crime?"

Breslin: "Only if they have.. are in violation of the carrying of weapons laws."

Kosinski: "That would be a crime then. Presume that a store-keeper is on his way home with a weapon in his possession to protect valuables and he is picked up in violation of that Act. Would that gun then be confiscated or destroyed?"

Breslin: "No. The present law provides that weapons cannot be confiscated unless the offender is convicted of an unlawful use of weapons charge. He has to be convicted of



an unlawful use of weapons."

Kosinski: "Well, would carrying the gun on the street be an unlawful use of weapons?"

Breslin: "Well, it would depend on the circumstances. I mean if he's not in lawful possession of the gun..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon.."

Breslin: "That's the present law..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, well, when I was first elected to the Legislature I was one of the strongest opponents for gun control. I thoroughly, I hope I'm still in that position. I thoroughly believe in the right to have weapons and I do not fear this Amendment whatsoever. I feel that this is a good Amendment. After all, someone gets ready to hold me up, and does hold me up, I hope they confiscate that weapon. I see nothing wrong with that. People that are for the use of guns unlawfully should lose their guns. That they're going to try to take my gun away from me unless I use it unlawfully, I mean to resist."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye', 16 'nay', 9 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1841. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1873, Mr. McAuliffe. Out of the record. House Bill 1888, Mr. Schneider. Out of the record. House Bill 1921, Mr. McClain. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1921. House Bill 1921 dealt with the.. amended the Business Corporation



Act. And it dealt with assumed names. This Amendment would provide that a foreign corporation may transact business in the State of Illinois without going back to their home state and changing their corporate name and we'll be able to utilize this new provision assumed name process in the state that we have here. The Bill is supported and written by the Office of Secretary of State Corporation Division and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Generally under the assumed name law you file with the County Clerk. Is .. But with the corporation do you file with the Secretary of State, has that been the practice in the past?"

McClain: "No, Dwight what's happened is.. no that process would still happen. What we are doing though is in the strict reading of the Business Corporation Act if a business, let's say Michael F. McClain Inc., I found my certificate of incorporation in the State of Illinois and therefore I can practice .. transact business, I then come back in my local community and I run M.F.M. Ink, which is in violation of the assumed name provision. So all we do is we amend that saying that that corporation now may file under the assumed name process as M.F.M. Ink and not be in violation of the Act. So they would file within the county."

Friedrich: "You have to file within the county too?"

McClain: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "Okay. Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1921. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1921. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1922. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1922 is one of the series of chop shop Bills, which has...have passed through this House. In the Senate, Amendments were put on, and I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to this Bill. It provides for clean up of definitions to exclude terms which are already defined. It tightens up the existing language for offenses relating to motor vehicles. For example, vehicle part is included with vehicle, so that the definition relates not only to the car, but to the parts of the car. It redefines an automotive parts recycler, and adds new definitions of scrap processor, which includes the very specific activities of that industry and relieves problems which they had with the Bill. It provides for the inspection of the licensee's established place of business premises to verify the records required to be kept. It provides for separate recordkeeping requirements for the scrap processors tailored to their industry, and deletes the provisions which require the Secretary of State to revoke or suspend a license of the licensee upon notification of federal or state government of a tax lien. I would move for concurrence in Amendment #1 to Senate...to House Bill 1922, which, it generally, revamps the requirements concerning operations by auto rebuilders. It will provide for a great strengthening tool for the Secretary of State in his



fight against 'chop shops'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak against the concurrence motion, but I'd just like to ask the Sponsor one question if he'll yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Flinn: "Does this...I was listening, and I didn't hear you say, does this take care of the auto setters' problem that they had?"

Getty: "Yes, Sir."

Flinn: "Thank you very much."

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

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Have the...are these provisions agreed to by the legitimate auto recyclers?"

Getty: "Yes, Sir."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1922?'. 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 146 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1922. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1939. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

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

I would move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1939 so we can get it into Conference Committee and work out the details."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1944 (sic). All in favor signify..."



Catania: "1939."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. 1939. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. And the House nonconcurrs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1939. House Bill 1944. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Senate added one Amendment to the 'Sunset Act'. It was an Amendment permitting the select joint Committee to hire staff. It also provides that an agency that has been discontinued cannot continue functioning after a period of more than a year. The rest were technical changes involving renumbering. I would move concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Katz, could you take this out of the record for a minute so I..."

Katz: "Surely. Be glad to. Mr. Ryan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record. Okay on page 8 appears House Bill 2111, Mr. Mautino? Out of the record. House Bill 2129, Mrs. Chapman? Mrs. Chapman? Out of the record. House Bill 20.. Mrs. Chapman. 2132, out of the record. 2148, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill (sic) 2148 was one of the assessor of Bills that we passed out of the House, the comprised package, and this established post election qualifications for those assessing districts under 25,000 population. There was an Amendment adopted in the Senate, Senate Amendment #1, which we certainly have no objection to the intent of the Amendment, but it looks as if it makes pre-existing qualifications for those assessors under those jurisdictions and we have, as I say, we have no objection to what the intent was, but we would like to not concur in Senate Amendment #1 and work out the language to do what was intended. I think what they were



.. I see you looking at me questioning me, Getty; but what the intent was on vacancies. Alright. Take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2161, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 clearly makes a small change. It changes the word the Board may suspend or delay judgement to censor party response. Basically this Amendment will have the same effect as the original Bill. It was suggested by the Department of Registration and Education and Senator Nash placed the Amendment on the Bill and I concur with it and I would move that the House do concur with the Amendment to House Bill 2161."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall...' The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Well doesn't this weaken this legislation? You're changing it.. the penalty from suspension or delay implementation of judgement, to just censor? Isn't a suspension more serious than a censor?"

Simms: "The Board may suspend or delay implementation of judgement. They may also revoke or suspend. It gives them the additional option of suspending or delaying judgement."

Darrow: "Are the pharmacists in favor of this weakened language?"

Simms: "Yes."

Darrow: "Well, as long as they like weaker language, we'll go with it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2161?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye', no 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2161. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2168, Mr. Daniels? Daniels? Mr. Ryan. Out of the record. House Bill 2228, Mr. Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2228 the subject matter dealing with that legislation has to do with the Election Code and the Campaign Financing Disclosure Article. It was a suggestion made by the State Board of Election and the Advisory Committee to the State Board and what it does was made some technical changes relative to the notice of obligation and the manual and so forth that an individual receives when he files his nominating petitions and papers. Senate Amendment #1 made technical changes in that system in Section 916 and I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2228."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2228?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'aye', no 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2228.

This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. "



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2233, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I haven't seen the Amendment itself but according to the Digest Senate Amendment #1 merely adds the requirement that in the Section of the School Code in regard to the annual budget, it requires the budget to be entered upon a school district budget form prepared and provided by the State Board of Education. It requires adoption of the annual budget by September 1st of each year and provides that all school districts shall use the program budget, the county system by fiscal year 1981. And I would move to concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? How about Amendments 2 and 3, Mr. Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "I believe that those Amendments, Mr. Speaker, deal with a check off system and I would move to concur in those too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill 2233. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Yes, I will."

Walsh: "Amendments 2 and 3 deal with what?"

Jaffe: "I believe that they deal with the check off for union dues and permits them to, you know, permits the school district to deduct that from the salaries."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this doesn't permit the school district to check off or to withhold union dues or payments for.. payments to the credit union or for whatever reason. It requires



that the school district do that at the direction of the school employee, probably a teacher. Now, I suggest to you that this is a bad idea and has no business in this Bill. There's no reason on earth why a school district using taxpayer's money should be checking off union dues and should be checking off payments to credit unions under the control of the union for the benefit of whomever. And I suggest to you also that this could very well include contributions to political campaigns. This is not a good idea. A public body shouldn't have that requirement. There are taxpayers who are paying for the upkeep of those schools that may disagree absolutely with the purposes for which those things are being checked off. And I submit to you that this is wrong and I'm surprised at the Gentleman for moving to concur."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to the last speaker, I do now have the Amendment before me and as usual Representative Walsh is totally incorrect. I will read the language to you, 'The Board shall upon the written request of an employee..'- There has to be a written request upon the employee.- 'withhold from the compensation of that employee any dues, payments or contributions payable by that employee..' etc.etc.etc. So, there has to be a request by that employee and I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1,2, and 3."

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

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, this concurrence affects Senate Amendment #1 and I'd just like to point out to the Membership here is the State Board of Education dictating what kind of report forms that these local Boards of Education may use. It's an accounting procedure that the local Board ought to maintain by themselves. I don't think we should say to the local district that they've



got to change their accounting things to meet the State standards. As long as it's a prescribed certified accounting system, that ought to be good enough. We on the State level shouldn't be dictating what kind of forms the local districts should use and Senate Amendment #1 certainly ought to be defeated. And I would move so."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "Are the Amendments germane to the law?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What was the question, Sir?"

Robbins: "Are the Amendments germane?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendments are germane. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to close."

Jaffe: "Yes, I think that we've explained the 3 Amendments.

Basically, you know, Amendment #1 requires that the School Boards use the forms that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's closing now, Sir. No he did not respond to your question. He informed me that you were incorrect. Please proceed."

Jaffe: "Well I think that we, you know, that we really have discussed all 3 Amendments and I think everybody knows what they are and I would just solicit an 'aye' vote on concurrence on Amendments 1,2,3 of the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1,2, and 3 to House Bill 2233?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'aye', 31 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1,2, and 3 in House Bill 2233. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2237, the Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Senate Amendment merely tightens up the qualifications and I move for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2237?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'aye', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2237. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2268. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower. Bower? Out of the record. House Bill 2283. Out of the record. House Bill 2291, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2291. The Senate Amendment which was introduced by our former colleague, Representative. er Senator Sangmeister, removes as 'and' that would have permitted double prosecution of both the owner and the driver. The basic Bill is a Bill which increases the penalties and fines for overweight trucks. I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2291?' 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 133 'aye', no 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2291. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared



passed. The Gentleman.. House Bill... Let's back up for one second, House Bill 1681. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1681. The Senate Amendment authorizes the Secretary of State to issue special registration plates to former Members of the General Assembly. I'd like to move for concurrence and approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute, is there any discussion? The question ... The.. Why don't we take this thing out of the record? And we'll get back to it later. Take it out of the record. House Bill 2305. Mr. O'Brien? Mr. O'Brien? 2305."

O'Brien: "I move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to explain the concurrence please?"

O'Brien: "Yes, the concurrence, to the best of my knowledge, simply drops the licensing fees from 100% increase to a 50% increase."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane.. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I think this has to do with commencing action within 3 years, civil action for recovery for amounts, rather than fees."

O'Brien: "Yeah, I stand corrected. I didn't have it in front of me. That's exactly what it does. Representative Kane is correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion?"

Kane: "What's the purpose of deletion or what's the effect of that deletion?"

O'Brien: "Why don't we take it out of the record and get back to it in a few minutes?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record. How about 2308? You want to take that one out of the record, too?"



Mr. O'Brien? How about 2309, Mr. O'Brien? Okay. 2321, Mrs. Kent. Out of the record. 2358, Mr. Barnes. Out of the record. 2367, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula? Out of the record, Sir? 2373, Mr. McBroom? Out of the record. 2377, Mr. Griesheimer. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrences, Senate Bill 289. Mr. Getty? Mr. Getty, you want to go with 289? Nonconcurrences? Senate Bill 563, Mr. Yourell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 769, Mr. Peters. Out of the record. It's the intent of the Chair to go through the Concurrences once again on the matters that were taken out of the record. Give the Membership an opportunity to maybe some of the ones that were not here another chance. House Bill 666, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Look, I'm going to move to nonconcur in that Amendment, Mr. Speaker. We have some problems with it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 666. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. The House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 666. Yes, Sir. House Bill 905. The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew:"

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move do not concur on House Bill 905, Senate Amendments 1 and 2. It's do not concur Representative Walsh. You've got the wrong Bill anyway."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves not to concur. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. And the House moves not to concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 (sic) to House Bill 905. House Bill 1098, C.M. Stiehl. Mrs. Stiehl? She's not here. Out of the record. 1196, Mr. Reilly? Out of the record. 1260, Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. 1461, Mr. Hoffman? Out of the record."



1576, Mr. Jaffe. Out of the record. 1681, Mr. Watson. Out of the record. 1873, Mr. McAuliffe. Out of the record. 1873. We'll make it back to you,.... ? Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "I move to concur with Amendment #1 which puts the Article exactly like that of Chicago Police Department. They removed the enacting clause and we redid it to do exactly what the Chicago Police Department does, retire with 23, 53 years of age."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1873?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1873. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1888? Oh, I'm sorry. Wait a minute. House Bill 1576. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1576 adds the provision that in the case where a number of tenure teachers are dismissed due to economic necessity, the teacher with the least amount of tenure shall be dismissed first unless an alternative dismissal procedure has been established through collective bargaining agreement. In addition Senate Amendment 2 stipulates that the proposed procedure shall not ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe, excuse me. We're going to have to get back to it. There was some problem with the Message from the Senate on this Bill so the Clerk can be able to straighten it out. Then we'll get back to you. Thank you. Okay. House Bill 1888, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."



Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 1888 is the Bill drafted to help one district or others if there are some that have experienced problems with bonds as a result of the elimination of the corporate personal property tax. Mohammed had issued bonds prior to January '79 which had been approved and there were some questions that may have emerged through the bonding about the authorization and the ability to implement that law on the basis of the replacement. This language allows hopefully at least to satisfy these bonding houses that are concerned. It allows Mohammed to proceed with the construction which they have already undertaken. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion?"

Schneider: "I move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1888. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1888. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1944, Mr. Katz? Take it out of the record. House Bill 2111, Mr. Mautino? Out of the record. House Bill 2129, Mrs. Chapman? Leave Mr. Schwartz? Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with the Amendment to House Bill 2129. They are technical Amendments to resolve a problem relating to public health by the County of Cook and the State Department of Public Health."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners?"

Kempiners: "Yes. Would the Lady yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Kempiners: "Did the Senate add any Amendment relating to this particular proposal or relating to the concept of devising a formula that would ...? Go ahead. I'm kind.. I'm just a little concerned about the problems.."

Chapman: "It was a response to a question raised as to what the assessed would be if there were municipal counties .. municipal health departments formed in a situation where there are already was a county health department and I don't believe you'd have any problem with it, Bill."

Kempiners: "Okay. Do we have any problem with.. Does the formula call for the..."

Chapman: "The formula is not spelled out. This is up to the department..."

Kempiners: "The department to..."

Chapman: "The Department of Public Health."

Kempiners: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Getty: "I'd like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Our file indicated that Amendment #2 was adopted. Is it only Amendment #1 that was adopted by the Senate?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "... .. on this Bill. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "I believe you'll find there's two Amendments."

Getty: "The Calendar indicates one and the Message from the Senate indicates one. And the Bill only indicates one."

Chapman: "I believe there's... I believe it's in error then."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, this is on House Bill 2129? We only have one Amendment here."

Chapman: "There are 2.. Well, I move to concur with Amendment #1, but I think that another Amendment's going to turn up, quite frankly. Well, maybe we should take it out of the record until we see."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony, how many Amendments on this Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "There appears to be only one Amendment with the message."

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

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion here because I think at least some of my down.. rural downstate Members ought to be a little concerned about this because according to the information I have, Senate Amendment #1 by itself, could create some problems for a downstate county that wanted to start a new health department. Senate Amendment #2 responds to that problem..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me..."

Kempiners: "So I think .. this out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Let me just clarify this, if I may? The message was incorrect. It was recalled back to Second for a second Amendment. There are two Amendments on this Bill. Help the Clerk too. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 213... 2129. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. So kindly correct your Calendars. It should be Senate Amendments 1 and 2. The Gentleman.. .Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'aye', 8 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2129. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2132. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, there's one Amendment on this Bill that was put on in the Senate at the request of the Chicago Board of Educagion that responds to a question that they had about the language of the Bill. I move concurrence with Amendment #2."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is it.. Senate Amendment #1 right? Correct."

Chapman: "With the Senate Amendment. There's just one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2132?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2132. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2168, Mr. Daniels? Take it out of the record. House Bill 2268, Mr. Bower? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was to amend the Revenue Code to bring it into conformity with the Election Code in regard to propositions. The effect of the Senate Amendment is to delete the provision requiring.. limiting the number of propositions that would be on the ballot which is exactly the way it is in the Revenue Code now. I would concur with the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2268?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2268. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2283, Mr. Madigan. Out of the record. House Bill 2305. Mr. O'Brien. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members, I move to nonconcur with Amendment.. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2305."



It's the fee increase. It deals with the limitation on criminal actions for violators in relation to reporting their taxes and I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2305. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. And the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2305. House Bill 2308, Mr. O'Brien. The Gentleman.."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2308."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I believe we asked before that if the Sponsors could just kind of tell us what the Amendment that we're not concurring with."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Amendment #1 requires that all excess funds from the Liquor Control Fund to be transferred into the general revenue fund. And Amendment #2 deleted the one hundred percent increases in the distributor license, the wine maker retail license, and the retailer's license from one hundred percent increase to a fifty percent increase."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2308. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. And the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2308. House Bill 2309, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309. It deletes the required filing of the information return by all taxpayers within 30 days after the date set by the Depart-



ment and substitutes the filing of the return within 60 days when required by the Department of taxpayers selected by the Department."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2321, the Lady, Mrs. Kent. Take it out of the record. 2358, Mr. Barnes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This .. The original Bill 2358 authorized the Comptroller to specify the format in contract for certain controls required to be filed with him.. Senate Amendment #1 deletes the Comptroller's authority to specify the format for the presenting information required under the Sections 11 and 15 of the Comptroller's Act. We do agree with the Amendment. The Amendment makes the Bill better. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1 to 2358."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "I don't understand why it wouldn't be desirable for the Comptroller to prescribe the format instead of having such a hodgepodge of.."

Barnes: "The Senate pointed out that there was some problems relative to some federal contract and it would not necessarily be uniform. It wouldn't fall within the purview



of the Comptroller to so prescribe."

Friedrich: "But he would have no authority to .. with this out? With this Amendment he would have no authority to make any uniformity at all in the requirements of the contract?"

Barnes: "We would require a basic information to be included in it, but he would not with this Amendment be able to specifically set a strict format."

Friedrich: "But he could require .. definitely require certain information."

Barnes: "Definitely."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2358. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2358. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2367, Mr. Matula. Out of the record. House Bill 2373, Mr. McBroom? Mr. McBroom? Out of the record. House Bill 2377, Mr. Griesheimer. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer on 2377. "

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2377."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'What does it do?'"

Griesheimer: "I knew you'd ask that. The basic Bill is the Bill that brought the commercial game code.. commercial license fees in line with the individual license fees that were passed through here last Session. The ... Mr. Speaker, take it out of the record. I'll get back to it later."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll take it out and we'll go to Mr.



McBroom and then we'll come back to you. Alright Mr. Griesheimer? Mr. Griesheimer, we'll be back to you in about two minutes. House Bill 2373. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, thank you for coming back to me. The original Bill, this refers to.. This is a Bill of Commissioner Harris, banks.. Commissioner of Banks. I've discussed it with John Leon and Elmer Conti and I don't believe they have any objection. When the Bill left the House it permitted officers and employees of a bank to be able to get a loan up to \$25,000. The Senate Amendment limits the amount to \$10,000. And I'd like to move to concur Mr. Chairman.. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2373. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye', 1 'nay', 5 recorded as 'present'. And this.. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2373. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2377. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, there's been a request from the Democratic Leadership to hold this for a day so that they can take a look at it. I have no objection to holding it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take.. Take it out of the record. On the Calendar on page 2, are Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. Senate Bill 140."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill .."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Let's correct the Board. It's Third Reading. Okay."



Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record temporarily."

Senate Bill 565. "Mr. Marovitz on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 617. Mr. Cullerton? Mr. Cullerton? Out of the record. Senate Bill 768, Mr. O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien? Out of the record. Senate Bill 871, Mr. Taylor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 967, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 967, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1038, out of the record. Senate Bill 1072, Mr. Reilly? Reilly? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "You passed 1038, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, because the .. Mr. Pierce is not here."

Ewing: "Well, I've been handling that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I have no objection with that. Leave? Leave. House Bill (sic). I'm sorry. Senate Bill 1038. Mr. Ewing. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act in relation to penalties for failure to file for filing fraudulent tax returns and amending certain Acts herein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which has been discussed several times on this House floor and taken out of the record. It deals with and it comes out of the mirage study in Chicago and it provides for increased penalties for filing fraudulent tax returns under the Income, Motor



Fuel, Sales, Cigarette, and Liquor Tax Act. It includes in these penalties not only the taxpayer, but the tax preparer and it changes the penalty and I think this is important for everybody to realize, from misdemeanor to felonies. It would also provide for increase in penalties for those agents who collect tax and pay it in and would also make it a felony for being late in payment of your taxes. I believe that most people probably have a good idea what the Bill contains. I would glad to answer any questions and then would move for a Roll Call on this legislation."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman go for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Leverenz: "What is the penalty now in the Bill for the individual who collects the tax, but doesn't"

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

Brummer: "I wonder if we could have ten people join to take this matter off of Short Debate. This is a very important, very serious matter and we should..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Even the Sponsor wants to take it off of Short Debate. Please proceed. The Bill is on Full Debate. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, sir. What is the penalty for the person that collects the tax and does not pay in the tax?"

Ewing: "Under the Bill or under prior law?"

Leverenz: "Under what it is currently and then what it would be under the new Bill."

Ewing: "It's my understanding that the class B misdemeanor currently and it becomes a class 4 felony."

Leverenz: "Class 4 felony, in other words, one to three years under the proposed piece of legislation whereas a class B misdemeanor is up to six months."



Ewing: "That's correct. It's also up to \$10,000 fine."

Leverenz: "\$10,000 fine. What would it be for the.. What Section of the Bill is covered now or under your proposal the class 3 felony?"

Ewing: "That would be Section.. Chapter 120, paragraph 431, which I believe deals with the income tax."

Leverenz: "Well, who is that? The preparer, the tax preparer?"

Ewing: "That's correct. Any person or tax preparer. Any person who .. the tax payer and the tax preparer. It's class 3 under the Income Tax Act."

Leverenz: "And that is the Section that does not include willful?"

Ewing: "No. There's no knowingly in that Section."

Leverenz: "Knowingly is not in that Section so anyone that would send in a false return, even if they were provided with bad information to begin with, could be liable to go to jail for 2 to 5 years and up to \$10,000 fine?"

Ewing: "I think that's a reasonable interpretation."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lindsey Shrod Newspaper seeks leave to take photographs from the Press galleries. Leave is granted. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "One of the violations of various Sections of the Revenue Act is a... it is a violation to file a return or a penalty for filing a return late, if I file a sales tax return one day late, under this Bill, what would be the penalty?"

Ewing: "Well, my interpretation, the penalty could be a class 4 felony."

Brummer: "I could have a class 4 felony for filing a sales tax return one day late?"

Ewing: " I think that's one interpretation. You know, whether



the courts would be that unreasonable, I think it's hard to believe they would. But I think it's possible under this law."

Brummer: "Well, that is the crime that is described in this Bill. Whatever the courts would impose on you as a penalty would be up to the discretion of the sentencing Judge. But nevertheless, you would be guilty of a class 4 felony as a result of filing a sales tax return one day late."

Ewing: "That's correct."

Brummer: "Why don't we make that a class x felony? I mean, that's so serious to file a sales tax return one day late or possibly the death penalty. Under.. We have some discussion under this Bill concerning this Bill previously on page 3, Section 5. There.. You have included in there the tax repairer as one of the people who are subject to penalty. Under Section 5 on page 3, it appears to me that the tax preparer would be guilty of that felony even though he did not know that the tax return that he was filing was fraudulent. Is that correct?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Brummer: "Can you give any justification for imposing upon the tax preparer a felony conviction when he is preparing a return that he did not know was fraudulent?"

Ewing: "No. It should have been knowingly."

Brummer: "Well, this Bill.. You had dicussed bringing it back to Second Reading. It was not brought back to Second Reading for Amendment?"

Ewing: "No, it wasn't."

Brummer: "Well, in the current condition of the Bill we should resoundingly reject this motion to concur and vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is not a motion to concur. "

Brummer: "Okay. It's on Third Reading. It should go on the Spring Calendar or we should just fail to pass the Bill."



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

Borchers: "If the Sponsor will yield I would like to ask one question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Borchers: "In your estimation what in the world would the tax preparer who is innocent, what would be his remedy if any? Is there any possibility of recovery? What would be his position? I'd like to know that."

Ewing: "Well, Representative Borchers, I feel I have a real conflict here because his remedy would be to hire an attorney and to fight the case in court. And being an attorney, of course, I could see how that might create a conflict of interest for me. "

Borchers: "Not only a conflict of interest, but it would be a tremendous expense for the poor devil that did the preparing."

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

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Something is unclear in my mind. Obviously this is directed at a fraudulent return whether by the preparer or by the person for whom it is prepared, a fraudulent return. Did I understand correctly that a late filing is fraudulent? That it would be subject to a class 4 felony?"

Ewing: "I think possibly in the...."

Kosinski: ".... fraudulently filing."

Ewing: "I think possibly in the legislation that it could have been more clearly designated those who we were really trying to get after in this particular case.."

Kosinski: "In other words, you want to get after the fraudulent preparer, not after a late filing. Because many of us would be guilty of that."

Ewing: "Right."

Kosinski: "If that's not clear in your mind, I think it



should be made clear by returning it to Second."

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

Leinenweber: "I've got a question for the Sponsor. If I

recall when this was at Amendment stage, we discussed whether or not knowingly prepared a.. for signature for false return would encompassed a tax preparer who had reasonable grounds to believe that the statistics given to him by his client were inaccurate or understated and you seem to think that that wouldn't really be a problem, but you weren't too sure. Would you comment on that, Sir?"

Ewing: "Would you repeat that again, Representative Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah. When we discussed this Bill on the Order of Second Reading, it was my recollection the term 'knowingly ' assists in filing a fraudulent tax return, I expressed the fear that that might include within its web a tax preparer who has a client come in and he knows or has a very good reason to believe that for example, he's understating his income, but goes ahead and files the return based upon the facts given to him by the taxpayer. Would he be required under this Bill in order to avoid criminal liability to conduct an independent audit of his client to make sure that his fears that he .. the client was understating his income or sales was either accurate or inaccurate?"

Ewing: "I do not believe that's a reasonable interpretation of the responsibility put on the taxpayer in this legislation, Representative."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would respectfully disagree with the Sponsor of this legislation. I think what you're going to be doing is you're going to be placing the people who are in the business of preparing tax returns, whether they be bookkeeper, CPA's or other people who do this type of work, in the uncomfortable position of having to conduct



an independent audit of all of their clients where they have reasonable grounds to believe that their clients are understating their income or their sales even though the books that are given to them would show that this is not the case. I think this would be a very uncomfortable position to be in if I was a professional tax preparer because I might find myself indicted for this particular crime which is a class 4 felony even though in the rush towards the end of the income tax filing period I didn't have time to quiz very intricately and study in greater detail and conduct an independent audit of my client's books. I think this is .. the idea is probably good. I think however that in practice this would work to the tremendous disadvantage of tax preparers and unfortunately I would have to urge my fellow Representatives and Mr. Speaker to give a resounding 'no' vote to Senate Bill 1038."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask Representative Ewing, Representative Ewing, in this .. where you provide for the penalties, where does it.. where is it possible say for example in following Leinenweber's questioning, if the accountant who is preparing a return knows it's fraudulent and doesn't want to be penalized and wants immunity, what do you provide for that in this missal?"

Ewing: "You mean in the legislation missal?"

Giorgi: "Yeah, this missal you're throwing at us. Where do you provide for the immunity or the plea bargaining, now?" I know that some of the attorneys have helped put this together know that there's somewhere in here where the felony, class 4 felony can be dropped to a misdemeanor again and I'd like to know where that's at for the people I represent, you know."

Ewing: "I think that would be.. That is not covered in this Act. That's covered in the plea bargaining legislation."



Giorgi: "Is that part of this Act?"

Ewing: "I'm sure it would apply to this Act like it would to... This is not a mandatory felony charge any more than any other of our penalties sets in our statutes. The courts have that leeway."

Giorgi: "And I notice you didn't answer Borchers' on what the suggested fee was for handling a case like this in a tax court or any court."

Ewing: "I don't do a lot of criminal work so I suppose the fee would be about \$50."

Giorgi: "\$50?..... Where do you practice? Missouri?"

Ewing: "No, I was giving you a minimum fee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "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 Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's been adequate debate. I think everybody understands the issue and I would put it to the judgement of this House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 1038?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Katz: "Yes, I don't really understand why you don't simply adopt the federal language which has been in effect a long, long time and all of us are familiar with it. We argue about what it's going to do here and I just don't see any reason for adopting new language. I'm not satisfied that. ... I'm in favor of what you're trying to do, but it does seem to be the simple solution is to amend this to exactly the federal language and I don't think anybody would have any doubt about it. I know I would vote 'aye' if you did that."



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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to explain my 'yes' vote. I think this is a good law and order Bill, and I'm for law and order and I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is also Representative Pierce's Bill who can't be here because of the death of his father. I think Representative Ewing ought to put this into Interim Study or take it out of the record and put it into the Fall or next year's Calendar rather than have it receive the devastating effect it's getting now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "I really am not after to setting any records on votes here today and think that it would be"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing please. My mistake."

Ewing: "Would appreciate having enough green votes up there to put this on Postponed Consideration."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Ewing: "For what reason did you take it out of the record. I didn't make that request. I would ask for leave to put it on the Spring Calendar, then."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to put the Bill on the Spring Calendar? Hearing no objections, the Bill is on the Spring Calendar. Senate Bill 1072."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

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



House. Senate Bill 1072 as it came over from the Senate made a simple technical wording correction in the Transportation law. An Amendment was added on in the House by Representative Ewing which at first there was some question about. It dealt with signing and there was some worry from the Department of Transportation and Representative Brummer that it might have effect federal funds. Yesterday, we took the Bill back and took that Amendment off and put one on that was worked out by agreement with the Department of Transportation and I believe, Representative Brummer. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley? The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1072?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill (sic) 1004. Take it out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. House Bill (sic) 1338."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill (sic) 1338, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1338 amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief. The qualifying income maximum will be raised from the current 10 thousand to 15 thousand. The maximum has not been changed since the circuit breaker was enacted in 1972."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Mr. Kornowicz. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman would take this Bill out of the record? -Would you take it out of the record, Representative? What does that mean?"

I'm Irish. "

Kornowicz: "Okay."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That means 'vita' (foreign phrase).

Take the Bill out of the record. On Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears House ... Senate Bill 93. The Gentleman... Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 93, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 93 started out as being a Bill that would permit counties to cut weeds on lots of those owners who did not keep their weeds cut. And there were some Senate Amendments changing the notice from 10 days to 15 days and some technical Amendments. But on two House Amendments, House Amendment #4 and #5 I would like to briefly explain them because they really mean more than the Bill does itself. On the House Amendment #4 was Representative Hudson's Amendment which would permit the County Boards to elect a County Chairman countywide. In those counties where they do elect them countywide, to not necessarily be a Member.. have to be a Member of the County Board but it excluded DuPage County and so that ruled DuPage County out in this case. Our problem in St. Clair County is we have a countywide election for County Chairman and he only runs two years, but the County Board Members run for a four year term and in between their term half of the people in the county are prevented from running or sort of disenfranchised from running for



County Board Chairman. So this would alleviate that.

What it would do it would permit them to either be a Member of the Board or not be a Member of the Board. They could be a voting Member if they got elected as a Member of the Board, but they could be a nonvoting Member if they were elected County Board Chairman and not a Board Member. House Amendment #5 put on by Representative Dyer yesterday would provide for veto power for the County Board Chairman. What this would amount to in case of County Board Chairman would veto a particular measure on the County Board, it would take a simple Majority of those elected to override the veto. I don't stand one way or the other on that Amendment.

I did think it need a brief explanation although we had an explanation here yesterday by Representative Dyer, the Sponsor and the opponent, Representative Hudson. I would move for the adoption of Senate Bill 93."

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

Walsh: "I was going to ask because Representative Hudson is not here and had spoken and was opposed to Amendment #5 and therefore to the Bill as it is before us, if the Gentleman would take it out of the record until Representative Hudson is here."

Flinn: "Well, in all due respect to Representative Hudson, he knew I was first on the list and I told him I was going to call it and I told him as far as I was concerned he could speak against it and I had no objection to it. But I took no position on the Amendment that he objected to and I've been very fair with him. I'm first on the list. We're liable not to get back. This is my last day to pass it and to take it out of the record now it takes a risk on me not getting back to it again. And therefore, I think I ought to get a vote on it."



Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I like the Gentleman better as Speaker than I do as Member. Let me then attempt to give the arguments in opposition to the provision that permits the County Board Chairman to veto .. give the County Board Chairman veto power. Veto power, Mr. Speaker, suggests executive power and indeed, is very strong, indeed, even in this case where it only requires a simple Majority to overrule the veto of the Chairman. What it provides is and done by Amendment without Committee hearing or in any other way, what it gives that Chairman and it, as the Gentleman said, there are just two in the State to which it would apply, what it does is give that Chairman considerable time to hold up a measure. There is time that he must have in order to consider whether he will veto it or not and there is time that the Board has or must be given to consider whether they will sustain or overrule that veto. So what this does is provide considerable additional power to two County Board Chairmen who, when they were elected, the electors did not consider that they would have that power. So I suggest to you that this is perhaps illadvised and I say perhaps because it did not have the approval of a Committee. I think a Committee ought to look into this and see why on earth this has to be done and for that reason I would urge you to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill as amended does provide reasonable and responsible authority to rest and reside in the Chairman of the County Boards of both DuPage and St. Clair. Both of these positions are countywide positions, in other words, they have to be elected on a countywide basis. You want to have an executive who is elected on a countywide basis you



have to give that executive at least a modicum of authority. And all this does it provides that he has the right to review the decisions of the County Board and if he disagrees with some, return them to that County Board with his suggestions and then by a simple Majority, Ladies and Gentlemen, not an extraordinary Majority, not like our situation with the Governor on total vetos, but by simple Majority they may reaffirm their previous decision or accept any of his changes that they are inclined to. This is good government. This is responsible. This will create the rights and the proper kind of relationship between a County Board Chairman and those Members. And for that reason, Ladies and Gentleman, I am a Cosponsor along with Representative Dyer and Representative Daniels of this particular Amendment to this Bill. And it's not partisan. It's bi-partisan support for this program. And I would ask your support of this Bill as amended."

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

Borchers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Borchers: "I am not particularly interested in the facts that I've just heard, but I assume that no.. that the weed cutting provisions of this Bill are still in it. The enacting clause has not been struck out, is that correct or not?"

Flinn: "That's right. It's still in the Bill."

Borchers: "Okay. I merely would like to make the comment for those of us who might have had the residential zoning like my county did some years ago that we have some miles of designated residential zoning that could be very costly to the people who might be forced to cut these weeds because I'm sure they're not aware that this kind of a Bill that could mean that maybe a neighbor or someone driving by lived in Decatur for



example that thinks that a pasture ought to be cut that's still pasture, could force them to have this .. all their weeds cut. So, I feel we should look at some of us who have had residential areas zoned such, should look into the other side of this, another part of this particular Bill."

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

Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. 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 St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, to close."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel one way or another on Amendment #5 and I've told Representative Hudson that. I've told Representative Dyer that. I'm neither for nor.. for either the Amendment or against it. But I am suggesting that we need in St. Clair County, we need Senate Bill 93 because we are disenfranchising one half of the people each year when we hold an election. One half... One year when we elect the County Board Chairman and the other half, the next two years when we elect the County Board Chairman. It's something that I believe any lawyer worth his salt could take to court and find unConstitutional. I chose this route rather than someone go to court. I never dreamed I would ever get to stir up this much trouble over a little weed Bill. So I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 93?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, to equate the veto power of a Mayor or a Governor with the type of veto



power that we're trying to grant here I think is wrong. If a Member is elected... a Member of the Board of Commissioners and has the right to enter the debate and to vote with the other Members of the Board of Commissioners, to give him also the power of veto I think is erroneous because he has every opportunity to do his debating during the discussion of the issue before him and he shouldn't have the authority later on to then veto the message and have it.. or veto the action, have it reconsidered by the entire Board. The point is, he has the power to vote. He has the power to debate. A Mayor does not have that. He merely presides supposedly. The Governor doesn't have the power to enter into debate. And I think it's wrong now to give veto..."

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

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like a little more time. I tried to ask this question prior to the closing of debate. Is Amendment #4 still on, Monroe?"

Flinn: "Yes, it is."

McMaster: "Do you have page 2 of the Amendment starting on line 15- 'and all other Counties of Chairman may either be elected as a County Board Member or be elected as a Chairman without having been first elected to the Board-'"

Flinn: "That's only in those counties that elect a Chairman countywide. It only affects St. Clair and DuPage."

McMaster: "I know you say that, but where is it provided in the language of the statute?"

Flinn: "Well, the statutes now require that they be a Board Member in order to run for County Board Chairman and this removes that requirement in those counties where they elect them countywide."

McMaster: "Yeah, but it doesn't say that in Section 7 of this



Amendment."

Flinn: "I think you might be misreading the Amendment. I'm sure it does."

McMaster "Well, I'm a little bit concerned about..."

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rose in opposition to Amendment #5 yesterday. It has already been addressed. Most of the points have been made. But I'm going to say that some of us in DuPage County feel that what we're doing by putting this Amendment on to an otherwise perhaps okay Bill ... It's a bad Amendment on maybe an otherwise okay Bill. The County Board Members, the Majority of them do not want their Chairman extended these powers. It's an extension of power that he does not now have. Our county has turned thumbs down on home rule powers. This is in a sense a home rule power being given to the Chairman of the Board. He does not need it. There's no rush for this. There's no emergency. It should... We should take time before we enter into this. It's a substantive change and I do not feel it should be imposed upon..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Dyer: "I want to thank those who are voting 'yes' and I want to remind you of the key point of this Bill. It's whether you believe in Majority rule. At present in a 25 person Board, if 13 Members are there, 7 people can pass an ordinance. It can go out. If the County Board Chairman who has been elected at large by all the people feels it's not a good ordinance, he returns it to the Board with his veto. To override we're not asking an extraordinary Majority, just 13, a Majority of one. We are making sure that a Majority of people



on a Board govern rather than 7 people. Thank you so much for your 'yes' votes. It's a good government Amendment."

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

Friedrich: "Well, I was quite in accord with Representative Flinn's Bill as it was originally introduced but, boy, it's come a long way from weed cutting and I'd like to see it sent back to the Senate to take that Amendment off so that we can get on with the weed cutting in St. Clair County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been looking up at the Board and I believe a Legislator ought to be cautious, but I think Mr. Yourell is going too far on voting on both sides of the issue and my parliamentary inquiry is, 'Does he get two explanations of vote?'"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye', 50 'nay', 13 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 244, Mr. O'Brien? The Gentleman... Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 244, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, requests to bring the Bill back to Second for the purpose of Amendment. Hearing no objections, Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I believe that this would be Amendment #7..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments?"



Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, O'Brien, amends Senate Bill 244 as amended by House Amendment #6 by deleting the sentence added to the Bill on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, yesterday we put Amendment #6 on which included the first five Amendments and we tabled the first five Amendments. What we're doing with Amendment #7 here is the provisions of this Section apply within the corporate limits of any municipality only if authorized by an ordinance of the municipality or in the unincorporated parts of the county only if authorized by the ordinance of the County Board. Any such ordinance shall be filed with the County Clerk. What we're doing with this Amendment is we're making it optional but instead of making it a law and having the municipalities the villages and the home rule units pass an ordinance to opt out, we're requiring them to pass an ordinance to opt in should they want if for landmark protects property relief on landmark designated properties. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Just to inquire, Mr. Speaker. Has this Amendment been distributed? I do not have a copy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Im sorry, Ma'am. What?"

Pullen: "Has it been distributed? I don't have a copy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendment has not been distributed. We'll ask to hold... keep the Bill on Second Reading."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll move the Bill back to Third Reading and then till the Amendment is distributed, then we'll bring it back to Second. Third Reading. On 244. Senate Bill 389, Mr. E.M. Barnes."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 389, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and



Universities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 389 is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Board of Governors. This Bill went into the Senate at a request of 130 million, 255 thousand. It was reduced there to 123 million, 415 thousand. It is essentially the same for the House action. The estimated expenditures for FY '79 was 119 million, 756 thousand. There is roughly .. roughly an 8% increase over the fiscal year from '79 to 1980 and I would solicit the support of the House on Senate Bill 389."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 389?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Lee? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye', 2 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 574. Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 588, the Gentleman is not on the floor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 667. The Gentleman is not on the floor. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 687, Mr. McBroom? 687, Eddie. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 716, Mr. Stuffle. Out of the record. The Gentleman is not on the floor. Senate Bill 762, Mr. Van Dyune. Out of the record. Senate Bill 854, Mr. Patrick. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 854, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Firemen's Annuity and Benefits Fund Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



Senate Bill 854 amends the Chicago Fire Department Retirement Fund. It provides for a recall of elected Members to the Board of Trustees. The Chicago Police Retirement Fund has this type of provision. This Bill has no cost impact. It passed out of the Pensions Committee 12 to nothing. I solicit your support for this fine Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 854?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I was only going to say here that this Bill was opposed by the Pension Laws Commission and the Pension Laws Commission is in the process of studying this whole issue relative to Boards of Trustees and I would like to call the attention of that to the Membership in case they'd like to reassess what they've just done with their vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt, to explain his vote."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Sponsor should at least answer one simple question so that the Membership knows what they're really voting on. How long are these Trustees elected to serve? What is the period of time that they serve?"

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

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the term number one is for 2 years and the problem that has arisen is that the Trustees that are Members of the system have to be Members of the Chicago Fire Department. Now there are cases whereby a firefighter is suspended or resigns from the service and therefore there is no provision for recall of that Member on the Board. Now before the person can be recalled there has to be signatures of 60% of the participating Members. The Chicago Police Department



has the same provision under their Pension system and it has worked in that system and therefore I really don't see anything wrong with the Bill. There's no cost impact under any system on the Bill and I simply would urge support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'aye', 17 'no', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 870. Take it out of the record. The Sponsor isn't there. Senate Bill 873. Out of the record. Senate Bill 939. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I'm the Sponsor of 873 and I'd like to call it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh. We'll get back to you right away."

Catania: "I'd like to call it now, please. We're on that order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I've already called 939. We'll get back to you immediately."

Catania: "I did not ask to have it taken out of the record. I would like to call 873."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mulcahey, you on the floor? You want to proceed with 939? Clerk, read the Bill."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I asked to call 873...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I said we'll get back to you right away."

Catania: "I did not ask to have it taken out. Right away after this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right after this Bill, Ma'am."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 939, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of agricultural districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 939 creates the Agricultural District Act. Now the purpose of this Act is to provide a means in which agricultural land may be protected as a very valuable segment as we all know to the state's economy. Each county shall establish a County Agricultural District Advisory Committee which shall advise the County Board in relation to the proposed establishment modifications withdrawal from and termination of any agricultural district. The procedure is very simple. Landowner or landowners shall or may submit a poll to the County Board. Number two, the County Board then receives poll...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Robbins, for what purpose are you roaming at the galleries? Come on back here Clyde, where you belong. Did you try the other side, Clyde? Come on Clyde, I need your vote. Mr. Mulcahey, would you please proceed with Senate Bill 939?"

Mulcahey: "Okay to start over with the procedures once again. The procedural.. The procedure is, number one, the landowners may submit a proposal to the County Board. Number two, the County Board then received proposals and publishes notices, modification proposals by adjacent landowners must also be submitted within 60 days. Number three, proposal is then submitted to the County Committee to any existing regional and county planning Commissions. Public hearings are held on the proposals. The modifications are made. The County Committee makes its recommendations and it goes to the County Board. And finally, number five, the County Board has 90 days to act on this proposal. If approved, it's filed and in the County Recorder's Office. And I would move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."



Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, despite everybody's agreement and objection, they're back right... right back where we started from before they put the Amendment on. Senate Bill 939 was introduced by Senator Gitz as a restricted land use Bill limiting agricultural district advisory Committees which shall advise the County Board in relation to proposed establishments, modifications and termination of an agricultural district. In the event that these districts would be in an urban area, then the public service ... public service utility company certainly would be hampered. This Bill will not preclude a farmer's activities. It will, however, undoubtedly restrict the public utilities and their services to their customers. Senate Bill 939 was amended in the House to restrict power over public utilities. This is contrary to the best interests of the people of the State of Illinois who are served by these utilities companies and disfigures the original intent of this type of legislation. Consequently, it's just another authority over utilities which take time, additional hearings, increased cost expense of operations which will be reflected in the utility rates. Now we've been hearing about crocodile tears all along. There are several Amendments on various Bills that we should shut off the utility bills at the end of the... not in winter months. We're complaining about the rates going up higher and we keep regulating and stipulating on these utility companies. This is another attempt. The Bill was killed in the House. And it's the third time this Bill has come up as an Amendment on another Bill. I urge the defeat of this Bill. If we want to help keep the rates down in public utilities, let's kill this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that House.. Senate Bill



939 in its amended form which is basically the form in which it was introduced in the Senate is now a very excellent Bill. You will recall it was only yesterday that we passed out another ag. areas Bill. I think, as I recall, under the Sponsorship of Representative Ewing. That piece of legislation was so watered down in its final form that really it didn't do anything. I'm interested in passing out an ag areas Bill that at least has a few teeth in it and will do something about protecting Illinois farmland. Now you think about who those people are that might make encroachment upon Illinois farmland, Elmer I've got to grant you your point. I mean, utilities are one of these that we have been fighting in various places throughout the State of Illinois. In addition to that, we have had many other problems, particularly in our Legislative District up in the northwest corner of the state with the state coming in and attempting to take by means of eminent domain area for park land, area for nature trails and many, many activities of this kind. I think that if we're really going to be serious about talking about trying to serve Illinois farmland, we've got to give Illinois farmers the opportunity to somehow band together and to have at least a certain amount of regulation on this kind of activity. I think Senate Bill 939 in its present form does that. I think it's an excellent Bill and I'm hoping that all of my colleagues, at least on this side of the aisle are going to be supporting it."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Swanstrom: "Representative Mulcahey, does the Department of Agriculture support this Bill?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is whether the Department of Agriculture support the Bill, Mr. Mulcahey?"

Mulcahey: "They support the concept, Representative Swanstrom. And I don't really.. They support the concept of the Bill, yes, Sir."

Swanstrom: "Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think the.. Mr. Conti was exactly right in reference to this Bill. What you're really going to do is make it impossible to construct or to go around and do the necessary things that you might have to do all in the name of an agricultural district. It means it adds a company, a utility or anything has to build, has to construct, has to make necessary improvements. The more land you get or the more farms, you get in line in order to construct a straight line for anything you need, the last ones will have a strangle hold on you. I say to you that this type of Bill will implement the growth not of the city of Chicago, but of all of your other local and suburban areas. Now if you stop and think that as a suburban area how you are surrounded by what they call 'farmland' you are the ones who want to be facing the real problems. This is not just simply an attempt to help the farmer. Because what you're doing here is you're going to strangle the utilities. You're going to strangle construction and growth throughout the state. Many people have cried that we don't need such things as the railroads. But yet all of those towns that were bypassed by that dirty iron horse, are no longer in existence. Or they're only a marker on some distant trail. There were other cities and communities who said they didn't want a sea port with the smelly fish. They, too, are down in the antiquity and we can't even find them. And I suggest that if



you want to strangle the growth of the state and allow this type of Bill to pass, that's exactly what you're doing. Don't listen to the crocodile tears. Read the Bill and try to determine what it actually does."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 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 Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to close."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to point out the Farm Bureau does need support this particular Bill. We all know the problems we've had in recent years as far as quick take in agricultural farmland concerned. We had a problem just about 12 or 13 months ago in the same situation. This is a Bill that will provide the provisions necessary to protect the farmland throughout the state. It's been a problem not only throughout the State of Illinois, but throughout this country and throughout the world as well. It's a very simple Bill. It's going to get the job done and I would ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 939?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I've heard some of the discussion on this Bill here in the House. We've already passed out a measure similar to this which probably wasn't as stringent nor gave as much power to the type of districts which we are trying to form in this legislation. I would encourage a 'yes' vote on this piece of legislation. It isn't going to strangle the growth of this state, but it may preserve some green area across this state which



will not only help feed our families, but keep us from living on top of each other in the decades to come.

I think it's a good Bill and I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I guess you have to take a choice whether you're going to strangle to death or starve to death. If you keep taking our land away, you're not going to have much land left on which to grow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Mr. Walsh? Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. What? On this question there are 64 'aye', 66 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote to 'aye' and ask others to do so just to get it to 70 so they can go on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Let's wait till we get the count first. Mr. Stearney wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mrs. Macdonald as 'aye'. Mrs. Dyer as 'aye'. Mr. Piel as 'aye'. Mr. Stuffle as 'aye'. Mr. Kornowicz as 'aye'. What's our count? The Gentleman has 71. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey. Put it on Postponed Consideration. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's always nice to have Colonel Hudson, a former Member of the General Assembly, standing over here by Dave Jones. Carl, welcome back. You're always welcome back here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Our man from Pontiac. Welcome back, Carl. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I want to be recorded 'aye' on that last vote and I want to tell Miss Day that my daughter told me she would be here when she called day before yesterday and I still haven't found her. And I'm still going to vote the same on 101 regardless."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...leery of those notes. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" Mrs. Hallstrom?"

Hallstrom: "I'm coming. I wondered, is it too late for me also to be recorded as 'aye' on that last vote? I was on the other side of the room.. and didn't get over."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely, Ma'am."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Robbins and Mrs. Hallstrom as 'aye' on the last vote. That's enough. Okay.

Senate Bill 873. The Lady... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

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

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

Senate Bill 873 is a Bill that is required if we are to put the public hospitals in the State of Illinois on any kind of sound footing. Cook County Hospital for one, as a result of an agreement that was worked out today, finally, will be okay because of some advance money and some other things that it's getting until Oct. 1st. But it's purely a temporary kind of arrangement. They'll have to come back and continue to act for help. This Bill would establish that we will pre-register the indigent and the working poor of Illinois for health care so that they will know that they can go to the hospitals and have care when they need it and the hospitals will know, in turn, that they will be able to afford to keep their doors open to these people



backed up by this sound statutory base. What it will do is to say that the department will have to actively seek out and pre-register those people who should be eligible for health care here in the State of Illinois. They will have to provide health care not only for those people who are recipients of basic maintenance grants, but also for those people whose income is not more than 25% greater than the maximum income level at which they would qualify for basic maintenance grants. These are the poor and the working poor of the State of Illinois, the people who run out falling in the cracks. At Cook County Hospital in 1972 over 60% of the patient care days were found eligible and were reimbursed by the Illinois Department of Public Aid. Since then because of the tightening of the requirements and the Department itself admits that it has been largely bookkeeping problems in many cases that have caused them not to be able to reimburse for patient care days. Since 1972 that 60% of patient care reimbursement has fallen to around 30% for Cook County Hospital which is what has caused the dire plight in which Cook County Hospital now finds itself. This Bill is necessary to put Cook County Hospital and the 40 other hospitals in the State of Illinois, that serve the poor and the near poor on a sound basis so that they know that they will be able to continue to provide care for these people of the State of Illinois. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from

DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, she will."

Catania: "Yes."

Vinson: "Representative, on page 2 of the Amendment, House Amendment #1, should I infer that it's the purpose of the Bill to guarantee that no person will lack for



medical care?"

Catania: "We certainly are attempting to state that, that the State of Illinois wants to be sure that our citizens have good and decent health care. I'm not sure what line you're referring to, but that is an intent that's stated in the Bill, yes."

Vinson: "The language on lines 16 through 19. So it's your intention to have the state and not the Federal Government take over prime responsibility to make sure that everyone of its citizens gets a full range of health care?"

Catania: "Not at all, Representative Vinson. As I'm sure you know, we have failed to qualify for millions of federal dollars which we will be able to qualify for if we go to pre-registration."

Vinson: "Now would you explain how your pre-registration system will work under this Bill?"

Catania: "Yes. Under this system the Department of Public Aid will be required to see to it that people in the community are aware that they can pre-register for health care, people who come into the clinics for instance, people who come into the emergency room, people who go the public hospitals for their health care don't have their own private doctors will be made aware that they can pre-register for health care so that they will have a card to present when they are admitted to a hospital and then the hospital will not have to go through all of the rigamarole that's involved after, for instance, someone has major surgery of trying to qualify that person for reimbursement."

Vinson: "So you will actually be giving something on the order of a green card to each person who would pre-register under this system?"

Catania: "It will be a card that will be valid for six months and then if they want to continue to have their pre-



registration, they will have to reapply and get it re-validated."

Vinson: "How will you determine whether people are eligible for this card?"

Catania: "In the same way that they become eligible for public aid, they will have to demonstrate what their income is."

Vinson: "Is it true that some people will qualify for this card who do not qualify for the normal green card?"

Catania: "Yes. Those people who have total income of not more than 25% more than the eligibility income level for the basic maintenance grant will qualify under this program."

Vinson: "So public aid would then be in the position of actually giving cards... a card of some sort to people who may when the time comes to use the card, not in fact, be qualified for any current medical assistance?"

Catania: "As I said, it would be valid for only six months. As you know green cards are given only for short periods of time as well."

Vinson: "That's right. But when they.. When the person actually went in and used that card, there is no guarantee in the Bill that he will be qualified?"

Catania: "The department could certainly require that the hospitals show that these people had cards that were valid at the time of admission. The department is still free to establish many different kinds of standards to insure that there cannot be any abuse of the system."

Vinson: "Is it your hope and your expectation that under this program more people would be qualified for state or federal assistance for medical care than currently are?"

Catania: "Certainly. The problem right now, as I think I said earlier, is that only about 30% of the patient care days at Cook County Hospital are being reimbursed by the Department of Public Aid when clearly their



clientele includes a much larger number of the poor and working poor than that amount."

Vinson: "But this program does go beyond Cook County Hospital. Is that correct?"

Catania: "Yes, that's correct."

Vinson: "What do we do in the way of providing cost containment mechanisms to hold down the cost under this expanded medical care program?"

Catania: "These hospitals come under the cost containment rate review process just like all the other hospitals and there are safeguards built into the Bill which say that for instance, payment shall not take into consideration any losses resulting from improper, inefficient or poor management as determined by the department. The department is free to set standards to be sure that the taxpayer's dollars are being properly spent."

Vinson: "Now in addition to your program for .. providing for encouraging greater direct care for people, you also provide something in for form of an impaction aid or a subsidy to qualified hospitals. Is that right?"

Catania: "It's on page 2 of the Bill. Is this what you're referring to, the department shall give special consideration to those hospitals who serve a high incidence of persons eligible for assistance under this code by providing special impaction aid to minimize the effect of such practices on the operations and financial condition as such provided. "

Vinson: "Yes, that's right."

Catania: "That's the language in the Bill. That's right."

Vinson: "And as I read the language of the Amendment, payments under that program shall not take into account nor be debited for any improper, inefficient or poor management as determined by the department. Is that correct? "

Catania: "I think that you're reading that the other way..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his re-



marks to a close?"

Vinson: "I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I may then?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Vinson: "Regretfully it's necessary for me at this time to oppose this Bill. I had offered several Amendments which I thought might tighten it up somewhat, but the Sponsor has declined to take the Bill back to Second Reading to consider those Amendments. What this Bill does and I.. Could I have order, Mr. Speaker? This is a very important Bill that everybody should be aware of. What it does is to create a direct grant program, a new health care program, for poor people in the state. I certainly sympathize with the plight of the poor and the importance of health care for them and I think that's an important objective for us. But I don't believe any state alone can deal with the lofty objectives of this. Both Senator Kennedy and President Carter and various other Members of Congress have offered programs to deal with that problem. Invariably their programs contain mechanisms for cost control to avoid duplication of services to insure that services are delivered in the least costly way. None of those guarantees are provided in this Bill. We are asked to engage in a very costly new health care program for the poor with no guarantee that that service will be provided in a cost efficient fashion. There is no provision in here as best I can determine from reading the Bill, on the other Bills that currently would apply to Cook County Hospital, to have a good state audit before the money goes to them. That's something that I think every taxpayer in the state has a right to request. We have a right to know how they spend this money, how they spend their other money. I have been told that currently, the governing Commission for Cook



County Hospital spends 8 million dollars a year on stone operations. That's not health care through the hospital, that's the operations of the Board. And I would question whether we should begin to subsidise

Cook County Hospital are engaged in a new program until we have adequate auditing and adequate cost containment mechanisms in place. Finally, I would point out that no one who's worked at this problem has addressed the question of whether Cook County Hospital's continuing it and subsidising it, is the best way to pay for health care for the poor in Cook County. There are a variety of other suggestions on the table. They may be much better and we ought to thoroughly and comprehensively examine them before we spend this money. Perhaps satellite community hospitals with private hospital care subsidized for intensive operations, or intensive care might be a much cheaper and a more efficient way.

Before we engage in this expensive new program, we ought to examine that. For all of those reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. It's very important that we protect both the integrity of the state fiscal situation and that we know that whatever program we embark on is the most efficient program for dealing with health care for the poor in this state."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Vinson has given an excellent detailed reason to vote against this Bill. And I won't get into that other than to say this is a flat grant to the hospital that qualifies under the provisions of the impactation aid formula. There are no strings attached to this and there is no pay back to the state. Now what is the cost of this new program that we're establishing? The Bureau of the Budget estimates that the department would spend 91 million



dollars per year should we enact Senate Bill 873 as it is currently amended. Now the people who are supporting this through the guise of helping the poor people of the state would lead you to believe that your hospitals and my hospitals would qualify for impactation aid under this Bill. I have a list of about 40 hospitals which might, and I underline that word, might possibly qualify under the impactation formula except of that 40 few of them, so few, are experiencing the operating revenue deficits that are typical of Cook County Hospital.

Which means that a great bulk of this money would go only to Cook County. Of the 40 hospitals that would possibly qualify I believe there are about 5 or 6 that would probably get any money at all outside of Cook County Hospital. I don't think that you and I, Ladies and Gentleman, want to be fooled by the charade that we're going to be helping the poor people of this state by passing this legislation. Because the information I have is that we will not. We will be helping simply and purely Cook County Hospital eliminate an operating deficiency. And I would join Representative Vinson in urging you to vote 'no' on this legislation."

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

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Vinson did sum it up pretty well. I just wanted to let you know that the worst thing that could happen to this General Assembly is know that the state generates any where from 3 to 400 million dollars a year and in the next 48 hours, 60 hours in this General Assembly, we'll be trying to spend a 300 million dollars that the state generates. I want to reemphasize the cost of this program. It's 91 million dollars and if we're going to go ahead with other programs such as school fundings, transportation, we've got to be very careful on how we're spending 91 million



dollars."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to 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 Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to close."

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

I was amazed to hear that someone on my side of the aisle talk about the good points in the Kennedy National Health Care legislation. I would doubt that he was really a supporter of that legislation and I think that's an interesting situation indeed. As you may or may not be aware, the agreement that was reached today about Cook County Hospital in the State of Illinois includes an audit by the Auditor General. And I think that that addresses another point that was raised here. Our Auditor General is going to go in and audit Cook County Hospital so that if this Bill would reach the Governor's desk he would have that audit on which to base a decision whether to sign it or not. We also heard an allegation that one of the speakers has been told that the governing Commission spends 8 million dollars on its administration. The last time we began to discuss this Bill we talked about some other things that he's been told, which turned out according to Dr. Hoten to be inaccurate. For instance, he charged that Dr. Hoten practices medicine on the side which he does not in fact do. He did not get a license to practice medicine here in the State of Illinois specifically said that he could never be charged with that. We are told that perhaps Cook County Hospital is not the most efficient means of delivering health care to people in Illinois. There is nothing whatsoever in this Bill which would stop studies from going on to discover what might be more



cost efficient. But I'm sure that everyone realizes that if Cook County Hospital goes down, it's the private hospitals in the other public care hospitals in the Chicago area that are going to have to pick up the difference and then will we ever hear the screams here in Springfield. You won't need to read the newspaper, you'll be able to hear the shrieking all the way from Chicago. I ask for your support for this legislation if you think that we really do in fact owe the citizens of the State of Illinois some guarantee of decent health care."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 873?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm voting 'present' on this Bill because I have been a part of the negotiations that we were talking about earlier and I would not want to do anything to jeopardize that negotiation that we have going at the present moment. I know that we need some help for the poor folks of this state and I'm doing all that I possibly can and I solicit your vote on 'present' on this particular measure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Forget about him. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to publicly thank Representative Taylor for his efforts in the negotiations we've conducted and for being a man of his word on this. I thank him for that."

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

Gaines: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to ask



that you give us atleast 70 votes to put it on Postponed Consideration so that these negotiations they're talking about failed will soon have a vehicle. So I'm calling on many of those who are now yellow to turn to green so we can have this on Postponed Consideration so that if the so called negotiations don't come through we'll have a vehicle to work with."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am painfully aware of the tendency of discussions about Cook County Hospital. But that notwithstanding this is still a very good Bill. It provides for health for the working poor. I would strongly urge Members who are voting yellow or red now to give 70 votes so that this Bill may put on Postponed Consideration. Because certainly the problems, the medical problems that we're working for... I'm not going to go away. And we may need to reconsider this matter at a future time. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As one might expect there are some people on this side of the aisle who are asking what happened? What happened to the support we were supposed to have from the Majority Leader to help poor people in the city of Chicago in Cook County? What happened to the other Member of Leadership who was supposed to be for poor people in Cook County? What happened over there folks? What happened to the so called party of the people, the Democrats who are supposed to help the poor people of the State of Illinois? This is your golden opportunity to get on the Roll Call and show once and for all whether you're really for poor people



or whether you really don't care when the chips are down."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the Democratic party doesn't have to apologize to anybody about its concern for the poor and the under privileged and the neglected in this country. Starting with 1935, Social Security and Unemployment program...It's a very war on poverty lead by L.B.J., the... leaving us out of illness by FDR, the great years of Truman, the Camelot of Kennedy... Should I go on?"

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't feel it necessary that I explain my 'present' vote in light of the count currently recorded on the score Board, however, my name was mentioned during the explanation of vote. I have been very supportive of this Bill. I have worked diligently on its behalf but at the same time, I think it's fair to say that I have caused discussions between the Department of Public Aid and Cook County Hospital to be conducted during the last week. The results of that.. of those discussions has been an agreement between the department and the hospital which has been entered into by officials of the department and the hospital and which is designed to solve the problems which this Bill attempts to solve at the same time. In light of those discussions, in light of that agreement, I don't feel that there is a need for this Bill to move at this time and that is the reason for my 'present' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, apparently the Lady has touched a nerve and I would say in response to the Gentleman from



Winnnebago there's a lot to proud of, World War II, Korea and Vietnam."

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

Yourell: "And let's not leave out Nixon, Attorney General and all the rest of that bunch."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 34 'aye', 70 'nay', 60 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On a point of personal privilege?"

Schlickman: "On a point of privilege. Now that we've disposed of the bad news I'd like to give you the good news. The Cubs are winning 6 to nothing and Kingman has hit his 25th and Martin has hit his 12th."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Schlickman. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti. Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday I filed a note to reconsider the vote by which 1593 passed for reconsideration and let me explain why I do and I want it for the record. Thornton township had a Bill introduced by the Legislators from that area yesterday to include parts of Thornton or all of Thornton to be in the metropolitan sanitary district. The analysis and the brevity of the Speaker to try to expedite the Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Conti. Would you give the Gentleman some attention please?"

Conti: "I think this is important..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deuster? Please continue, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I think this is important to all Members. The very



fact that we're trying to clear up... clean up the Calendar, when I finally got to the analysis the vote was taken. The Bill was passed. I find that a few added parcels were put on to this Thornton Metropolitan Sanitary District. And when I checked the legal description on the few added parcels I find out that the town of Imberness some 40 miles northwest of Thornton was also included in the Metropolitan Sanitary District. Now, I'm.. All my objections have been raised but I know that the two Representatives.. the 3 Representatives Mugalian, Stanley and Friedland from that area knew nothing about this piece of property being included in the Metropolitan Sanitary District. I further checked the legal descriptions. I find out it's only a portion of a golf course, or all of the golf course but this could happen to you unless you read your analysis, unless you pay attention. One of these last closing days you might find yourself in the taxing district that you may not like. And for the record I would like to recall that motion that I filed to reconsider the Bill that was passed yesterday and that's on House Bill 1593."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back on the Calendar on page 3 is Senate Bill 942? Mr. Vinson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 950, Mr. Taylor? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 950, a Bill for an Act in relation to reimbursement of cost of certain medical services rendered by prisoners detainees in jail. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 950 amends the Cook County Hospital Governing Commission Act. It provides that the Commission is entitled to reimbursement for medical service for inmates of Cook County penal facilities from the



inmate by insurance of benefit programs available to the inmate...the Illinois Department of Public Aid if the inmate is eligible for social system. Mr.

Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for Senate Bill 950."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 950 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 'aye', 47 'nay', 11 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 971."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 971, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workmens' Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 971 amends the Workmens' Compensation Act. It increases the number of members to the Illinois Industrial Commission to.. from 5 to 7 members. I solicit your support for Senate Bill 971."

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

Wolf: "Does this Bill also increase the salary as the Digest says of the Chairman from 32 thousand to 41 thousand 8 hundred dollars a year?"

Taylor: "No, that was done last year. When everyone else got their salary increase, that's when they got theirs. This Bill does not do that."

Wolf: "Senate Amendment #1 the Digest shows that they increased the salary of the Chairman from 32 thousand to 41 thousand 8 hundred. Is that.. Has that been removed from the Bill?"

Taylor: "That was in the drafting of the original Bill."



Wolf: "There is no such Senate Amendment? It's never been taken off. In other words, that is what this does. It does raise the salary. Am I right?"

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

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, that pay raise for the members of the Industrial Commission including the Chairman went through previously. The Chairman's salary was raised although I don't believe that the Commissioners are receiving that increase due to some technicality being in office at the time the raise was passed. But I don't think there's any need in this Bill to raise their pay. It's already been passed previously. So I would question if there is such an Amendment. If there is one, I don't think it's of any significance. Their pay was raised from 32 thousand to 38 thousand, members of the Industrial Commission and the..."

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

Johnson: "Well, unless the Digest is in error, Senate Amendment #1 changes the salary from 32 to 41,800. Right?"

Taylor: "That was the salary. The Bill that was written, it was wrong."

Johnson: "Why do we..."

Taylor: "Senate Amendment corrected that."

Johnson: "Why do we need to increase the size of the Industrial Commission from 5 to 7?"

Taylor: "Back logs of cases that have increased."

Johnson: "Pardon me?"

Taylor: "The back log of cases that have increased by 30 thousand."

Johnson: "How often does the Industrial Commission.. I mean what.. What's the operation? Do they.. Do they meet en banc or do they meet individually so that adding the number of Commissioners would increase the number of



processed cases? What's the procedure they follow?"

Taylor: "They meet both ways. There are full time members."

Johnson: "Well how, if they meet en banc, how is increasing the membership going to mean any reduction in case load?"

Taylor: "Because they also hear some cases on an individual basis."

Johnson: "What kind of cases and what percentage of the cases are met individually?"

Taylor: " All appeals in workmens' comp cases.."

Johnson: "All what?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "All appeals of the workmens' comp cases."

Johnson: "All appeals are handled how, en banc or individually?"

Taylor: "We..."

Johnson: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Both. The Gentleman from Cook..."

Johnson: "Well, just a minute, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Epton will respond to your questions."

Epton: "If I may, in response to the various inquiries that have been raised, they are certainly valid ones and I think that in many cases are justified. If you will recall, Representative Mautino chaired a Subcommittee of the Insurance Study Commission with Representative Schuneman and Senator Bruce and Senator Rupp and they found that probably one of the worst problems we had facing us in Illinois was the work of the Industrial Commission. There have been some changes. We have a new Chairman of the Industrial Commission and we have some new Members. And for the first time in the 12 years I have been here, the Members of the Industrial Commission have met with us individually and as a group and have attempted to avoid the situation whereby it is necessary for lawyers to appear in almost every instance. And although I'm an attorney and I appreciate the need for a lawyer to make a living, the fact is



that this new Chairman and the new colleagues are hearing cases en banc, hearing cases individually, and are trying to clean up the mess that Representative Mautino and Representative Schuneman found. If ever there was a Commission that's trying to do a job and turn around I would say to you it's the Industrial Commission and although it's not a direct response to your question, I do think to a certain extent it does help answer your inquiry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Taylor, could you explain to us what the.. what the substance and effect of Amendment # 3 is to this Bill?"

Taylor: "Representative Tim Johnson, you're a very able attorney. I'd like for you to explain it to me."

Johnson: "Well, you know, you're the Sponsor of the Bill and you want us to vote for it. It seems to me as I read Amendment #3 that it's a pretty substantial change in a substantive law and under the Workmens' Compensation Act having nothing to do with the changes in the number of Members of the Industrial Commission. I just wonder if you could explain to us what that does?"

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

Johnson: "Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the.. I'm not trying to harass anybody. I just think it's important that we understand what we're voting on. I wonder if the Sponsor could explain Amendment #3? It looks to me to be a very substantive change in the Workmens' Compensation Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get you an answer. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to support Representative Taylor on this. First of all, as you well know, and I'm.. we're all familiar with the workmens' compensation, but this Commission is the agency of State Govern-



ment that adjudicates all the claims between the employer and the employees and the employers. Now there is a back log throughout the judicial system in Illinois and particularly in the workmens' compensation field. There are thousands of back log cases. And what this Bill does will increase the Commissioners from 5 to 7, which in effect, will give two additional Commissioners the right to sit down with the employer and the employee or their representative, as the case may be, and adjudicate the claims either through settlement cases or in an appeal case. And after all, we're talking about a fair and an equitable settlement between the employee and the employer. The employers are just as much in favor of this as the employee and I see nothing wrong with it. If it's a matter of being fair with the parties, then we should go along with this. This is a reasonable piece of legislation, very economical as far as cost, and I think we ought to go with it. Representative Taylor should certainly be commended for his efforts to put this piece of legislation on the books and I would wholeheartedly support him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I thought you were going to respond to Amendment 3. It's the Gentleman's question."

Schraeder: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I will if you'd like."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to try to respond to Representative Tim Johnson. Amendment #3 is when an employer deliberately removes.. disengage a safe device then that person has the right to file suit and then go further if need be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I think you know, what we're doing here is to .. if we wanted to do this in a wholesale manner I might not oppose it. But what we're really doing here



is changing the whole structure of the Workmens' Compensation Act. The trade off that was made in the initial conception back at the turn of the century in workmens' compensation law is that employees ought to be compensated for their injuries sustained in the line of their employment. And the trade off for that is that they sacrifice their common law right to proceed whether it be in product liability action or negligence action or willful and wanton action, against their employer. And that's the trade off that labor and business both made and has really been perpetuated all the way through our law up to this date. Now whether we ought to make a wholesale change in that law is something else. But right now, this is putting a significant chink in that doctrine. And I think Representative Taylor should further point out that Amendment #3 also provides that an employer is to be deemed the manufacturer of any machine or equipment rendered unsafe in the manner described above which brings us along with the waiver of common law liability or the inclusion of common law liability I presume in the products liability realm. And I think this is something that has significant effects on insurance rates; It has significant effects on the coverage of the average employer and businessman and for that matter the laboring man in this state and I think it's a significant change in the law. The salary was changed as Representative Brummer pointed out to me a minute ago last year by Representative Beatty's Bill, I think, from 25 to 32 and now we're increasing it from 32 to 42 so almost have doubled the salary of the Chairman in the course of 2 or 3 years. We've added the number.. increased the number of Commissioners from 5 to 7 when appointing just mere hearing officers to take those would be a much easier conduit to the same route and I think this



Bill in its overall perspective is something that ought to be defeated and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Beatty: "Representative, you're increasing the membership from 5 Members to 7 and this is based on a political representation and an employer representation. How is the new Members going to be? Is one going to be a Republican or one from the employer rank? Is that what I read this to be?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Beatty: "So this.. We're appointing 2 Members and the Democrats are getting none of them?"

Taylor: "Will you repeat your question?"

Beatty: "You're employing 2 new Members and I think you've indicated one will be a Republican and one will be from the employer's rank so of the 2 Members, the Democratic party does not have one of the appointments. Is this what you're... Is this your Bill? Are you creating a job for the Republicans?"

Taylor: "One of each, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "One of each from what? One from the employer? One from the Republicans?"

Taylor: "One each.. One of each of the parties and one each in the rest of the parties.."

Beatty: "Jim, you're going from 5 to 7 so you're appointing 2 new people? One is from the major political party. I imagine that would be the Governor.. The Governor being a Republican, we're getting a new Republican Member. Is that correct? One Democrat, one Republican? Any promises for these jobs yet?"

Taylor: "No, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Well, I wonder if.. Okay. Thank you."

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



Huff: "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 'no's' have it. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, this is a significant Bill. Representative Johnson pointed out that the Amendment #3 which of course has absolutely nothing at all to do with the Bill and what you've lead to believe the Bill is about, which was to increase the size of the Industrial Commission. Amendment #3 added to Senate Bill 971 the substance of House Bill 431 and Representative Katz's words, this is the third bite of the apple type of Amendment and one that we ought to look at very carefully because, as Representative Johnson pointed out, it completely changes the philosophy of workmens' compensation. Now, you have heard, all of us have heard back home from our.."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, my Senator just walked in the doors. I want to take this out of the record for the time being."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 1331, Mr. McPike. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1331. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1331, as you all know, is the product of the Governor's Unemployment Insurance Committee. On Second Reading, on Second Reading a number of charges were made that the Bill does not help the small business man. I would like to go over some of the provisions in this Bill to make sure that those of you who are trying to protect the interest of small business people throughout Illinois understand exactly what you're voting on. First of all, there's one major change in here that organized labor asked for. Under current law if you're unemployed and have no children you can receive more money than if you're unemployed and have children. The \$135 cap is removed. The majority of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Mr. McPike. Let me get you a little attention. Would the Membership kindly be in your own chair? Would you kindly give the Gentleman some attention? Mr. Giorgi. Proceed Mr. McPike."

McPike: "No. I'd like to continue. To review some of the benefits in this Bill that will help small business people. It says that in the future only one spouse can claim, during the year, the children. Under current law, both individual, both the individual spouse or the unemployed spouse, regardless of when they're employed could claim the children in that year. The first benefit. The second is that no one can receive more than 26 times the weekly benefit amount subject to a maximum total wages earned in the base period. A second benefit for small business men. Third, we raise the base period earning's requirement from one thousand to fourteen hundred and the high quarter



from 275 to 385. That's a third benefit. Fourth, we increase the penalty for voluntary leave from eight weeks to twelve weeks and require that the individual earn six times weekly benefit amount before eligibility. The next benefit was discharged for misconduct was increased from six weeks to ten weeks. A next benefit was refusal of work was increased from six weeks to ten weeks. We have made a change in how the unemployment tax is figured on the individual employer. Currently, a major benefit to large business in Illinois you are allowed three weeks of unemployment before any assessment is made against you. That leaves an opportunity for a large employer in Illinois to shut down for a two week period and never be assessed for unemployment. The small employer never has that opportunity. Usually doesn't shut down for two weeks at Christmas or two weeks in the summer. We've changed that so that for every week that the individual is unemployed 126 of the amount is, is charged against the individual. And finally and the most important benefit for small business people, you'll recall that a year ago we raised their rate from .1 to 1.0. That was a 1000% increase. Now you didn't hear the Manufacturer's Association in Springfield fighting against that change but you did hear the small business people in your district when you returned crying about that, that unjust and unfair increase. The 1000%. Under this Bill we have decreased the rate from the current 1% to .4% which means this; 46%, I hope you hear this, 46% of all employers in Illinois are at the minimum rate. These are the small business people in your district. 46%. Now their rate this coming year will go from 1% to .4%. That's a reduction of over 50%. Now you can go home and tell every small business person in your area that's at the minimum rate that you decreased their taxes. There are other provisions in this Bill that are absolutely necessary because as everyone knows our fund is bankrupt. We are



one billion dollars in debt to the Federal Government. We have to repay it. We have to, to fund the system that, in the future, will be financially stable and at the same time allow us to pay back our federal debts. There's no doubt that no one is perfectly happy with an agreed Bill. There are a number of provisions in here that labor is not happy with and there are probably a few in here that Management is not happy with. But, in general, I think it is a decent Bill. It addresses itself to the problem of refinancing our system. It tightens up the disqualifications and it gives a tax break to small business people. For all those reasons, I think you should support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "A lot. A lot. Oh yeah. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, we have a young page here who has a hot dog and a coke and he seems to be lost with it. Who ordered a hot dog and a coke?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Margulas I believe. In the back."

Campbell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back row young man. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this measure. It's been called by some an agreed Bill but it certainly hasn't been agreed to by anyone who's been elected to represent the people of this state who sit here in this Body. And I say it's a farce and it's a misnomer to call it an agreed Bill certainly here in these legislative chambers. A better term, I think, to call this Bill would be a job-loser Bill. Because that's what's going to happen here in Illinois. More jobs are going to be lost if we pass and vote for this measure. In the area that I represent which is the second largest industrial area of this state, one manufacturer has advised me that it's going to cost him 34% more each year. A tax raise in his unemployment



insurance cost of 34% each year for a quarter of a million dollars. Now I'm talking about a manufacturer who's been thinking about trying to leave this state because of the already high cost and here we're going to burden him with another 34%. I'm talking about an area of this state that already has lost 12,000 jobs in the last ten years. Jobs left this state according to figures provided by the Department of Business and Economic Development. And so this Bill instead of helping the job situation is going to hurt the job situation. It's going to put more burden of taxes upon the back of job producers that already are considering not expanding, considering relocating in other states. And I say to you, let's vote no on this Bill. It's because of Bills like this that no wonder John Deere company has built five plants in the last five years and everyone of those five plants has been built in another state. This is their home headquarters. This is the largest agricultural state in the nation and yet John Deere company has built all of their plants out of this state creating jobs somewhere else and not in Illinois. It's because of Bills like this that Hiram Walker has announced they're going to close their job producing facility in Peoria. It's because of Bills like this that Obear Nester down in East St. Louis has announced it's going to close. It's because of Bills like this that A.O. Smith plant in Granite City decided to build their new plant in Tennessee with 3,000 more jobs. It's because of Bills like this that Flying Tiger Express that has 5,000 employees to be located at their new plant probably is not going to have any problem deciding whether they locate in Kansas or Illinois. With this Bill this decision will be clear. It'll be Kansas and not Illinois. So if we're really interested in new jobs in this state, let's vote no upon this bad Bill."

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

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "I think current law provides that anyone who has less than \$40,000 per quarter in wages has a lower maximum rate. Is that right?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "That is correct. Small..."

Brummer: "What is that rate?"

McPike: "Small business men or women engaged in business in Illinois who have payrolls of \$40,000 a quarter or less have a maximum of three percent rates and that rate is not changed by this Bill."

Brummer: "OK. This Bill does not affect those that have \$40,000 a year with regard to the rate."

McPike: "Would you repeat that?"

Brummer: "\$40,000 a quarter, I'm sorry. The maximum rate for those who have \$40,000 a quarter in payroll is not increased under this Bill."

McPike: "That is correct."

Brummer: "Does the State Chamber of Commerce have a position on this Bill?"

McPike: "Chamber of Commerce is in full support of the Bill."

Brummer: "May I address the Bill briefly? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Bill that appears to have had unanimous support of the agreed Bill Committee. I have heard numerous times here that it had no legislative input. It had no status. The agreed Bill Committee had no status. I checked on that. The agreed Bill Committee was appointed pursuant to statutory authority that was enacted by the General Assembly and the Members of that were the, were appointed to the Employment Security Advisory Board. That is statutory authority in the book, in the statutes of the State of Illinois currently. It had not been active for some time. As I understand it, the function and the purpose of the Employment Security Advisory Board is to advise the Legislature with regard to items of unemployment insurance. They did that pursuant



to the statutory authority and I would recommend an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye' aye, oppose. Previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. As you know, organized labor is in support of this Bill and so is the State Chamber of Commerce. I'd just like to read one small sentence that appeared in a recent letter from the Chamber. It said, 'The agreed Bill', and that is this one, 'presents the only gains business has been able to make in improving the Unemployment Insurance Law of this state since Labor Security adoption of a number of its Amendments in 1975'. There are major concessions made in this Bill. There is no doubt that, that as was brought up in debate, some large employers; actually any employers who have a very unstable work force, are going to have a tax increase. And there's no doubt that it's absolutely necessary. The employer representatives on the Committee drafted the financial arrangements as it so, as it stands right now they recognize that we have to pay back our debt to the Federal Government and that we have to fund our system. Now it is possible that an individual employer with a poor record may have a 30% increase. But how many of you cried a couple of years ago when small business had a 1000% increase? Now that's the way it is today. We increase the small business tax 1000% and now we're trying to roll it back. We're rolling it back from 1.0 to .4 and we're making numerous changes to tighten, tighten the administration of the law. I think it's a decent Bill. I think it has addressed some of the problems that have been, that have been brought up in the last few years and I think that if you want to go home and tell your business



community that you've tried to help them this Session,
I think you're going to have to give this an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall the House pass Senate
Bill 1331? All in favor vote aye. All oppose vote nay.
The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels to explain his vote.
Timer's on."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
The Illinois business climate has been deteriorating
at an alarming rate in the last few years. We are today
debating a Bill which will add another financial burden
on Illinois business to the tune of \$180,000,000. Does
this make any sense? Are there any redeeming qualities
of this legislation will make it's passage desirable?
I think not. Let's examine this Bill to see what it will
do to business. The moderate changes in the Bill which
will impact favorably for business will save 18 to 19
million. The added cost to the trust fund by raising
the benefits amount to an added drain on the trust fund
of about 45 million. The net cost of the trust fund
is 25 to 30 million. Is this the way to assist business?
I think not. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we
have here is a Bill that's masqueraded in an attempt to
call the agreed Bill process and one that we should accept
without..."

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

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
I also rise in opposition against this legislation. As
the previous speaker indicated, this is going to be an
additional drain on the trust fund in the State of Illinois.
The potentiality of \$180,000,000 of new taxes on the
employers of the State of Illinois that you're imposing
upon. You're driving business and industry out of the
State of Illinois and to use the axiom of the Chamber of
Commerce appointing it, frankly, their support's like
sending Neville Chamberlain to over to negotiate for



peace in our times."

136.

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in protest of this type of legislation to come in under the guides of being represented by all business. This represents the biggies view point but it doesn't represent the little fellows view point. The big one has no worry that he's going to be charged the maximum but those in between and those on the bottom can rest assured they're going to be max. And as this goes up and you go back to your district next time and they tell you, 'Hey. What happened? You didn't give us any relief. Instead you gave us a bigger Bill!' And that's what you're going to have to face. I recommend a no."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I certainly wish there were a few more members of the Chamber of Commerce up in the balcony because Gentleman, you have your heads in the sand. You don't know what you're talking about. Labor has again bamboozled you and you don't have enough common sense to realize it. More power to the Manufacturer's Association. Let me give you three reasons, three reasons why this is a bad Bill. First of all, it'll increase the potential benefits of every employee making more than \$202 a week. And if you don't think that's significant you better look around and see what small business is paying to people today. \$250, \$300 a week is absolutely nothing. Second of all, it'll increase the maximum rate of every employer. You better look around at your small business. We're all paying maximum rates because we're allowing these very lazy people to walk off the job for no reason and draw these benefits and that's the third point I'd like to raise. It still recognizes the right of those who walk off the job voluntar..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff¹³⁷ to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to remind the Members that this Bill passed out of the Senate 52 to nothing. But I think that Mr. McPike, Representative McPike is right on course. Perhaps it won't bring any new business into Illinois, but what it will do is make the business climate palatable enough so those who haven't left already won't do so. I remember three years ago when I was trying to get, find out why the unemployment checks were as much as a year behind, the Department of Labor didn't even have any documentation on how many jobs they left. But in 1976 they discovered we lost a million job unit. I say that this Bill is in the right direction and I'm sure that business will be competent by this measure and stay here as we try to endeavor to improve on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner. Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just how much longer are we going to shove it to business? It won't be long until business in Illinois will no longer be with us and you know when business leaves Illinois, so do the jobs. I vote no."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been called the agreed Bill and I suggest to you, my colleagues in the House, that this is a very, very poor agreement. Organized labor has been trying for the last three or four Sessions that I've been down here to get the cap removed on unemployment compensation benefits. It's been their number one priority in the Legislature. What this Bill does is give the union bosses their number one priority without closing some of those loop holes that permit compensation benefits to people who shouldn't receive benefits. Now, I



think we should give consideration to laborer's request. But not without closing these loop holes. You could have, you could have done the job yesterday on Amendment #2 to this Bill and the House refu..."

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

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise opposed to this legislation. We talk about agreed Bill here. Who agreed? A few large business people and Chamber of Commerce and the Labor. But what about the small business man. That was not taken into consideration whatsoever. He certainly wouldn't have agreed to this because any of us can sit down and figure out what it does to the small business man and every small business man is going to have his unemployment compensation raise. Now we've trampled on these people for the last few years. Here we're telling them, 'We're going to give you something' and we're absolutely not giving them one thing. We're just going to run more of them out of business. Many of these people, they can't move on like the big companies to other states, build the plants and so forth and, therefore; they end up having to move out, close up the business and cannot stay in business and by that same..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey to explain her vote."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as no on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as no. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson to explain his vote." Timer is on."

Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. This unemployment insurance situation seems to me to be like a ship with a huge hole in the bottom and a few leaky seams. I think what we're doing with this so-called agreed Bill is plugging up, caulking up a few of the leaky seams but leaving a gaping



hole in the bottom of the ship which has to do with voluntary quits and those things that have already been mentioned. But until that huge, gaping hole in the bottom of this ship of business in Illinois is plucked up, plugged up, is patched up, is repaired the ship of business in Illinois is going to continue to slowly sink in the seas. And I would urge a no vote."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Three things I think need to be brought out in explaining my no vote. There's been a lot of rhetoric about the State Chambers supports this. How many of your local Chambers support it? Not one of them. There's been also... OK. We got one over there. Anybody that votes green votes on this is voting for a tax increase whether you want to admit it or not because it's going to be a tax increase on small business and all of the units of local government who have chosen to use the reimbursable form on this as long as the cap has been taken off they're going to pay more money on it. That's three reasons for a no vote."

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

Davis: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker. There's really not much point I guess because this Bill's going to sail out of here with over a hundred votes on it. But I just want you to go back, those of you voting green, go back to your districts the next three days, particularly the new ones, the next three days your going to be asked to vote on a variety of tax increases, tax increases when you campaigned against them and this is the first one. Now this is just going to ring the neck of the golden goose a little bit more and it is a tax increase, make no mistake about it. So when you vote for it, go back and tell the folks back home you're for tax increases."



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

Huskey: "Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the, of the General Assembly. The Bills are suppose to be drawn within these walls. We're sent down here to do our own legislation. Not to accept things from outside of these walls. The maximum benefits are increased from \$135 to \$172 a week on this Bill. This gives your employers under the, and mainly your small business men a 28% increase in your unemployment insurance rates. A 28% increase. You hammered them in 1975. You're hammering them twice as hard again today. You're crying about us owing the government a million dollars. There's no agreement between... this Bill offers no agreement with the Federal Government on the repayment of that loan. Absolutely none. This is a bad Bill. It's another nail in the coffin of the small business ma..."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think there's two areas here that we ought to be concerned with and I think one is the fact that you can become employed one day, quit the next and begin drawing unemployment. I think this is bad. It's unAmerican and unIllinoisan. The second thing is that if you totally agree with the agreed process in terms of being a Body to legislate then there's really not much need of having a General Assembly. We just pass Bills by the agreed process."

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

Borchers: "Well, all I've got to say is you're doing it again. You're not thinking for the future benefit of this state or the future welfare of the state. I know I'm not going to change your votes. It's going to stay right there with 93 plus whoever's going to jump on it the last minute. I know you're going to do it. But how blind some



of you people are since I have been a student of history all of my life, of particularly Illinois, and you don't listen. I cannot understand how blind you are but go on and be blind till it's too late. You'll fall in the pit."

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

Katz: "It is to me very surprising when I look at the Board that this Bill is the result of an agreement reached by all but one Member of a Board that was appointed by Governor Thompson in Illinois. He selected the members. He made the appointments. He selected the business appointments and the public members. Every public member supported this proposal. People highly knowledgeable in the field of unemployment compensation and all of the industry members, all of the employee members that won as I understand it, unanimously from the board. I'm told a unanimous result of the board. This appointed by the Republican Governor. I don't know if you don't have confidence in your Governor. Here the Democrats are supporting the Governor because they believe that it is a fair proposal. That the people who were knowledgeable deliberated. Of course you didn't get all that you wanted out of it per..."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This definitely helps small businessmen. A year ago we, that we had business men in the State of Illinois who were paying only 1/10 of 1%. Last year they went... they tried to come into the federal deficit we went the 1%. Under this proposal, they can go back to 4/10 of 1% a 40... a 50% savings to 46% of people doing business in the State of Illinois. Now that's a savings that we can really appreciate and every small businessman. I'll go back and face my small businessmen and say we finally did something to cut into how much money you're going to



pay in unemployment comp.. We also checked into the, or we do some good in so far as voluntary leaving. We, the time now is from eight weeks to twelve weeks. Discharge for misconduct. We increased the delay in time from six weeks to ten weeks. Failure to accept suitable work disqualifications increased from six weeks to ten weeks. It's a good piece of legislation that I'll be proud to go home and go to any small business man or any large manufacturer and tell them we did something for the business community with this piece of legislation and the Republicans' that aren't voting for it are making a mistake."

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

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In one little town of Carmi we have lost 400 jobs since the election. Those people that are losing their homes because the factories moved out of the county and left them, and left them sitting. I don't think they would approve of us voting for a Bill like this that has driven their jobs out and we have lost something like 1500 jobs in my district. And I hate to see the people have to move and change because they do not get along on this. You can leave the State of Illinois and go across into Indiana at the present time and make a dollar to a dollar and a half an hour more in wages because they don't have the taxes to pay. Now where would you rather live and work? A lot of them are following the factories."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to observe I'll be happy to go home and indicate that I have supported the agreed Bill. The Members on this side of the aisle agreed to the agreed Bill process and agreed before the agreed Bill process took place. We didn't say we'd support the agreed Bill if it was our druthers. We said we'd support it win or lose and we're



here. We're up on the Board. We're supporting the agreed Bill and we're going to go home and be proud of it and say that we've submitted ourselves to the process. We've done our job. We've carried out our duty and we're proud to represent both business and labor in this important, sensitive process in State Government. Those of you who are voting red are supporting a position which is exactly the opposite of what you've been telling us all along. You said you want the agreed process but when it didn't come out suitable to one fraction of your interest then you won't vote for it. Well you've got to vote for the agreed Bill win or lose when you submit to the process and that's what we said we'd do and that's what we're doing."

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

Stuffle: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Members. It seems odd to me that a few short months ago business people came to me in my district from business associations around the state and said we've got to have an agreed Bill. Now we've got an agreed Bill and business in some cases doesn't want it. I don't think business wants to solve a problem. I sit here next to a small business man who he's not as happy as anyone in the world is about the Bill nor am I but it is agreed. It's an agreed Bill that helps Roman Kosinski and Roman Kosinski Jewelers in business for 75 years. He wants this Bill and I want this Bill. Some of the small businessmen want this Bill because they know and I know and you know that it's better than nothing. It solves some of the problems, in fact, it solves many of the problems before us. I don't think you really want to go back. I hope not. And let your business people continue to argue that they got nothing. I don't think you want to keep this issue alive forever just to have it there..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder to explain



his vote."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker I... Excuse me. I didn't intend to speak but I think I should make myself very clear. I think this Bill leaves a lot to be desired. But I made a commitment much earlier that if the agreed Bill process was put into effect at the request of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House and the Governor called the Committee that I would support it. I find this Bill very sadly lacking in many needed features but in keeping with the process of the agreed Bill, I'm going to support it and I would hope that this would be the beginning of further agreed Committees on workmans comp. and un&employment comp.. If those Committees continue to function, I will support those Bills in the future."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 ayes and 71 nays. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney wants to be recorded as aye. 101. And Mr. Simms wants a verification. Clerk will poll the absentees. Poll the absentees please. Stearney wants to be recorded as aye."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Kozubowski. Margulas. Molloy. Pierce. And Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Skinner wants to be recorded as no. All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. All unauthorized personnel. Would the Membership kindly be in your own seat? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty what purpose seek recognition?"

Beatty: "Could I be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman... Leave to be verified Mr. Beatty. Leave is granted. Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow.



Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn.
 Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garnisa.
 Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Hanahan.
 Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones.
 Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz.
 Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz.
 Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman... Mr. Leon requests leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Leon. And also Donovan. Mr. Donovan. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Matijevich. Mautino. McBroom. McClain.
 McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger.
 O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Polk. Pouncey. Preston.
 Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite.
 Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp.
 Slape. Stearney. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich.
 Van Duynes. Vittek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer.
 Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Taylor asked leave to be verified. Leave is granted. The Membership kindly be in your own seat. Mr. Simms do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Simms: "Yes Mr. Speaker. Representative Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Alexander is in her seat."

Simms: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Balanoff is by her seat."

Simms: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes is right here."

Simms: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell will ask leave to be verified. Leave. Gentleman from Macon Mr. Dunn what purpose seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Ask leave to be verified Mr. Speaker,"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dunn asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Capparelli. Brummer what do you want? Mr. Brummer asks leave to be verified."



Leave is granted. Mr. Capparelli in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Capparelli. Remove him."

Simms: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman. Janet could you move over just a little bit? Mr. Sharp. Sharp. Mrs. Chapman. How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman in the chamber? Remove her."

Simms: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Christensen. Christensen. He's here."

Simms: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Darrow is here."

Simms: "Representative... we gave Representative Dunn permission. Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa is here."

Simms: "Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"

Simms: "Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Greiman is in the back of the hall."

Simms: "OK. Representative Leon."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He was verified."

Simms: "I'm sorry. Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz is in the back of the chamber."

Simms: "OK. Thank you very much. Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mugalian. Mr. Mugalian. Mr. Mugalian: How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting ayes"

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

Mr. Sam Wolf wants to have leave to be verified."

Simms: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew. He's right here."

Simms: "You're here George. I see you. Representative O'Brien." OK. Very good. Representative Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly put Mr. Mugalian back on the Roll



Call. Mr. Sharp is in the chair, is in his chair. Mr. Mugalian is back in the chamber."

Simms: "Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Yes sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "So you know Mr. Mugalian is back on the Roll Call."

Simms: "Yes, I saw it. Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "OK. Put Mrs. Chapman back on the Roll Call."

Simms: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terzich. Mr. Terzich in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Simms: "I have no further inquiries Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "OK. On this question there are 99 ayes, 72 nos. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. O'Brien in the chamber? On Senate Bills, Third Reading, page 2, we're on that order of business, Senate Bill 244. The Gentleman... 244, Tony. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. The Amendment has been distributed. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, O'Brien, amends Senate Bill 244 as amended by House Amendment 6 be deleting the sentence added to the Bill on page one and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill is amended today and we put this Amendment on it, which is a change of Representative Walsh's Amendment, Amendment #5, what will be the required number of votes for passage today?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "All you have to do is get a leave of the



House to have the Bill considered today since it was amended. It would require... What does the Amendment do? Should only take 89 votes. You need 107 to suspend the rule though. 107 votes you need. Mr. O'Brien, what do you want to do?"

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we're probably better off leaving it on Third Reading and taking this Amendment up in the Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine..."

O'Brien: "... Appraise Representative Walsh of what the Amendment does and he's aware of it and it's basically flip-flops..... in Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put the Bill back on Third Reading and leave it there. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 157."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 157, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the expenses of the Judicial Advisory Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #2, 1,2,3,4,5,8,11,12,13,14,and 15 were adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Parliamentary, come to the podium please."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment # 16, Van Duyne-Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting in lieu of the last line in Section 12 the following."

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

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. Yesterday we adopted a number of Amendments on this Bill and some of them were capital on an operations budget and I believe this was one of them. What's the status? What's the posture of those Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't... I don't quite get your question,



Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "You the questioning of the germaness of those Amendments, is that your point?"

Totten: "I think this Bill was taken out of the record yesterday because of the number of Amendments that were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now I believe the Gentleman is a bit premature. The Bill was taken out of the record, but none of the Amendments that had been adopted on the Bill had any relationship to capital funding. The Amendments that had been adopted were all GRF, but this Amendment, the Amendment that we stopped on is Amendment #16 which I think the Gentleman may, may want to address this question to. But none of the previous Amendments that had been adopted had any relationship to capital funding."

Speaker Redmond: "You're talking about the Committee Amendments. None of those.."

Barnes: "No, there were some Floor Amendments also..."

Speaker Redmond: "Were those Floor Amendments?"

Barnes: "Those Floor Amendments that were previously adopted were all GRF funds. But this one, Amendment 16, which is.. we're on now, he may want to raise the question. I'm not suggesting that he do. But this is the first one that we have gotten to that is capital funding."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I do raise the germaneness of Amendment #16."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian advises me the Amendment is okay. Representative Totten."

Tottea: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Amendment is germane, but I think it would require 107 votes cause it's capital."



Is not that correct? No?"

Speaker Redmond: "From General Revenue funds. He said 89."

Totteh: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "A simple Majority, pardon me. Anything further? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from the 42nd District is much more capable than I of pressing this Amendment so I would yield to Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my second effort to have this Amendment adopted as you remember the other day I tried to put it on 487, the Department of Local Government Affairs. And for some reason or other Tom didn't want it on his Bill and seemed like most of the other fellows or people around here didn't either. But I since then have talked to most of the Members who objected and they have assured me that they will not object this time and have leant their vote toward this effort to get this \$500 for the city of Lockport in their attempt to reactivate Old Central School. And unless there are any more questions why I will belabor the point. I explained it I think the other day and I would simply ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Are we not only being lead down the primrose path, but we're just plain being mislead. The Gentleman said this adds \$500 from the General Revenue Fund. He forgot 3 zeros. It's \$500,000 to the Department of Local Government Affairs for a grant to Lockport Township High School. That's to renovate a high school and some of the money is going to go to the township, the Park District and Lockport to renovate a school that is just about falling



down anyway and it's been deserted by the School District.

This is really uncalled for and is also misleading so

I would ask your 'no' vote on Amendment #16."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Van Dwyne to close."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, Representative Totten. If I said \$500, it was a mistatement. I meant to say and as you will notice it says \$500,000 on your.. on your Amendment. And I really had thought that I had explained this in detail the other day and I'm not making any facade. I'm just telling you point blank this is a \$500,000 grant to the city of Lockport, to the city Park District of Lockport, and also the township and now they have made a valiant effort to raise the money on their own and in their own way they have pledged \$270, 000 from the township, Lockport Park District \$230,000 and the city of Lockport 210. So I'm not trying to masquerade under any guise of anything. I'm simply asking you to support me in my effort to bring a little pork, if you want to put it that way, back to our District and I think that Representative Davis and also Representative Leinenweber will agree with me in the support of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I'd vote for this if the Sponsors would assure us we won't get clerkanosis from it."

Speaker Redmond: " Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 82 'aye', and 61 'no'. And the motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #17, Braun, amends Senate Bill 157 by inserting after the last line in Section 12 the following."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #17 provides a grant to the Chicago Park District for rehabilitation of Jackson Park and relocation of a golf driving range. Many of you have read about the scandal in the Chicago Park District and particularly as it concerns the neglect of local parks. Amendments #17 and 18 relate to that neglect and represent my effort to redress some of the harm that has been done by Park District abuse to parks in the 24th District. I would appreciate your favorable vote on Amendment #17."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, well, I'll tell you, Lynn Bloom Park was enough for me. Jackson Park is just too much. Representative Pouncey wanted to build a field park. That sounded okay, but we're trying to relocate a golf driving range with this \$250,000. What's happened is the Chicago Park District all of sudden has got itself in a big mess and we've seen that in the newspapers. And now they're coming to get things in order by asking the state and the taxpayers of the whole state to bail them out. What the Lady is asking for is \$250,000 out of the General Revenue Fund for the .. to renovate Jackson Park. I submit that the money could much better go to the RTA and that this is an unwise Amendment and it ought to be beaten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun to close."

Braun: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The golf driving range in Jackson Park destroyed a wildlife preserve. The only AAU certified running track in the country... in the county, a nesting place for rare birds and bob-o-links and a place that has been used by the community for soccer, team sports



and the like. Now this Amendment will provide funds for restoration of that area and I think that it is appropriate for this Body to respond to the needs of the community for .. to preserve its parks. Thank you. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call. "

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 17. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye' and 51 'no', and the motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #18, Braun, amends Senate Bill 157 by inserting after the last line in Section 12 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Park...of the Park.. of the House. Amendment #18 goes for South Shore for a country club park, which is also in the 24th Legislative District and which has also been neglected by the Chicago Park District. I.. It addresses a very serious matter, the Park District took over the country club several years ago. It has been allowed to go to seed again because the neglect of the Chicago Park District. I call for your favorable vote on this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I again rise in opposition to the Lady's Amendment. The Park District as she says has neglected the sight and because they've neglected the sight they are now asking the taxpayers of the state to bail them out. This is another \$250,000 out of the General Revenue Fund for the Lady's District. We keep renovating all these parks and there won't be anybody left in the District to vote for and I think that we ought to defeat this



Amendment also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this particular piece of well planned park for is for this Lady's District as well and I rise to speak for the Amendment. What we're talking about here is not just an issue of Park District neglect well documented by the Sun-Times investigation, but this particular building which was until about five years ago a private country club for the people of the south shore community. The Park District under enormous pressure from the residents of the 24th District and the people of the south shore and neighboring Hyde Park, Wood Lawn communities put pressure on the Park District on the Chicago Planning Commission to buy that piece of property so that the South Shore Country Club building could become a palace for all the people. In order to make that building into the kind of building that it can one day be, in order to restore it to its earlier days of charm, grace, elegance for the people of the 24th District additional monies are necessary. This Amendment is a good Amendment. It's put for the people. It's to create a palace for the people of the south side of Chicago in the 24th District. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of the Amendment 18. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we don't want to hear too much from the prophets of doom and gloom. All we want you to do is consider this park project in the same light and reason as you would a leaky fair ground roof. It's something for our District. Something to help the Lady get re-elected. It's a necessity. And when you consider it in that light it really becomes



palatable. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 77 'aye', 58 'no'. The motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment # 19, Hallstrom, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 9 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment provides for the appropriation for the Governor's Purchase of Care Rate Review Board. The amount is \$225,000 and it is in the Governor's budget. This Board was the result of a law passed in 1978. The agency was created and given the statutory authority to approve costs charged by private facilities for handicapped children. There are approximately 325 such facilities within and out of the state serving almost 7 thousand Illinois students who are handicapped. To date, all the work of the Board has been carried out by ad hoc staff numbering 15 to 20 persons borrowed from 6 state agencies represented on the Board. Many long hours have been spent developing by laws, rules and regulations and a cost reporting form. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Board is doing a great service to the State of Illinois. First of all to children, secondly to the fact that it saves taxpayers money. Any school who charges over \$4500, they must go before this Board. I would ask for your support in this Amendment."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Senate ... Amendment # 19 to Senate Bill 157. I believe that the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board should be superceded



by much more soundly thought out State Purchases Human Services Review Board. That is the way the legislation should be. We should pass that Bill and we should in the comprehensive considered manner treat with a very important subject. This should be a 'no' vote on this Amendment and later on on Amendment 31 we should adopt it. I ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea. Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in opposition to this Amendment. I support what Representative Getty has said. I hate to rise in opposition with such a fine Sponsor of the Amendment but what this if we go with Amendment 31, this will provide \$300,000 instead of the 225. It will provide the opportunity for an integrated coordinated approach in terms of human services that are purchased by the state. I think that we should have a much more integrated program. I think we should have one that is accountable. 395 Board has done a good job in getting started. They will not lose any of their effectiveness because we have amended House Bill 986 which will provide for an even flow there. And this would then bring the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board together in a fashion we can expect much more coordination and a much better review and as a result, be much more responsible to the public as far as the establishment of a review. I think that we have .. There are too many staff, but with this here it would provide for the .. enough staff to do both of the jobs. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom to close."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope all of you please will listen to me. I do understand what Representative Getty and Representative Rea are talking about. Representative Rea can tell you I've spent a lot of time talking with him.



I understand what he wants. But the point is the Bill that he's talking about has not passed the Senate. It's on Postponed Consideration. I understand it will come back. I do not know if the Governor will sign it. If he does not, we need to have this appropriation for the Governor's Purchase Review Board. It affects many children and parents in our state. If the Governor so desires to sign Senate Bill 986 then this money will go back to the General Revenue. I also understand that under the reorganization that if it is necessary that the Governor can have this money go into the Board that Representative Rea is talking about. I do urge you please do not let us lose this Board. They have spent so much time on this work. It's very important to children and I would ask you please to support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 19. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 73 'aye' and 34 'no'. The motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #20, Wikoff, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 13 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an Amendment which corrects a .. not an over well, I guess basically an oversight in the budget of the State University's Civil Service Merit Board. This budget was passed out of here quite some time ago and the University's appropriation budget was passed out just the other day. This \$2,000 will bring their pay rate into line with all of those in the



University systems and I ask for the favorable vote on this \$2,000 Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Do you seek recog.

Representative Ewell. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aye's have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 21, J.J. Wolf, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by deleting Section 8."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I'd like to withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Amendment's withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 22, Taylor, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting after the last line in Section 12 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #22 is a good Amendment. It's one that's designed to help the Governor. The Governor has in the last few days passed a civil.. human rights Bill out of here where you merged three agencies together and I feel that there's not enough money involved for the merging in order to make a good strong agency as he so said that he wanted. I have introduced this Amendment action for 5 million dollars to Senate Bill 157 for the purpose of that merging. I solicit your support for Amendmant #22."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 22. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative



Taylor to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm certain that I cannot believe my eyes that we have 71..72 persons that are voting against this when all of the red lights that are up there voted for the merger and the merger is certainly going to cost some more money. I talked to the Governor myself. He indicated to me that it would not save money, the merger would not, and he said that it's going to need more money in order to be able to properly implement that program. I solicit your 'aye' vote for Amendment #22."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 78 'aye'.. 79 'aye', and 77 'no' and the motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 23, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 14 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #23."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 23 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 24, Braun-Stanley, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 9 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, we would withdraw Amendment 24."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 24 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 25, Wikoff, amends Senate Bill 157 on page 3 by inserting between lines 27 and 28 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

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



the House. This one's for slightly more than the last Amendment..."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members: of the House, in deference.. in all deference to my Committee Member who has served so faithfully on the Appropriations II Committee, this is the one that Representative Totten was speaking about earlier and so I will have to raise the question on it since it is a part of our rules. This Amendment addresses itself to a capital project and I would then suggest a ruling from the Chair relative to it. This is a capital project..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff?"

Wikoff: "Yes, I agree with Representative Barnes. I would ask to move to suspend Rule 27-F which if this is done would then allow this to go on."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. Would this then require 107 votes for the Bill to pass?"

Speaker Redmond: "I hate to give you an opinion because I may be overruled, but I think it does. I'm waiting for the Parliamentarian. One of the assistant parliamentarians.. Three-fifths vote. Wait a minute. What vote does this take to suspend the rule? Which rule was it you asked to suspend?"

Wikoff: "27-F."

Speaker Redmond: "27-F. 107 votes. Yeah. The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the suspension of the rules. Those in favor vote 'aye'.. vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Yourell? Have all voted who wish. Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 94 'aye' and 5 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: " Amendment 26,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your light was on.. What number is this, 26?..."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 26, Kosinski, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by deleting all of Section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Roman Kosinski? Representative Kosinski."

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

This puts back money for the criminal sentencing Commission of which Mr. Getty and several other Members of the General Assembly are Members. There was money taken out in the Senate. The total amount now comes to 137, 920 and I ask for acceptance of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "How much is this Amendment for?"

Kosinski: "This is up to 137, 920 to make it a full time situation."

Stearney: "You mean 137 thousand dollars?"

Kosinski: "Criminal sentencing Commission."

Stearney: "And this is to consider the types of penalties to impose for certain offenses, is that right? Mr. Kosinski?"

Kosinski: "Ron, this grew out of that class X Bill fifteen hundred."

Stearney: "Well, my question is, this, since you and the Gentlemen on this side of the aisle have amended practically every criminal statute and made practically everything a class X offense, I see no reason to study the criminal justice system any longer. Everything is now class X. What more can you do?..."

Kosinski: "I appreciate..."



Stearney: "Study the matter even more now reduce the sentences?"

Kosinski: "I appreciate your humour in this situation, but when our two good Members Harold Katz and Michael Getty Members of that Commission I want it fully funded so they can do their job. Thanks Ron."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge a 'no' vote on this. We've got a Commission now to consider sentencing but what we've done over the last two and four years is make practically everything class X. There's no reason to study the system any longer. It's a waste of the taxpayers' money, 137 thousand dollars. We do not need another Commission."

Kosinski: "Mr. Stearney, I presume that was in the form of a question. And I know how you're opposed to anything which might assist this state in terms of the criminal problems of the state. But I recommend accepting this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion... Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been a very close student of Mr. Kosinski's reasonable and practical policies in the fiscal field and I try to follow him very closely. But when I see a figure of 137,000 dollars, not to convict anybody, not to store him in jail, not to do anything with him but study the sentences that you get? It's incomprehensible to me because I sat here and listened to the lawyers all cry about one thing, judicial discretion. And if this is not one Bill that would cut to the heart and core of judicial discretion, what is? Now to think that we need 137 thousand dollars to determine whether a guy should get 99 or 100 years, it's ridiculous. But I have sat in the Committee long enough to debate the number of angels on the sides of a pin. We actually found out but then we erupted into a new discussion as to what size pin we were talking about. Here, you're talking about



137 thousand dollars and as Mr. Steamney said, simply to study the sentencing? We don't even convict 137 thousand people in Illinois. We don't even convict 13 thousand. In fact, the number of people that this Bill would affect simply studying their sentences would probably work out to over \$1,000 a head. And I think at this point we have gotten slightly excessive. And this is just a simple statement. It doesn't require an answer."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on Representative Kosinski's.. Representative Kosinski to close."

Kosinski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Ewell. And I mention your name in debate, I know how conscious you are in terms of appropriations. But clarification, we put this in at 100 thousand dollars if I'm not mistaken, it went to the Senate and was cut down to forty. We're trying to restore. Individual Members of the Sentencing Commission do not get paid. Thank you for accepting the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 26. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. If you really believe in fairness and the criminal justice system, you have to back that up with intelligent input in the various ...from the various segments of society. Criminal Sentencing Commission was started and designed with the view to have input from those segments to make recommendations to the General Assembly concerning the improvement of the criminal justice system so that we could have a fair and equitable system. But you can't do that by having the appropriation come out of the Department of Corrections. What's been done for the past year and a half since House Bill 1500 became law, since the



criminal sentencing Commission went into effect, is money has just been taken out of the Department of Corrections' budget. Now that's just kidding yourself. The Department of Corrections' budget has been proven to be inadequate as it is. We had to have a special appropriation for that budget in order to protect against prison riots. I suggest to you that the appropriate and proper vote is to have a line item showing just exactly what is being done by the Commission to question it as another .. any other Commission would be and that will be done if you adopt this Amendment, not just have money taken away from the Department of Corrections as the law presently is."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record .On this question there's 54 'aye' and 80 'no' and the motion fails. Any/further Amendments?"

CLerk Leone: "Amendment 27, Getty-Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting after Section 7 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "I think I see a former Member in the back of the Chamber. Boris Anntonovich, is he in the back there? Why don't you come up here so we can...? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #27 to Senate Bill 157 is the appropriation for the expenses of the Commission for uniformity of legislation. This is the Commission which represents the State of Illinois as Members of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. It's very important, very prestigious that Illinois continue to be a part of this National Conference which has provided the United State, the entire United States, with its uniform state laws which can be considered so that we can stay in step with other states and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentle-



men's motion for the adoption of Amendment 27. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it... Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Ask your question when you're voting. Representative Skinner is recognized."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, just for the record we would like to know, some of us back here that groove on things.. on junkets, junket locations, would like to know where this Commission's going this year? And where it went last year? Could you tell us?"

Getty: "Yes, as a matter of fact, I spent one of the most unpleasant weeks of my life at the last week in July in New York City. And if you want to know where the second worst place to be, that's it. The worst place I think is Washinton D.C."

Skinner: "Where are you going next year? Or this year?"

Getty: "This year it's in San Diego..."

Skinner: "How long?"

Getty: "Which is a definite improvement. Same period of time, it's one week every year."

Skinner: "How about next year?"

Getty: "Next year, now that's a goodie. That's the first good one. By the way, it's at an airport motel in San Diego, no big deal. But I really am pleased about the next one. We're not voting on that though this time. It's in Hawaii. Now.."

Skinner: "Hawaii?"

Getty: "No I want you to know I don't set the schedule of where they hold their meetings. They track the American Bar Association."

Skinner: "Well, I congratulate you on being on one of the best Commissions in the Legislature for legislative recreation."

Getty: "Well, I want you to know I'm not the only Member. We have another outstanding Member on it..."

Skinner: "Who else?"



Getty: "Outstanding from your side of the aisle.."

Skinner: "My side of the aisle?"

Getty: "I think he ought to stand up and identify himself."

Skinner: "Who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Senator Geo-Karris is..."

Skinner: "Who else is on it?"

Speaker Redmond: "There he is."

Skinner: "Now, Mr. Speaker, could we also know the public
Members?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Senator Geo-Karris is not on the Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the... We've taken the
record. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted.
Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 28, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157
as amended by inserting immediately after Section 14 the
following."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
in discussions with the people at the Department of
Public Health, we found one that in the city of Chicago
and in the County of Cook the hearing testing programs
that the Department has downstate are relatively non-
existent in Cook County. Conversely, some of the vision
programs that we have going in the city of Chicago and
Cook County are just in their very beginning and in-
fancy/stages downstate. We also find that the Department
or the people working in the hearing and vision section
have had a difficult time in getting sufficient monies
although we've appropriated for the hearing and visual
clinical equipment that they need. What this Amendment
would do would be to provide 34 thousand 6 hundred dollars
for diagnostic hearing service for children in the city
of Chicago and the County of Cook and it would set up
in 40 city schools and 36 suburban schools testing stations.



It would also set up some 39 new vision testing stations as a pilot project in four counties downstate, St. Clair, Polaski, Peoria, and Rock Island. This would be the beginning and the initiation of this program. The program as it has exists we have found have prevented a lot of young children from very serious and damaging ear trouble and ear diseases as well as eye diseases provided we could catch them soon enough and we hope that this program can expand it in that direction. It's a total appropriation of 75 thousand dollars which in terms of the good it can do is very little."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, would the Gentleman yield?" "We earlier had a Bill that had to do with who was going to do testing, whether optomologist or optometrists. This doesn't deal with that problem is that correct?"

Peters: "No. No, not at all. This is ongoing program, Representative Katz, it's just that we would like to expand it into Cook County where it really doesn't exist and the vision part into downstate where it's just getting started."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 28. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 29, Kosinski, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 4 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just a few minutes ago you rejected funding a Commission relative to criminal sentencing Commission. House Bill (sic) 29 however, puts it back in the Department of



Corrections from which it is issued. But it funds the action in the Department of Corrections. The amount in the Amendment is the same amount that it will be in the House... in the Department of Corrections."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield? Well, Representative, if there is no reason if the House has deemed fit to say that there's no reason to have a Criminal Just.. Criminal Sentencing Commission to be funded at 137 thousand dollars, then what justification is there to then allow the Department of Corrections to have an additional 137 thousand to consider the very same matter?"

Kosinski: "You know, Ron, that House Bill 1500 which we passed out of this House, passed out of the Senate was signed into law provided for this Commission, now it's a question of funding it."

Stearney: "But my question is this; the House just minutes ago rejected your Amendment to fund the Criminal Sentencing Commission at 137 thousand dollars. Now that being the case, what reason is there for us then to give the Department of Corrections that very same amount, 137 thousand dollars?"

Kosinski: "Because then it will not remove that amount of money from the Department of Corrections in its normal function. This will provide the money on the basis of the Bill that we passed out of here to properly fund it without pulling it out of jails, or pulling it out of action of the Department of Corrections."

Stearney: "What did the Senate do to this Bill? To the Commission Bill?"

Kosinski: "To the Commission Bill?"

Stearney: "How much are they .. reduced the amount of?"

Kosinski: "They appropriated identical amount in the House Omnibus Bill."

Stearney: "How much is that?"



Kosinski: "137 thousand, 920."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in addressing myself to the Bill. I say we should reject this Amendment, as we rejected the earlier one. There is no justification whatsoever for appropriating 137 thousand dollars to the Department of Corrections to study a matter that deserves no more study. I can say this however. If there is any further study it will be to create the new crimes of class Y and class Z. That will be the only justification. Because we have made everything class X. I see no justification for spending and wasting the taxpayers' money on a matter that deserves no further study. We've done all we could the the Criminal Code. You've amended it and re-amended it and over amended it. We've changed the crimes so often that not even the Judges or the prosecutors know what the penalty is any longer. There's no reason for this. I ask the House to reject this Amendment just as we rejected the other Amendment moments ago. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just for a sense of clarification, many of us have taken a dim view of Commissions and the funding thereof. That Bill.. Amendment was rejected, Amendment #27. However, to have the Department of Corrections assume the obligation for a judgement that we, here in the House, have passed doesn't seem correct for them to take it out of their budget. By restoring this money we will give them the money to properly fund that portion of the Bill we passed out of the House. I recommend its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "How much money is involved in this Amendment?"

Kosinski: "137, 920."



Cullerton: "How much money was spent last year?"

Kosinski: "I do not have a Commission report."

Cullerton: "Do you have any idea how much money they spent last year?"

Kosinski: "No, Sir. I am not a Member of that Commission.

But whatever money is not spent obviously lapses and goes back into the fund."

Cullerton: "I just want to know if this is an increase over last year's expenditures."

Kosinski: "It is an increase."

Cullerton: "You know how much?"

Kosinski: "I.. about 37,920, I think."

Cullerton: "37 thousand?"

Kosinski: "Because it was in the Corrections budget, it's a little difficult to tell the exact amount. But my ball park estimation is about 37 thousand dollars."

Cullerton: "And what's the reason for the increase?"

Kosinski: "... a full time operating Commission with staff for House Bill 1500 which we passed. They've been using part of Corrections staff. Corrections cannot afford the loss of personnel. They feel inasmuch as we established this entity, this Commission, that we should fund it in one manner or another, not steal personnel from Corrections who needs every person desperately in terms of the plight of persons today. Nor do they want to take on the extra burden of sustaining this financially. They feel that we passed the Bill ; We made the Commission ; We should take the obligation of funding it, not pulling it out of their budget, not pull their staff off their desks. That's the reason for the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski has closed, so we'll just let you explain your vote. The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we adopt Amendment #29 to Senate Bill 157. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote



'no'. Representative Ewell to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll be studying sentences longer than most people spend in jail. And I think this is a little bit ridiculous. I mean I don't mind doing some things for the Department of Corrections and spending money where it's prudent and wise. And if we really want to study the criminal law I even go along with increasing penalties and other things, but studying the length of sentencing for a Commission that going to spend more time than the people are even doing in jail, that's ludicrous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Dunn, will you please sit down? Dunn sit down?"

Leverenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Since the Amendment is failing, I won't have to ask for or try to get any answer to this increase of 50% over last year. How many positions \$24,000 for contractual, we don't know for what and \$15,000 for equipment for what we have no idea so thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 36 'aye', and 73 'no', and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 30, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after the last line in Section 7 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment merely assures the funding of the ongoing recreation Council. I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson, do you move to adopt Amendment 30? Any discussion? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, would you.. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Braun: "What did you say?"



Vinson: "I said, that the Amendment merely provides for the on-going funding of an already existing Commission, the Recreation Council and I urge its adoption."

Braun: "Is there an increase over last year?"

Vinson: "Yes, Ma'am, there is."

Braun: "What is the percentage of that increase?"

Vinson: "100%, Ma'am."

Braun: "What are the dollars?"

Vinson: "The dollars in the increase?"

Braun: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "\$25,000."

Braun: "And the total amount?"

Vinson: "\$50,000."

Braun: "Thank you."

Vinson: "Yes, Ma'am."

Braun: "What are the reasons for the increase?"

Vinson: "I beg your pardon?"

Braun: "What is the reason for the increase?"

Vinson: "To do a better job."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Without sympathy to the Sponsor, I would like to ask him a question or two."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Pullen: "What's happened to the substantive legislation in the Senate concerning the continuation of this Recreation Council?"

Vinson: "I don't believe it needed any."

Pullen: "Okay. What does the Recreation Council do?"

Vinson: "Well, Mrs. Pullen, I'm sure you know that..."

Pullen: "Not Mrs.."

Vinson: "Neither man nor woman lives by bread alone and what the Recreation Council does is to enrich our lives in the area of recreation. It works with local government, with the Universities, with State Government. Does a



very commendable function. I'm amazed that you could question it."

Pullen: "Is it the Members of the Recreation Council that live by something other than bread alone?"

Speaker Redmond: "Was that another inquiry?"

Pullen: "It was. I don't think he's going to answer it."

Vinson: "I didn't hear the inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Pullen: "I asked..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Lady order. Now repeat the question."

Pullen: "It's Miss, Mr. Vinson. Is it the Members of the Council who live by something other than bread alone from this Bill?"

Vinson: "No, it's all of us."

Pullen: "Oh, it's all of us. I didn't know that they had done anything for me lately. Has the Recreation Council filed any kind of report with the Legislature, or with the State of Illinois so that we could know all the wonderful things that they are doing for us?"

Vinson: "Would you like me to get you copies?"

Pullen: "I think it would nice if they filed it with somebody."

Vinson: "We'll get you copies."

Pullen: "Thank you so much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. Representative Vinson to close."

Vinson: "I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 30. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Borchers."



Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I wished to heaven that I'd had a.. \$50,000 recreation Council to tell me when I was just a boy about 7 years old how to lay out a baseball field for the gang of boys I belonged to in the park near us which I did. I wish I'd have of, we may have gotten the square, the bases just a little bit better squared off possibly. And I wish I'd had some recreation Council Members to be able to show me how to play football in that same park by which we were successfully able always to do with teams we chose ourselves and I suspect it goes on and on and on. We're getting to a point where our kids can't go out and play on their own which I'm sure they would do if we would leave them alone and save all of this money that we're throwing away on.. every day all the time. It's time to quit."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'aye' and 71 'no' and the motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 31, Rea, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 14.2 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment 31 to Senate Bill 157 provides the monies necessary for the new State Purchase Human Services Board. This provides for a Board to review contracts, grants and purchase care rates of various agencies. The purpose of that Bill is to reorganize and consolidate 2 functions... or the functions of 2 existing Boards that review and approve rates for the purpose of care and issuance of grants for human services such as day care, fostre care, home maker services, nursing home



rates and so on. This Board would establish standards and procedures for the purchase of human services by state agencies. I would move for its adoption."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we now are in the predicament after passing I believe Representative Hallstrom's Amendment to this Bill where we are trying to do the same thing in two different ways. The Bill which the Sponsor of this Amendment is trying to address is House Bill 986 and what he's trying to fund which is on consideration Postponed in the Senate and most likely will not pass. Now we're going to end up with I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars to do the same thing in two different ways. I would suggest that since the will of the Legislature has been to adopt the method that Representative Hallstrom suggested that this Amendment should be withdrawn. If the Sponsor is going to insist in pursuing it, then I would suggest that we oppose it or vote 'present' so that the matter can be resolved as it was prior."

Rea: "First of all, I have good reason to believe that it will be passing the Senate. Secondly, it does not do the same thing as Amendment 19. This here provides for the staffing and operation of two Boards, rather than just the 395 Board. This would add your Governors' Purchase Care Review Board so you would have the combination there which means that you would need additional monies. The Governor had said earlier that they needed 300,000, at least that was provided in one of the earlier Bills from the Senate which was caught up in Committee. So this would provide for the additional increase of responsibilities and would provide then the Governor the opportunity to .. if House Bill 986 passes to have



the flexibility of going the direction that he really needs to."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 31. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 81 'aye' and 68 'no' and the motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 32, Sandquist, amends Senate Bill 157 on page 3 by inserting below line 12 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment appropriates \$600,000 to the Secretary of State's Office to insure that all public libraries in the state receive at least the same level of funding under the newly enacted state per capita grant program of last year. Now because of the lateness in the state library submission of application forms only 197 of the state's 355 eligible libraries made application for state aid which was paid at the 27¢ level. However, this year the state library estimates that nearly all of the eligible 355 public libraries will in fact make application for this program. Secretary of State Dixon's budget is approximately \$600,000 short to insure that the same 27¢ level will be paid to all libraries. Last year the Chicago Public Library received \$900,000 under this per capita grant program and without this Amendment would receive some \$400,000 less. And I'd like to point out that 158 downstate public libraries now will be able to qualify for the per capita grants at the 27¢ level if this Amendment is adopted. The staffs of both sides have a roster of these libraries that are eligible. So I sum-



marize that this is necessary to make sure that we get the same funding as last year for all public libraries throughout the state and I ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Was this Amendment or a similar Amendment offered to the budget of the Secretary of State's Office?"

Sandquist "I filed it but I was asked to withdraw it from there and to put it into here."

Darrow: "Who asked you to withdraw it? Did the Secretary of State or who?"

Sandquist: "Pardon me?"

Darrow: "Is the Secretary of State in favor of this Amendment?"

Sandquist: "I don't know whether he's in favor of it or not. I've not asked him."

Darrow: "Well, it's my understanding that he did not care for an addition to his budget, that he was trying to hold his budget down."

Sandquist: "He didn't want it put on his budget that he had presented. But what I'm pointing out that if we don't have this money the state libraries will not be able to get the money that we have promised them by our prior legislation. We're the ones that make that decision."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Amendment #32. There just aren't that many books in the whole world that we can buy for all the money that we've appropriated for libraries this year. Nor is there enough land in this whole state to build the lot money that we've appropriated libraries for. The Gentleman is trying to appropriate additional \$600,000 to guarantee full funding of the



grants which are already the per capita grants which are already in the Act. We've already done that with Senate Bill 864. It guarantees the full funding. I suggest to the Members of the House that this Amendment ought to be well read and looked at carefully. The \$600,000 just isn't needed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This program is a beautiful example of how over a period of time the Legislature gets themselves boxed in. First it starts out by saying, 'Here's a great program and it won't cost you any money this year. We know you don't have the money and it won't cost you any money this year.' Then the next year the organization that puts these kind of programs in turn around and come back and say, 'You mandated this program. You promised you would pay us so much money. Now here, pay us.' And this is where we are right now. It seems to me that if we can't pay regular school transportation at any higher level than 87% on a proportion basis, doesn't seem unreasonable for me for the same kind of program that's to be used for libraries. And for that reason, I would oppose this Amendment."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all I'm asking us to do is what we promised we would do to the libraries throughout the state so that they have the same 27¢ level that they had last year and that all libraries can participate. I think it's something we promised and I think it's something we should do and I ask your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 32. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, well I see a number of green votes up there. Maybe I won't take too long to explain my vote. But I've got a number of correspondence about this Amendment. Libraries desperately need this additional money. They will have to cut back on their book purchases if they don't get it and I urge an 'aye' vote in favor of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 66 'no'. The motion prevails and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 33, Polk-Darrow-Bell, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 6.1 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow. Representative Polk?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is for a little less than 6 million... 5 million, 958 thousand dollars for the conversion of the East Moline Mental Health Center to the minimum security correctional center. As I'm sure you all know and if you've read the .. if you have read the synopsis recently..."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Again, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to my good friend, Representative Polk, this is capital and I think being consistent as I raised the question on Representative Wikoff, the question also here should be raised I believe it's necessary under Rule 27-F I think it is that we waive that rule before we can adopt this."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend.. waive Rule 27-F."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 27-F. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 17 'no'. The motion prevails. Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, as you may know, some of you may know, in the last couple of weeks the Governor has made a determination with the Department of Mental Health that they will close the East Moline Mental Health Center. At the same time we held meetings in our community and a decision was reached. It was acceptable but the people in our community to have a minimum security correctional center and a work release center. It's necessary at this time for side improvements to change obviously the sight from a mental health center into a minimum security center. It will take 4 million dollars to do that. At the same time so that we can maintain those grounds, we have gone to the many different agencies in our community and asked the state agencies to move out to this large center so we can maintain it. The state police has agreed to do so. They're going to move from a very small area in Rock Island and move in on this .. on this sight as well. That is going to cost an additional million dollars for remodeling there. We have to move now the patients from East Moline down to Galesburg, down to the mental health center. That cost.. That cost plus the remodeling of a building in Galesburg is \$610,000. Bottom line, 5 million, 958 thousand, 400 dollars. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and answer any questions. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion



for the adoption of Amendment 33. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 34, McPike-Mulgalian, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by deleting Section 16 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, we're in the process of replacing the corporate personal property tax. This Amendment will allow monies put into the personal property tax replacement fund to be transferred to the Department of Revenue for dispersment so local taxing districts. I move for the adoption of it."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I see that this is a sum of 519 million, 900 thousand. That's considerable.. good deal of money. Now it occurs to me that we fire about 10% of the payroll of the State of Illinois which would be from my point of view an excellent thing to do, we'd pick up about .. about 100 million and then if we would knock off according to the records of the Federal Government in their last check up on welfare, which our budget is around three billions of dollars or close to it this year, we knock off the 38%... Oh, just make it 20.. they say 38% of their completely fraudulently or partially fraudulently... we knock off just say 20% of that. Let's see. That's about \$600,000. We'd have \$700,000 to use that would leave us about 100 thousand... I mean 100 million dollars to use. That would leave us 100 million roughly to the good in this ... in the next checker.. in the checking account of the state. So I think we should vote this one down



just for general principles and take action in the other direction."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Obling... Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "Is it 519 million, is that the figure?"

McPike: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "Alright, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, some of us have felt all along that 519 million is more money than needed to be placed. I know our staff analysis and our studies seem to show that the figure is much lower than that. So I would just suggest to those who did not vote for the Democrat replacement Bill when it went out of here that they probably shouldn't vote for this Amendment either because you are in effect adopting the figure on the other Bill which we all on this side of the aisle anyway think it's too high. So I would ask for a Roll Call and that my colleagues join me in a 'no' vote."

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

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think everyone recognizes that whichever monies are collected and put into this fund, have to be transferred back to a local government because the Constitution mandates that. Now you may dispute the figure 519. Perhaps we should put in 100 million dollars add come back every quarter with a supplemental so that we can transfer those monies. Because the Constitution mandates that whatever is.. that we replace the lost revenues that we distributed to the local governments and it's not intended to be State monies. This is technical and allows this to happen. You may dispute the Bill itself and vote against that, but I don't believe that you want to be in a posture of preventing the transfer



of those monies that are collected."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 34. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 83 'aye' and 68 'no'. The motion prevails.. The Amendment's adopted. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, would you let me have a copy of this Roll Call? I'll want to take this back to our District too to show to our School Districts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber moves that that lie on the table. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 35, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 157 by appropriating 1 million, 500 thousand dollars to the Chicago Park District for the purpose of building a new field house at Chibona Park."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I heard today about building new park houses on the south side of Chicago and I've in the past voted for some of those Amendments and it's come to my attention the park house in my own homeprecinct is kind of run down. It's got a lot of graffiti painted on the outside of the walls and some windows are broken. So I've decided to call upon some of my friends in the General Assembly to help me cause charity does begin at home. This park is located a block from my house. I can go over there and jog around and go the park house and shoot baskets and go over there and watch the plays and probably even have some political meetings there. So I'd like to call on all my friends in the General Assembly who have these pork barrel Bills from downstate who I always vote for them and my friends from Chicago who have parks in their neighborhoods, who



have got graffiti covered walls. I'd like to ask them to help me to tear down this park house that we have now that's covered with graffiti and broken windows and a lot of broken bottles and build us a nice new park house. Charity does begin at home and I would move for the favorable consideration of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I'm not opposed to this legislation necessarily but I question the form in which it's prepared. I don't believe that our Reference Bureau prepared it. Perhaps we could take the Bill out of the record and have Roger redraft it or he could withdraw it. But at the present time, it's not in proper form."

Speaker Redmond: "Was the Amendment prepared in the Reference Bureau?"

McAuliffe: "Absolutely."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I am really amazed at Representative McAuliffe. Here he is worrying about a little ole ... million dollars. He could have made it just 10 million just as easy as not. I don't know what's the matter with him or what's the matter with the House. I think we should.. if there's any rules and regulations from our legal advise up there, I wonder if I could put an Amendment on an Amendment to raise this to say 10 million instead of that simple one million you want. I think your motives are good. I may vote for this one just for the hell of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that the Amendment is not in proper form. Any further Amendments? Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I.. I'd like to amend it on its face... change



the Amendment on its face."

Speaker Redmond: "That would be a pretty good trick. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. "



Speaker Redmond: "578, Representative Oblinger."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 578, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Aging. Second Reading of the BILL. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "I believe there are..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Is there any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "By whom?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Oblinger. Amends Senate Bill 578 as amended on page one, line twelve, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I have to give you a little background on this. Most of you know, but for those of you who don't, the Department on Aging budget is made-up 90% of Federal monies and 10% of State money. In order to arrive at a federal budget with their different budget year, we only have one thing to go on when we prepare a budget in the Department on Aging, and that is the Congressional authorization..."

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

Barnes: "I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the staff has reviewed this Amendment, we're going to suggest that the Amendment be adopted by voice vote. Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Kempiners, amends Senate



Bill 578 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 578 is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Public Aid. Currently there is no appropriation Bill for this Department in either the House or the Senate. Due to the adjournment of the Senate and the last night for the passage of Senate Bills in an uproar, the Department's appropriation Bill was caught in the switches. The Bill as it was introduced here is at the level of two billion, four hundred and forty-nine million, two hundred and eighty-five thousand, and one dollar level. It basically reduces the operations of the Department by three million, seven hundred and fourteen thousand, one hundred and ninety-nine dollars. There are other provisions in here that I'll go through quickly that Members of this House might be interested in. Part of the money in here that is appropriated that previously had not been appropriated in previous years is a thirteen million, five hundred and eighty-four thousand, six hundred dollar contribution for general assistance program for Cook County. That, basically, had been provided in the Department's budget but not appropriated in the past and we are now doing, appropriating it just as we are appropriating federal funds that come into the State of Illinois. It adds two million, four hundred thousand dollars for physician service for childless pregnant women, it adds two million for emergency assistance for families with dependent children, both of those are appropriations for Bills which are almost completely through this General Assembly. We take money from the Medical Assistance line item to provide for a 5% increase to public assistance clients beginning October 1st, 1979. In addition, this budget is different in that we delineate the services and agencies involved in the local



initiative fund, and basically, we break out the different agencies which contract for title 20 funds through the local initiative fund and break out the category of service that would be included within that agency. We transfer the in-home care program from the Department of Public Aid to the Department of Aging and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. And finally, we reduce the various Medical Assistance line items by thirty-six million, six hundred thousand dollars to fund many of the programs, that I have discussed in making this presentation. As I indicated, this is not the best way of discussing an appropriation for a major agency of State Government but due to the problems that were experienced in the Senate, there is no Department of Public Aid budget in this General Assembly. Therefore, we are having to attach this Amendment, or coming to you to attach this Amendment onto Senate Bill 578. And I would urge your support of my motion to adopt, or my move to adopt Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, this is as indicated, the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Public Aid. This Bill has been worked on and I think that every consideration has been given to all of the, to mirror the problems relative to Public Aid. Inclusive in this Bill is a funding for a 5% cost of living effective October 1st. In conversation with Senate Members this Bill now, the bottom-line is consistent with the Senate appropriations, and consistent with the thought relative to the Senate as to the particular items relative to the funding for Public Aid, the funding for the various programs necessary for the functions of human services in this State. And I would urge the support of the House in joining Representative Kempiners in adopting Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 578."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."



Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out we're talking about an Amendment to a Bill that will appropriate two and a half billion dollars. This appropriated amount didn't go to a House Committee, and I realize the time we waste, but how in the world can we justify passing a Bill that covers a budget of two and a half billion without even sending it to a Committee? I think this is a farce. And I don't accept the Senate's plea that it got lost in the shuffle. If that's the best they can do in the Senate is lose a Bill that's got two hundred, two million, two billion and a half in the budget, something is drastically wrong. And I, for one, am not going to support this. I think it needs more scrutiny than an Amendment laid on the top of our desk. Even Appropriation Committee admits they didn't even see the Bill in Committee. And how can we appropriate that kind of money. I think it's a farce and ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

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

I rise to support Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 578. As you know, we have been working long and hard over the past few days trying to find some relief for Cook County Hospital. The Black Members of the House and many of the other Members that were working on the negotiating team agree that this was the best route to go. And since it is not going to solve all other problems of Cook County and to Public Aid, we will continue to work. Continue to work with the Director of the Department of Public Aid to find permanent solution to the problem that we have at Cook County Hospital. I think that this is part of an agreement that we will come to. And I solicit your support for Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 578."

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

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



the House. I ask for your favorable vote on Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 578."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Peters."

Peters: " Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue, as a number of issues in the House, have taken a lot of time and a lot of consideration, a lot of concern. And in many ways, it's very emotional. The Amendment is passing and my purpose is really not to direct my remarks towards passage of the Amendment. But to indicate, on my part, and the part of our staff Members, my thanks to the Members of the Black Caucus for their in-put, their kindness and their consideration in resolving this matter, and certainly to the assistance and aid given to us by Jim Taylor, who is the Assistant Minority Leader, in resolving this question. We appreciate ... Majority Leader, I'm sorry. We appreciate that help and we are thankful to him and for his understanding and certainly for the efforts of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Gene Barnes and for Carol Braun, who also had a very deep and abiding interest in this. We think this is a resolution of a problem that we can all live with. It's not the best solution, but it's a solution that we can accept now and hopefully working together, we can put things together again for next year. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 96 'aye' and 44 'no'. Motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, E.M. Barnes, Amends Senate Bill 578 as Amended in Section 3.06 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #4."



Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, E.M. Barnes, Amends Senate Bill 578 as Amended in Section 3.06 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Sponsor Barnes? Representative E. M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, if I will, I would like to defer a part of this for explanation to Representative Bowman. But this is the Amendment for four hundred thousand dollars and it adjusts itself to the problem of alternative schools and Representative Bowman will go into that for me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The alternative schools network is an institution which serves young people who are school drop-outs, who have been discipline problems in the public school system, who have had other kinds of problems that have caused them to leave the public school system. It has been in existence for some time now and has been very effective in working with these kids. Now, what this particular Amendment does is that it takes some Title-20 money and this is all we're talking about, is Title-20 money, we're not talking about general revenues here, and earmarks some of this for alternative schools. I would point out further, that this particular group has been down here in Springfield every week for the last month and has met with everyone that I can think of on both sides of the aisle, they met with the Governor's Office, they have met with the executive departments, trying to work out a solution to this. I think this is the most reasonable solution that we have come up with and so I would urge the adoption of this Amendment. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Deuster: "Are these private schools, these alternative schools?"

Bowman: "This is a private nonsectarian school."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Vote per Member. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 83 'aye' and 54 'no'. The motion carried. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Mulcahey, Amends Senate Bill 578 as Amended by deleting Section 3.04 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

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

Amendment #3 reduced the Public Aid over-budget, budgeting, by thirty-four million, two hundred thousand dollars, and number 3 and this Amendment itself will make a total reduction of a hundred and one million, six hundred eighty-two thousand, two hundred dollars. Now the Department and our staff, the House, met several weeks ago to go over this budget request and in that meeting the Department could only justify an average of nine thousand five hundred and fifty-five... or nine hundred and fifty-five thousand clients on Medical Assistance. In order to insure conservative estimate, the staff allowed for an average of five thousand additional persons each month. Therefore, the medical line items are based upon the nine hundred and sixty thousand average of eligible persons rather than the Bureau of the Budget's estimate of nine hundred and seventy-three thousand persons. This makes a total reduction based upon those figures of sixty-seven million, four hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "Is it my understanding that you're making this reduction on the medical line item grants?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, Sir."

Kempiners: "Would...was that before the thirty-six million, six hundred thousand was transferred out of that, out of those medical law line items?"

Mulcahey: "That's on top of that, Representative."

Kempiners: "So what have you, what is the bottom line figure of what you've done for the medical line item grants?"

Mulcahey: "Well, it's not on medical, but the bottom line is one hundred and one thousand, .. one hundred and one million, six hundred and eighty-two thousand."

Kempiners: "And those are the various medical line items that you've taken that out of?"

Mulcahey: "Yeah but, the various medical line items come to a total of sixty-seven million, four hundred and eighty-two. Then I add on the other thirty-four million and you have grand total of a hundred and one million."

Kempiners: "What are you taking out from Nursing Homes?"

Mulcahey: "Nothing."

Kempiners: "What are you taking out for physicians?"

Mulcahey: "For physicians?"

Kempiners: "Yes."

Mulcahey: "Roughly twelve million, a little less than twelve million dollars."

Kempiners: "What are you taking out for hospital in-patient?"

Mulcahey: "Twenty million."

Kempiners: "What are you taking out for prescribed drugs?"

Mulcahey: "Five. "

Kempiners: "You mean after all those phone calls and letters about the seven percent increase that they're not going to get, you're going to come down even more? I'd like to address this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Mulcahey: "Representative Kempiners, this is money that they're



not going to use. It is over-budgeting."

194.

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of you, I am sure, are in the same position I am in, in your districts, you are getting phone calls and letters and everything else from providers of medical care, honest providers of medical care, for Public Aid recipients. Their big complaint, and first complaint, has been the delay in payment. Some of those changes are being made. But just as I indicated in my questions, I'm sure you, just as I, have been getting phone calls and letters from the pharmacists asking for a seven percent increase. They're not going to get that increase. And if Representative Mulcahey succeeds in what he's doing, they're probably going to even lose money. He says this money will lapse. Well, I doubt that it will, but if it does, it still won't be expended, whether it comes out or not. We have taken money from these medical line items and we have placed them at other points in that budget. Now if you want to go through the next year in having to justify a vote to people who are calling and saying I'm not, only not getting my money but I'm not getting anywhere near what I'm billed for. You can go ahead and vote for this. But I'm going to tell you right here and now, those people are getting paid for services rendered. We hear a lot about, of talk about what we're doing to the employers of Illinois, well, here's one area where this Legislature can say that if you're going to provide services, the least we can do is pay you for those services. We recognize we're not paying what you bill, but we're at least going to pay you. I stand in opposition to this Amendment and I would urge your support in its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you've ever had the experience of calling a



physician where you do not usually doctor with and ask him if he will see you, his answer may be 'yes'. But then if you tell him you have a green card, or you're on Public Aid, nine times out of ten, he will quickly tell you that he no longer sees Public Aid patients; that they should go to the emergency room of the hospital, or that they should take two aspirins. If you're poor, if you're on Public Aid, this country does not provide adequate medical care. There are two classes of medical care in this country. One, for the rich the middle class, and those who have money. And the other classes, who have none and are on Public Aid. And we have contributed to that division. Through our efforts down here in Springfield, we have not paid the physicians an adequate amount. You can take other professions. Who here that sells insurance or sells real estate, would take less than the going rate from someone who is on Public Aid? That's what we're asking the physicians and the dentists to do, the hospitals. In order to keep medical care available to these people we should defeat this Amendment. In order to allow the doctors to have their fair share, in order to allow the doctors to be willing to take Public Aid clients and not to do all charity work, we should defeat this Amendment. And it surprises me greatly that the Sponsor of this Amendment today is cutting back this budget. Last year he was here, he was asking for more money for the Nursing Homes, adding to the Public Aid budget. That was when he was getting heat from the public nursing homes and the private nursing homes. I'm sure, if he's successful in this Amendment, the doctors, the dentists, and the hospitals will again be contacting him, asking him to come in with a supplemental appropriation. I solicit a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Darrow, more eloquently than I, has stated the case. I would agree with his



sentiments. And solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Sponsor a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kent: "Representative Kempiners, do we not purchase this service from the pharmacists?"

Kempiners: "I heard the question. I'm not sure that you want to ask me the question. I am not the Sponsor of the Amendment. I opposed the Amendment."

Kent: "I know that. That's the reason I'm asking you. Do not we... we not purchase this service from the pharmacists and others who give care?"

Kempiners: "That's correct."

Kent: "If we do not pay the... what it costs to give this service, who is paying for it?"

Kempiners: "Well, nobody will pay for it because the service won't be provided or they will probably increase the charges that they charge to you and me when we go in to make up what they're going to lose on this amount."

Kent: "In other words, we're taxing those people who pay for medicine because we are not able to pay for the Public Aid cost that we tell people we're paying."

Kempiners: "I have been told by medical providers that that is the case. That they have to charge higher rates to people who purchase these medicines because they do not get the full rate through Public Aid, that's correct."

Kent: "And yet, you oppose this Amendment."

Kempiners: "Well, the Amendment would even further reduce the amounts for the medical line items which means that we either wouldn't provide the services at the end of the year, or we would have to reduce the rate. So, I'm in opposition to the Amendment."

Kent: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mulcahey to



close."

Mulcahey: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Let the record show right now that I'm not out to hurt anybody. I'm not out to get anybody in this particular area. But let the record also show that in 1978 Public Aid was over-budgeted by fifty-nine million dollars. And in FY-79 it was over-budgeted by an estimated hundred and twenty million dollars. The Senate cut this area of the budget, a hundred and eighteen million dollars when Public Aid was a part of Senate Bill 583. The House cut this area of the budget, a hundred and eighteen million dollars when Public Aid was part of House Bill 1319. This Amendment, along with Amendment #3, as I said at the onset, only cuts a hundred and one million dollars from the Public Aid budget, allowing yet, allowing yet for a seventeen million dollar over-budgeting. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 6. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 24 'aye' and 9 'no'. The motion fails. 24 'aye' and 109 'no'.. The motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Braun, Amends Senate Bill 578 as Amended by inserting immediately after Section 3.07 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I oppose Representative Mulcahey's motion, although it is a well known fact that Public Aid has been over-budgeted historically. Provided for example, an increase of some 15% for providers. Public Aid for the wealthy. This House earlier voted a 7% cost of living increase for Public Aid recipients, and in an attempt to provide for the needs of people who have no other means of paying for food and



utilities and housing and clothing. A family of four on welfare presently receives three hundred and thirty-three dollars a month . With a 7% increase, they would have received \$354 a month. This budget as submitted, as an Amendment 2, Senate Bill 578 provides for 5% cost of living increase. which will raise that family of four to \$349 a month. I don't think that's enough and I think many of you don't think that's enough. People cannot live on that kind of money in these hard and inflationary times. However, I've been advised that the Governor is willing to provide only 5% and not 7, that being the case, I withdraw Amendment #2. And say that I appreciate the assistance that's been given in working through this very difficult problem by the Governor's Office, by the Department of Public Aid, and hope that we can concur and pass this budget out. I appreciate all of the attention that's been given this matter, the people back home will appreciate it also and I thank you and withdraw this Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments? "

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Kempiners, Amends Senate Bill 578 as Amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, before I get into Amendment #8, I would just like to thank Representative Braun . We all represent , or try to represent our districts as best we can and we don't always receive or accomplish what we would like to accomplish. But as long as we realize that we have to try to do the best we can for the whole State and make money stretch, we're going to be responsible Legislators. And I think that she has demonstrated that on the floor of the House today, that she is indeed a responsible Legislator. And I want to tell her I appreciate that and thank her for her actions. Now Amendment #8 Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask leave to Amend Amendment #8



on its face on line 15, where it says on page 5, by deleting lines 22 and 23, or 21 and 22 and inserting, change lines 21 to line 22 and line 22 to line 23. I ask leave of the House to Amend it on its face."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Does the Gentleman have leave to Amend it on its face? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Can you make the Amendment Mr. Clerk? Any discussion?"

Kempiners: "Ok. If I have leave, I would explain the Amendment Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "Amendment #8 just makes technical changes and corrects typographical error. There is no change in any dollar amounts and I would move adoption of Amendment #8."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. It's the plan now to take all the Third Reading Bills, non-appropriation Bills and go to Consideration Postponed. We have to get these out of here by today. So we'll go to Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. First Bill on page 2 is 140. Representative Davidson... Representative Jones, J. David Jones."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the up-grade of the Senior Citizens' Circuit Breaker Act and it provides for the ceiling being raised from a 10 to 12 thousand and it provides for the maximum grant from 650 to 750 and in essence that's what



it does. It's the same as we had in here last year and the Bill was not called on the last day and I move now for your approval and green lights for the passage of House Bill 140 for the benefit of the senior citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I would like to atone for my mistake of yesterday by asking the Speaker.. or asking the Sponsor if this Bill is now in its unamended form as it came over from the Senate."

Jones: "This Bill is amended as it came over."

Skinner: "Okay."

Jones: "It was amended on Second Reading."

Skinner: "I was wrong yesterday. I thought we were on Third Reading and I thought it hadn't been amended, as Representative Van Duyne pointed out. And I think I'm right today. The Senate Democrats have caucused in and are not going to vote for any tax relief program whatsoever except for the sales tax program. If we want senior citizens' property tax relief, we must .. we must send a Bill from the Senate directly to the Governor's desk. We cannot afford to sent it back to certain death in the Senate on a Concurrence vote. And I would again ask what I asked yesterday in my point of personal privilege and, which Representative Van Duyne asked more forcefully while trying to ask for.. while trying to move for reconsideration, let Representative Jones take the Bill back to Second Reading and take the Amendment off. Because if he doesn't do it and we pass it, it's going to get killed in the Senate and I.. my fear is that Republicans who wish tax relief and Democrats who wish tax relief are being played off one against each other and that the Senate is being played off against the House and I think we're going to go home after this Session and we're going to come



back in the Veto Session, we're going to find not one single tax relief Bill has been signed period. And I really believe that senior citizens deserve property tax relief. I don't think that Representative Jones' Bill in its unamended form really solves the problem but it's a lot better than nothing. And so I, you know, I would ask Representative Jones to reevaluate his position and I would ask you to be very hesitant to vote 'yes' because if we pass this thing, it's going to certain death and I promise you that. If you don't pass it, it goes on Postponed Consideration and Representative Jones gets another chance to talk to Senator Davidson and perhaps then Senator Davidson will say, 'Gee whiz. It's better to have an 18 million dollar program than no program.' As it is it's going to cost a little over 9 million. And I, you know, I don't pretend to make all the decisions for 177 people but those are the elements that are flying this floor and around this capital right now and I thought you ought to know about them."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think we all would like to give senior citizens better.. more and better tax relief through the circuit breaker program. I think the proper vote on this Bill is a 'present' vote. I'm urging a 'present' vote. I plan to cast a 'present' vote because it seems to me that if we indiscriminately pass tax relief measures the Governor is indeed less likely to sign the sales tax exemption for food and medicine. Now if you want meaningful tax relief for senior citizens it seems to me that's the basket in which you want to put your eggs. Because senior citizens spend a very high proportion of their income on food. Certainly the lower the person's income, the more they spend on food as a



proportion of their income. The kind of tax relief we're talking about under that measure is very substantial, not this.. not the puny amount that we're talking about under this Bill. I think this provides a paltry amount of relief. The sales tax on food and medicine if it were eliminated provided substantial amount of relief and I think that's the way which we ought to go. So I urge a 'present' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Council on Aging which is appointed by this Legislature a number of the Members and some by the Governor from the general public set up their priorities for what they hope this General Assembly would do. Number one was House Bill 969 and for that I thank all of you and number two, was a raise in the circuit breaker. They did not get the relief on food and medicine until priority number five. If we're really respecting what they say they need, we should vote for this Bill."

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

Jones: "This Bill was sponsored in the Senate by hyphenated Sponsor, a former Member of this House and Vadalabene and Senator Davidson and it came out of the Senate 50 to.. 52 to zero votes. I would appreciate anything beyond 89 votes on this Bill at this time because we need to provide an escalated income for the senior citizens because they have .. they're in the same bracket that everybody else is with the escalation of costs of living."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He is right that it did come out of the Senate with a very good vote but since that time he has cut the benefits from 15 thousand dollars plateaudo down to 12. They will not be eligible



over 12 thousand dollars worth of income. And I am with Representative Bowman. I think just a non vote or a 'present' vote is the ideal vote. Maybe if he only gets about 45 or 50 votes why he might bring it back to Second Reading after all."

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

Piel: "Mr. Jones just closed, Sir. And now you're calling on Mr. Van Dyne.."

Speaker Redmond: "You're absolutely right. And when a Member raises his hand I don't know why he's raising it any more than I knew why you raised it."

Piel: "You realized why.. what he was talking about..."

Speaker Redmond: "Now I don't know why you raised yours, but I recognized you."

Piel: "I apologize."

Speaker Redmond: "The question. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 78 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 565. Representative Jones, for what purpose do you arise? What was that?"

Jones: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's too late. I've gone on to 565. Representative Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 565, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retail Installment Sales Act and the Motor Vehicle.."

Speaker Redmond: "Request Postponed Consideration.."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz here? Out of the record. Representative Jones, it's on Postponed Consideration. 617. Cullerton. "

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



Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 768. What's the motion? Representative Cullerton? What do you want, out of the record or Spring Calendar? Representative Cullerton has moved that 617 be put on the Spring Calendar. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 31 'no'. And the motion carries. 617 on the Spring Calendar. 768 O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 768, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Gas Revenue Tax Act and the Public Utilities Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members Senate Bill 768 excludes from the gross receipts tax amounts received for furnishings and installation facilities or appliances when the taxpayer is liable for the sales tax already in respect of its transfer acquisition of the facilities or appliances. Present court decision in 1977, the Illinois Power Company versus Macon, indicated that they were ... would be liable for the sales tax which they pay when they buy these facilities, when they buy the transformers and the equipment and they're also liable presently under the court ruling for the utility tax, it's an economic disincentive to lease the equipment and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "In opportunity to get a few more green votes up there, I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "Quite frankly this is a double taxation that is



befalling the utility companies in the State of Illinois They pay the sales tax on the transformers and the equipment when they first purchase it and because of the court decision they're now required when they lease the equipment out to also pay a utility tax. Now if you have Hertz or a company like Hertz they pay the sales tax on the automobiles when they first buy the automobiles and they do not have to pay any type of a tax when they lease the automobiles. This is passed on to the consumer this double taxation and it would just opt out the utility companies from requiring to pay the double taxation.... fiscal note that I think was filed was somewhere in the area of 7 to 800 thousand dollars being passed on to the consumers."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, he just gave me an idea for a Bill. I think we ought to tax the car rental leasing agreements."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 77 'aye' and 78 'no'..."

O'Brien: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1104. Wait a minute. Representative Reilly on 1072."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 10..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly? Have you acted on that one, 1072? Representative..."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House and I must ask for your indulgence. The problem with this, we did indeed pass it, but the problem which we discovered later was that we'd inadvertently taken off an Amendment we need to put on. With the indulgence of the House, I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which the Bill was passed, bring it back, put the Amendment back on and then move the Bill again. It's a technical problem. It's a noncontroversial Bill and



with your approval I would then move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1072 had passed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the vote by which 1072 was passed be reconsidered. Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aya's have it."

Reilly: "Do I have leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading? "

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 1072 to the Order of Second Reading?"Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Reilly: "I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves that the vote by which Amendment #1 was tabled be reconsidered. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. Representative Reilly?"

Reilly: "Do I have leave to bring the Bill back from Third Reading and consider..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 1072 to the Order of Third Reading? And have it considered now, is that correct?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is... Maybe you and Representative Getty, have you discussed this?"

Reilly: "Representative Getty, I'm sorry that I did not. our staff person pointed out that Amendment #2 was drafted in terms of Amendment #1 and was not just a substitute for it and so all I'm.. I need to get one and two together. It's exactly what we agreed to this morning. Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly is it?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you up now?"



Reilly: "Can we take this out for just one minute while they..."

Speaker Redmond: "Alright. Take it out of the record. 1104."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this a Bill that was debated yesterday and I accepted Totten's Amendment and Totten's Amendment removes all the opposition to the Bill and I urge the House support."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that limits the Civic Support Act to the other.. authorities that are now in existence and none will be joined after July 1st."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "This went awful fast, Mr. Speaker. But perhaps in explaining his vote the Gentleman could also tell us if the state makes any committment in this legislation to reimburse the exposition centers for any loss or if they're unable to pay their bonds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "That's on Senate Bill 667, it's going to come up later on."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all... Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 28 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 565 Marovitz."

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



the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 565 provides for a 21 day period for redemption of collateral that has been repossessed or surrendered voluntarily. It allows the purchaser to redeem the repossessed property by paying the unaccelerated amount due on the contract as well as the cost of repossession. This Bill provides for a remedy for consumers and an opportunity to become current on the amount that they have due in owing. It provides for 21 day period of redemption without accelerating the entire amount owed. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've read over the Amendment and there are some questions that I would have and.."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Piel: "I would ask the..."

Speaker Redmond: "You ... ask questions without taking it off Short Debate."

Piel: "Well, I see in case other people have questions, I would like to be joined by nine Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he joined by nine? Proceed."

Piel: "Representative Marovitz, for the Democratic Members who have their legislative support center sheet, did the Amendment add... I noticed the very first thing, the proposed Amendment where it has in there the remedy provided in this Bill would apply only to repossess goods and not goods surrendered voluntarily. Is that basically what the Amendment covers?"

Marovitz: "Yes, the Amendment covers that. I believe that in terms of .. in the voluntary terms that covers amounts



that have been paid ...where 60% has been paid."

Piel: "Well, you state in here that, you know, because we're repeating exactly the.. the last line that was in this.. the very first point that they have in here in the proposed Amendment. It has, 'and not', I repeat, 'not', to goods surrendered voluntarily. This whole Bill here deals with voluntary repossession, or this proposed Bill. 565."

Marovitz: "The proposed.. The proposed Bill"

Piel: " 565."

Marovitz: "It deals with non voluntary, only voluntary where 60% of the amount has been paid."

Piel: "Okay, you're saying it deals with nonvoluntary?"

Marovitz: "That's correct. Voluntary... The Section amends the voluntary Section where 60% of the amount has been paid."

Piel: "Okay, well you're saying nonvoluntary and I've read through the Bill and the area deals with voluntary. I would like to, you know, go to the Bill and then I'll go back to the Amendment. And I would ask the Members of the House to pay attention to this because as the Bill originally came forth none of the financial organizations, this is the IBA, ICBI, AMBI, credit unions or savings and loans or finance companies, were are in favor of this Bill, I checked with them, gone over the Amendments with them and they're still not in favor of it. So if you'll pay attention to the way that the Bill states..."

Marovitz: "They're also not opposed to it..."

Piel: "They are opposed to it. They are opposed to it."

Marovitz: "Not all the ones you named. Not after the Amendment."

Piel: "I'll just read one sheet I got this morning, the very last line, 'we urge defeat of this Bill.' I got this this morning."



Marovitz: "Who's the ..."

Piel: "I'll go to it; I'll speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Piel: "Okay, on the first part of the Bill, it says if a buyer has paid the amount equal to 60%. Alright, 60% of the loan or more of the deferred payment price at the time of his default under the contract or if the buyer at the request of the holder and without legal proceedings surrenders the goods, In other words, if a person voluntarily brings in the money, voluntarily brings in the money, I will repeat going back to the legislative support system, not to goods surrendered voluntarily, but the Bill states voluntarily.. releases the goods to the holder in ordinary condition, ordinary condition, not below ordinary, not exceptional condition, but ordinary condition, surrenders the goods. And free from miscellaneous damage the holder must, this is the people who are giving out the loan, must one of two things, within a period of five days from the date of receipt of the goods, the bank, finance company, credit union, must within five days of receipt of the goods, either a or b; retain the goods and release the buyer from any further obligation under the contract; In other words, you're saying to the bank, here's my car. I don't want it anymore. I paid 60% of the loan. My pay.. my payoff is complete. The bank cannot go back to.. for a deficiency balance on this because this man's paid 60% of his loan. Or, b, return the goods to the buyer at the holder's expense, at the bank's or savings and loan's or credit union, whatever, the finance companies, expense and be limited to action to recover the balance of the indebtedness. The person comes into the bank and says, 'I'm sorry, I cannot make the payments any further.' Now if the bank realizes that they're going to lose a lot of money on



the car, they're supposed to give the car back to the man knowing that the man can't pay the balance off. I'm telling you with actions like this, you say that it's a pro-banking Bill well I want to tell you, it's a pro-consumer. You know, this Bill would be a detriment to the pro-consumers groups because the first thing you're going to see, you're going to see the banks, the finance companies, the credit unions, tightening up their lending procedures. What we're trying to do is loosen the lending procedures so these people can get credit. But I will guarantee you, this is the type of legislation you want to see banks dry up money real quick, this is the type of legislation that will do it. Going to the Amendment, now. The Amendment has one area, he dropped it that they had to hold the goods. In the Amendment he changed it from 30 to 21 days. Now where's the bank, a person comes in. Customer A brings the car in. The bank even though the customer would sign a waiver telling the bank to go ahead and sell the goods, the bank has got to hold that car for 21 days. They cannot sell that car. There is not a waiver. The banks.. ICBI, IBA, and AMBI all ask to add this in the Senate and the Senate Sponsor would not put the waiver provision in there. So right now, a bank has to hold the collateral which is a car, a motor vehicle under these circumstances, it says nothing as far as boats or any other type of goods, they cross off the word 'goods' and put motor vehicle and they have to hold onto it for 21 days. In my ten years in banking the first thing you had to do, you had to notify the people even though they brought in the car to you. Still had to notify them by certified mail. So there you're got another day because.. another 2 to 3 days because you've got to wait for the returned receipt. So in other words, the bank has got to hold on



to this collateral for approximately anywhere from 25 days to 4 weeks. This is a horrendous Bill. I do, you know, commend the Sponsor. He tried to clear up the Bill with the Amendment. He cleared up some areas, but he did not clear it up at all. And I ask the people, the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to resoundingly defeat this Bill because if not, it's going to drop a lot lending money throughout the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I said early here today when we were debating the Amendment I worked in Attorney General Scott's Office in Consumer Fraud Division. And we had many of these kinds of cases coming into the office. And among the ways that the Attorney General's Office worked out with the lenders was this very same procedure that Representative Marovitz is introducing as law. And I ought to commend Representative Marovitz because his law firms represents one of the largest auto firms in Chicago. So he is not talking about something he doesn't know anything about. He knows this business. So he is not adverse to the industry. I thought you ought to know that." He is not doing something that he doesn't know about and he is trying to do what many of the reputable agencies do now. And some of the other fly-by-nights the Attorney General's Office is making them do it now. So if you're really interested in helping the guy who buys a car and gets sick and gets behind and wants to catch up, this is the Bill to vote for. It does not help the chronic guy who gets behind and behind and behind because you can only use it once. You can only use this catch up procedure once. So that means if the chronic guy if he uses it once, they catch him on the next go round. So I'm saying here that this



situation is so prevalent in the Attorney General's Office that we deal with it every day. And I think that you'd be doing a favor to the Attorney General's Office and all the other places interested in good government by voting 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, even with these Amendments this has to be one of the worst Bills I've seen in this Session. And I think it's obvious if you would favor this Bill you don't know much about the credit business. I've spent my life extending credit in one form or another and quite a bit of it in the finance business where we're financing automobiles. My friends used to tell me well, when you get a real bargain, I'd like to buy it. I've got news for you. Never get a bargain in a repossession. You get some car that some guy's torn half up and you want to get rid of it as fast as you can, because you've got a loss. Now all you're doing as has been pointed out here, you're going to start drying up the credit for the very people you say you're trying to help. Now I know that Representative Marovitz thinks that this is a good consumer Bill, but actually it will work in reverse because those who extend credit will tighten up and tighten up and the very guy you're trying to help won't get credit at all. Now if you think that's helping him, that's what this is going to do. But I can tell you that no lending institution which finances automobiles will be in favor of this car or appliances either one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I move the previous question on this Short Debate Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Representative Marovitz."



Marovitz; "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify a few things. The Secretary of State today under its rules pursuant to a court order cannot change transfer title within 21 days on a repossession. So that's existing law today that the Secretary of State must abide by. This Bill has the most important clause in it which rectifies most of the objections of the people who originally and I stress that, originally, were opposed to the legislation. And that clause is, 'if the holder may ...the holder may refuse the buyer's tender of payment and performance if the holder has reasonable cause to believe that the security of the collateral will be impaired by the redemption'. If the holder believes that this guy is a deadbeat, he's not going to pay, he's going to give him the chattel back and he's not going to be able to get him, then that holder is within his rights under this legislation to refuse to return the chattel. Once again, this can only be used one time. It covers involuntary and voluntary only when 60% has already been paid, 21 days, we reduced it from 30 days. This is a Bill that will allow people a remedy and an opportunity to become current where otherwise, they may have had some temporary problems, problems like illness, like emergencies in the family, like lay-offs from work. This would allow somebody to become current and pay up the amount that they owe. They can only do it one time. And if the individual holder has a belief that the guy's a deadbeat and not has a legitimate right, well, he doesn't have to grant him this remedy. We've compromised this Bill. We've answered people's questions. We've amended the legislation. This will help people across the State of Illinois who because of economic problems, as I said emergency death, lay-offs, illness, that kind of thing, want to become current, but have had problems



during the one month or two months situation, where they haven't been able to pay the amount that they owe on the chattel. Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, think of those people who really want to pay their money that they owe, but have temporary set-backs, this is legislation for them. We've amended it to make it.. to answer almost all of the questions of the original objectors. I would ask for an affirmative vote on Senate Bill 565."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'aye', and 69 'no'. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Please poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty. Bradley. Capuzi. Dawson. DiPrima. Doyle. Hoxsey. Kelly. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Leverenz. Mautino. Molloy. Oblinger. Pierce. Reilly. Robbins. Stearney. Stuffle. Terzich. Vitek. Williams. and Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I hit the wrong button. Would you record me as 'no', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Wikoff as 'no'. What's the count? 73 'aye' and 69 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is ... Postponed Consideration. Representative Reilly, did you ever get 1072 straightened out? On Senate Bill, s Third Reading, on page 2, Senate Bill 244. Representative O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 244, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."



O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Senate Bill 244 is a Bill that has been on the Calendar for some time and has gone through the Amendment process to take out some of the questions that some of the other Representatives have raised in the chambers. What the Bill does is it freezes the property taxes on landmark designated property in the State of Illinois at the 1979 levels. In addition to that, there is an Amendment that was placed on by Representative Walsh which gives all local home rule units, villages and municipalities the opportunity to draft an ordinance and opt out of it should they want to should the measure cost that municipality or village too much money. It's important to provide some sort of relief for those people that are presently living in landmark designated areas because in many instances, they have to go to drastic measures to remodel the property to keep it in with the guidelines that a landmark designation required when it was first originally designated as a landmark. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call and be happy to answer any questions that any of the Members may have in relation to the measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative O'Brien, is it your intention somewhere along the line to get this into a Conference Committee so you can put that other Amendment on?"

O'Brien: "Well, we have Amendment #1 which is Representative Walsh's Amendment.."

Leinenweber: "Well, didn't you have an Amendment..."

O'Brien: "That Amendment, it does specifically one thing.

It allows a municipality to opt out of the provision should they want to. When a municipality opts out of a provision they have to actually sit down and take a close look at what they're doing in their home rule



units in terms of making landmark designation and also what it would cost.."

Leinenweber: "Didn't you have an Amendment that would even improve the Bill even more and let them opt in... or out?"

O'Brien: "We did. That's correct. There is another Amendment and I've decided not to put that Amendment on at this time which would flip-flop that provision and require them to opt in rather than requiring them to opt out and I can't tell you what the Senate Sponsor is going to do."

Leinenweber: "Well, I had the impression..."

O'Brien: "It has the same effect, Representative Leinenweber. It has the same effect, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I think one improves the Bill much more. I had the impression that you said that you'd put it in a Conference Committee and then put the Amendment on rather than take the risk of not being able to get the votes to suspend the rules so we could have immediate consideration. That was what I thought I heard you say. I just wanted to know what your intentions were."

O'Brien: " Quite frankly, Representative, the Amendment does the same thing whether or not they have to opt in or opt out. I think that Representative Joyce would be happy with either Amendment and could live with the Bill with either Amendment on it, whether or not they are required .. the home rule unit's required to opt out or whether or not we would require them to opt in."

Leinenweber: "I just had the impression we'll never see the Bill again if we... vote it out."

O'Brien: "I think that Representative Joyce has talked with Representative Madigan who had some concerns in relation to the Bill and it's kind of given him the impression



that he would move to nonconcur and switch the Amendment if that was a problem with Representative Madigan and the city of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to some questions?"

O'Brien: "Be more than happy to."

McMaster: "Danny, we have an area in the city of Galesburg approximately 6 blocks long by about 12 blocks wide that is designated an historical area. This includes places of business downtown stores, banks, business buildings, on out into the perimeters that include the private homes, a number of things such as that, grocery stores, what else. Are you telling me that what this Bill would do would be to freeze the taxes on that area at the 1979 level unless the city of Galesburg wanted to opt out?"

O'Brien: "No, I'm not, Representative McMaster. This Bill does not include any multi-dwelling units that are in any landmark designated area..."

McMaster: "Okay,..they're not dwelling units. They're business places..."

O'Brien: "Nor does it include any commercial property in any landmark designated area. The Bill addresses itself to single family dwelling units..."

McMaster: "... Private homes, it would."

O'Brien: "Private homes and private homes only."

McMaster: "I happen to have a number of letters from people within that area in single family dwellings that think this Bill is nuts, to be frank."

O'Brien: "Well, everybody's entitled to their opinion, Representative McMaster, but the Bill... to answer your question, the Bill does not deal with commercial property. The Bill does not deal with multi-dwelling units. The Bill does not effect any piece of property



unless that piece of property is forty years or older. The Bill does not effect any property whatsoever unless it is in a landmark designation. The reason for the Bill is very simple. The restraints that are put on people that are living in landmark designated buildings ranges all the way from taking away their rights and many individuals have found that the land value on which the building is built is probably worth 4 and 5 and 6 times in some instances on Lake Shore Drive and 'Iester' street, than the building is worth and the property is worth on the fair market value. However, they cannot sell it. In addition to that, you have an instance where you have a family or a couple that they're living in a building, should they want to remodel that building, they have to have the plans approved by the Landmark Commission in addition to the building department and the proper permits both and most of the remodeling, quite frankly, all of the remodeling has to be done in the architectural period in which the building was rendered an architectural landmark. Many of these people find themselves in a property tax areas that are continually going up and they can't turn the building into a duplex because it's designated as a landmark and I think we've got the Bill and all the Amendments on the Bill so that it's restricted to single family dwelling units. I think it's a good Bill and I think it's going to pass this General Assembly, if not today, within the next Session of the General Assembly. Because there is mounting concern for some sort of relief for these people and there's a ten year repealer in the Bill."

McMaster: "Dan, you must be an attorney. You talk too long. Danny, I know what you're saying. I would suggest that if you have people in an area such as that that are restricted by the problems of the historical



area that they become de-historicalized. That can be done. You can change that landmark area. May I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, this is one of those Bills that is going to very severely restrict local governments by saying one part of the area will have their taxes frozen, the other part of the area can have their taxes go up. Now I think that is very unfair to those people in the area that have the taxes frozen. I think it's completely unfair when you expect the residents of a city or whatever, to pick up the cost of operations of the units of local governments and continue to add to the while the people in this sacrosanct area have their taxes frozen. I think the Bill is a disaster. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewing: "Representative, you mentioned the hardships on these people who live in these historic areas. How is this going to in any way address the problem of the repair to their homes? Would they have to do it within a certain architectural style?"

O'Brien: "It has no effect whatsoever, just a hardship that is presently being you know, a burden that those people who live in landmark dwelling or landmark buildings right now are having to undergo when any remodeling takes place because of the landmark designation of the building."

Ewing: "So the only relief then that you're talking about for these people is the tax relief."

O'Brien: "That is correct."

Ewing: "What was the reason that you picked the ten year repealer? Would you think we face for those homes



a sizeable increase at the end of ten years or do you anticipate this will be renewed or how would we solve the problem ten years from now?"

O'Brien: "Representative Ewing, I would imagine that we'll probably be back with a similar measure before the Illinois General Assembly within 3 or 4 years should this Bill become enacted to determine what effect it has had on certain specific landmark designated areas in the State of Illinois. In addition to it I think the Bill may have an effect to somewhat slow down local municipalities in their landmark designation commissions from indiscriminately designating landmark status to every building in every municipality in the State of Illinois, the city of Chicago, the County of Cook."

Ewing: "One further question; Why did you chose the 40 years? Most homes, 40 years are not historic as far as even the people that have lived there. Why didn't we pick 80 or 100 years. I don't think there's anything on 'Aster Street' that's 40 years that would qualify is there?"

O'Brien: "No, there aren't, but according to the Landmark Commission and the National Historic Landmark Register, 40 years is a pretty agreed year for say anything constructed prior to 1939 which is certainly prior to World War II starting."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill. The Sponsor of this Bill has worked very diligently in behalf of this measure. He brought it before the Revenue Committee and I would have to say to this Body that there was a mixed reaction on the Revenue Committee as to this measure. It was finally approved by the Committee and passed out here to the floor. I have some problems with the Bill. I have also received mail all, of which has been in opposition to the Bill. The point of my remarks to this Body is that this is not a Bill which



has been unanimously approved by the Committee. It's not a Bill that doesn't have some possible ramifications for your own communities and areas and I would earnestly encourage you to look at your Digest on it. Look at your report of your staff and then of course, make up your own mind. But it's a piece of legislation which does require more than just passing attention."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative O'Brien has been accomodating indeed in trying to fit this measure to answer objections and I think that he has done just that and has answered the objection of Representative McMaster because, indeed, a city... a village or a home rule unit, need not seek this assessment relief that this Bill provides for landmark areas. They don't have to do it at all. And if they don't have to do it, then there can be no injustice. Now, I submit that the justification for the Bill is that sometimes there are hardships worked on owners in areas designated as landmark areas as Representative O'Brien pointed out. They are unable to convert to purposes that they might deem to their satisfaction because of the landmark designation.

In return for that, they get some assessment relief. That's perfectly fair. Now in areas where there are single family residents and the zoning is for that, and there is no economic benefit that the landowners can get by conversion, then the village Board or the city council can by ordinance say that they do not get that assessment relief and so the municipality loses no revenue. This is a perfectly reasonable Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge everyone to vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative O'Brien to close."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, thank you very much."



We have had.. We have worked very hard on this Bill as Representative Walsh has indicated. We've answered many of the questions that some of the Representatives have had from their local communities. There are some 61 landmark designated areas in the State of Illinois and they are designated landmarks either by the National Historical Landmark Commission or by the local municipalities that have their landmark commission. We've put on some 4 to 5 Amendments to answer the questions that any of the Representatives and any of the Senators may have dealing with whether or not the village, the municipality or the home rule unit want to opt in or opt out. It's an excellent measure. We've spend plenty of time on it. I think that the opposition that you may be getting or the letters that you may be getting were in relation to the Bill before the Amendments were put on it and there was somewhat some misunderstandings in relation to the Bill. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we've got the Bill in the best shape that it possibly can be and it does have a ten year repealer on it. We'll back assessing it next Session in the Illinois General Assembly and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call. I know it's a new concept but it's not a bad concept at all."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120.. 130 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 278. Representative Waddell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 278, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."



Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is in two parts. the original Bill was a Bill whereby the collection of security bills from the race track operators as initiated through the Law Enforcement Department, they were making these as we had designated on a monthly period but could not do so because part of the formula relates to the population of those people who are at the race tracks. Therefore they were making them on a basis of quarterly rather than as stipulated by law each month. They found that this too, was not convenient and it was not right so the law enforcement came back in again and said, why don't we do it at the end of the year, one collection for all and that's it? That's the first part of the Bill. The second portion of the Bill, in 1975 we did not address the fact that other states under what they deemed right in their own racing laws, then at that time, we had no allowance to use, in fact, it was prohibited, that they could use the race results of those tracks in the State of Illinois for the practice of betting. Therefore, this portion relates to that. This portion says that, and we'll take an example; the State of New York allows betting and off-track betting and if they allow those persons to bet on that issue, then they, in turn, in the use of Illinois race results then we are saying that this having gone from the race track operators, and making a contract with those in New York, must make that contract through and with the approval of the Illinois Racing Board. The end result is that if this is approved and comes back, then what we have here is a bonanza for the State of Illinois because we will collect as Representative Greiman's and Collins' Amendment 7½% off of the top. Next, the horsemen and the track operators who made the contract then would receive 50% of what is left. There-



fore it means that it would swell the treasury of the State of Illinois and it would put the racing industry itself on a better footing. That's what this is all about. Solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that you will pay attention to the Amendments that were adopted on this Bill, particularly the one that was adopted in the House Executive Committee. There was a Bill that purported to put a bonanza into the state coffers of Illinois around this General Assembly the last couple of years and that one called itself, 'off-track betting'. This Amendment seeks to reap the benefits of off-track betting in other states. Now I'm sure that it is not the Sponsor's intention to do this, but I know that.. I can imagine that scenario next year if this Bill passes now when the off-track betting Bill is brought in again. And the Sponsors of that Bill will tell you, well, we've already gone on record approving off-track betting because we passed that Bill last year to allow off-track betting powers in other states to use Illinois race results. And they'll say, this will be even better because then our Racing Board can keep it more under their control, etc., etc., etc. Well we don't have to approve off-track betting. And that is really what the issue is on this Bill. It is not an issue of whether we're going to have a bonanza in the State of Illinois. The issue is, do we approve off-track betting? This Bill will permit the use of Illinois race results in other states' off-track betting powers. And this Bill is nothing but a foot in the door for next year's Sponsors of next year's off-track betting Bill and they will tell you then, you've already said 'yes' to off-track betting. You might as well get in bed with it here in Illi-



nois. And I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Waddell: "Well I think the issue is pretty clear. In fact we were even discussing whether we ought to have a filly race back here in the House so that the Members coming out of gate number one, we could take time and cast bets on that. But all humor aside, this is a bonanza. It has nothing to do with the State of Illinois and our off-track betting it is bonanza to the State of Illinois and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I think Representative Pullen has very well illustrated this is the beginning of off-track betting in the State of Illinois that's going to further legalization of gambling in this state. You want to be on record as favoring gambling? And off-track betting, this is the first step towards it. Cause next year, next Session, you're going to see him back with that same type of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Kempiners, is seeking attention over there. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 30 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 574. Representative O'Brien."

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 Redmond: "O'Brien or Terzich? Or Terzich or O'Brien? 574. Out of the record. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of an intro-



duction. The wife of my seatmate, Sam Vinson, Cindy, is up in the upper right hand corner of the Speaker's Gallery, her parents Mr. and Mrs. Bob Pride and Mr. Ed Cartwright from Los Angeles."

Speaker Redmond: "667. Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 667, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Metropolitan Exposition Auditorium and Office Building Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that quite a number of the Members have asked me about. This is Senate Bill 667 that has to do with supporting civic centers. The only levy I would like to intro.. to introduce in this discussion is that it was Lincoln that said, 'You must do for the people that can't do for themselves.' And this case, it's the buidling of civic centers and the supporting of civic centers because the people can't do it for themselves. What happens here is that as you know, 3½% of the Horse Race Privilege Tax goes into Metropolitan Exposition Fund. This year that fund has reached 8 million dollars and the 'amortization' necessary is only 6 million dollars. Representative Jones earlier in the day passed out to all of you a newspaper synopsis of a court decision that is going to leave Springfield \$400,000 short their first year because they have pledged all of their revenues for debt service. Now in this case I think Springfield is going to be the only metropolitan exposition authority that's going to benefit, but it is in their for all the 10 cities that have a civic center. Now working with the Bureau of Economic Development we amended the Bill to put a cap on it so that no authority will receive five times.. more than five times what it needs in deficiency and up to less than 75% of their deficiency.



In the case of Springfield they're going to need \$400,000 this first year and we.. this Bill is really patterned to help Springfield and I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. It was heard in Cities and Villages and there was a full discussion. I'd like to call your attention to a few things that I think are important that we ought to consider. First of all, a civic center legislation like this is enacted as a capital program to help constructions of civic centers throughout the state. Now there are many civic centers that are in the process of building their buildings and working on this particular aspect. This particular Bill provides that funds shall be used for the general corporate purposes to pay the operating cost and we're going now from capital development to paying operating cost. We heard in Committee that Springfield was short about \$300,000 and from the time the Bill was heard in Committee, now it's increased another 100,000 and the Sponsor tells you it's 400,000 for the Springfield project. Every other authority in the State of Illinois has agreed to pay for their levy .. toalevy, for any operating expenses that they need. Springfield has not done that. As a home rule community Springfield, of course, has the option to levy up to 5¢ to take care of their operating costs. I don't think that we should get involved with this type of thing. I think we're setting a precedent and I think this is something that we should not be doing and I would urge a very consideration in voting against this piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leverenz: "Does this have anything to do with the Springfield Civic Center? Are they being sued for over a million dollars by the electrical contractor and this would bail them out on that?"

Giorgi: "All I understand what's occurring is that the money that was set aside to 'amortise' Springfield's bonds earned one million, 800 thousand dollars in interest and they went to court to try to secure that money and the court ruled against them. I'm not aware of the suit you're talking about."

Leverenz: "You said earlier that we must do for people what they cannot do for themselves.."

Giorgi: "Lincoln said that."

Leverenz: "Oh, I think you just did too. Does that include paying a debt before it's incurred?"

Giorgi: "I think Lincoln might have recommended that."

Leverenz: "Does that also include taxing them when they can't tax themselves?"

Giorgi: "I don't want to get into that issue."

Leverenz: "I'm glad you don't. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Springfield does have a hotel and motel tax that is shared with the auditorium authority for debt service. But the reason the local authority is in this fix is because when they started out their first bond issue, they received the interest money on the bonds while they were in the investment stage. But when it came to the next bond issue, Governor Walker told them that they would... if they received this interest money, that they would not get their original grant. Now that is the problem. Now if they would receive the interest money of a million, 400 thousand dollars which was in that court case, and then .. that are distributed to you it indicates that you said that the



local authority did not protest. Well they didn't protest because the Governor says if you do, you won't get your original grant. Now that's in testimony by Francis Butinger, the Chairman of the Board. This is the only authority in the state that has an elected Board where the people themselves directly take up the cause of the civic center."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this particular piece of legislation also. Although my city is one that would be one of the recipients of some of this money. But they signed the contract with BED at the time that they would fund the operational deficit. Now I'll tell you, the original Act was bad enough. And I was sorry that I voted for it and I tried to stop the Danville Civic Center in the last Session of the Legislature, but this is one of the worst pieces of legislation that I have ever seen in the 16 years that I've been in this General Assembly. And you talk about proposition 13, this is really going to bring us proposition 13 when we start picking up operational deficits. It gives no incentives for any of these civic center authorities to control their expenses in any way and for those of you who think that I can vote for McCormick Place, I can justify that in the sense that we made a trade-off at that time for 6 million for the county fairs downstate. And that is used and it's used to the extent that the money that's generated in the general revenue fund under McCormick Place from people all over the world through their transportation, their taxicabs, their lodging, their meals and so forth, but you're going to find everyone of these downstate civic centers to be a complete white elephant. Believe me. And this is the worst Bill that



I've ever seen and I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tuerk: "Is it not true, having sponsored the Bill that was finally ruled Constitutional on civic center funding, I'm vitally interested in this type of Bill. Is it not true that the state is paying 75% of the construction costs for the civic center?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir. That's true."

Tuerk: "Well, would it be logical in your estimation then for the state to somewhat protect its investment by helping to .. helping the civic centers along on the operating deficits to a limited degree?"

Giorgi: "That's the reason for this Civic Center Support Act now. That's the reason for this Act at this moment."

Tuerk: "And this would .. I would presume, this would be thoroughly consistent with what has been done for the city of Chicago McCormick Place. Is that true?"

Giorgi: "Well, I would say that in the initial subscription for McCormick Place the General Assembly came up with 20 million dollars. When McCormick Place burned down and the insurance didn't cover the rebuilding of McCormick Place we appropriated 12 million dollars for two or three years in succession. We're giving McCormick Place now 6 million, 800 thousand dollars a year for a corporate uses and I think it should be pointed out this is not a property tax. This Act guarantees that those civic centers won't be 'amortised' from property taxes. This civic center... these civic center dollars come out of the race track skim. When you go to the race track window and you buy a \$2.00 ticket, 16¢ part of it goes into this fund. This has nothing to do with the property tax and I would hope that some of



these people being on this floor would not get into the property tax in this issue."

Tuerk: "I just have one final question and I appreciate the fine responses you've given my indepth question. How many of the civic centers across the state would be benefited by Senate Bill 667?"

Giorgi: "At the present time I think there are 6 centers under construction, but there's only one that would be.. that would qualify for the next fiscal year."

Tuerk: "But eventually ours in Peoria might get a little bit of the funds and once it's constructed and operating?"

Giorgi: "The way the law is written now, all nine of these contemplated civic centers would qualify for some aid in the event they needed it. They'd have to show proof to the Bureau of Economic Development on the forms prescribed that they are indeed in a deficiency state and need the money."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there is certainly established precedence for helping ... for helping support this state civic center Bill. We all know the problems that Springfield depended on the money and the court has ruled that they can't get their hands on it. We know what inflation has done to building and the Springfield authority has pledged all of their money to debt service. They're.. In this case, they're in very dire straits. This is somewhat of an emergency and



I think that trying to recall all the aid we've given to McCormick Place and some other things from the Agricultural Premium Fund then the privilege tax, I think this is a very worthwhile project. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Kane to explain his vote."

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

I rise in opposition to this Bill at this time. It's been stated that Illi.. that Springfield needs this money because it lost one million, 3 in interest. Well they knew five years ago that they were going to lose that money and there's no reason why they couldn't have planned for it in the meantime. If you look at what's happening in Peoria and Rockford and in other places, Peoria which doesn't even have a completed civic center yet, already has four million dollars stashed away to take care of operating deficit and has got a fund up to 5.6 million which will take care of operating deficits when that center comes into effect. Rockford at the same time has got a 5% motel and hotel tax which is going to supplement the Rockford center and I think that this at this time is a bad provision. We should let Springfield go on its own, find out what it's going to do and let them come back next year, if indeed, they do run the deficit."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "Get enough votes on this so we can put it on Postponed Consideration. No. No. I'm serious about this. A lot of misinformation is being passed out and we won't have a chance to answer it. The deficit is not .. the total deficit is 75% of it and it can only be for five times that to be.. that would be the end of it and it would be for this purpose. McCormick Place



receives this 6 million dollars regardless of whether it has any deficit or not. And we think that that only should be fair and I would appreciate it if we'd get enough votes on that so we could put it on Postponed Consideration and ask for other votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Slape."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I lost track in the Calendar.

Is this the Byrne-Thompson compromise we're voting on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is this what?"

Slape: "The Byrne-Thompson compromise we're voting on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 21 'aye' and 98 'no'. The Gentleman.. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 687. Representative McBroom. Representative Broom."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 687..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 760."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 760, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle here? Out of the record. 942. Vinson?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 971, Taylor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 971, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I filed a motion to .. to return Senate Bill 971 to Second Reading for the purposes of tabling Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 971 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, it's on Second Reading. Representative Taylor moves to



table Amendment #3. Is that correct?"

Taylor: "That's correct."

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

Brummer: "Yes, could we have an explanation of what Amendment #3 is that he's moving to table?"

Taylor: "Amendment #3 which would have permitted an employee to also sue employer when an injury was caused by deliberate removal of a safety device or guard on any machinery."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I have leave of the House to hear Senate Bill 971?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear 971 on the Order of Third Reading? Hearing no objection.."

Taylor: "Senate Bill 971 would increase the number of Commissioners on this Industrial Commission from 5 to 7 Members. Two new Members to be appointed are required to be balanced between the two major political parties and also to be balanced between the employer and the employee affiliation. The Bill was amended in the Senate to correct a draft in the area in the original Bill that did not include the forty-two thousand, five hundred salary of the Chairman of the Industry Commission. That was raised to that level last year when everyone else had their salary adjusted. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move for the passage of Senate Bill 971."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "Does the present law provide for a mixed.. political mix in the Industrial Commission?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Friedrich: "And this would continue that for the additional Members? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Representative Taylor, is there money appropriated in the budget for the increase in salary?"

Taylor: "There was no increase in salary."

Simms: "Well, you're increasing the Commissioners from five to seven so there'd have to be additional money available for two extra people unless they're going to work for nothing."

Taylor: "I'm sure that there's an accompanying appropriation available, but I don't have that information at present."

Simms: "I'm informed it's not in the Industrial Commission budget or any other place."

Taylor: "Representative Simms, you have more information than I have."

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

Robbins: "In explaining my vote, as I look at this thing the way it was set up before it was one from each of the major political parties, but now that is two from.. from one major political party and one from the other.. two from the major political party and one from the minor one."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've discussed this Bill before. This is a Commission. It deserves our support. They're trying to turn around the problems that have faced us and since we can't do much of this through legislation, it can only be done through the work of the Industrial Commission. The new Chairman is excellent. The new Commissioners are excellent and this Bill deserves our support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 55 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 appears Senate Bill 1072. Representative Reilly."

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

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill we took out of the record a minute ago. It was a technical problem that we left an Amendment off that should have been on. We've now worked that out with the other side and I think it's all clear. I would ask the second time today for favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 1072."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 2 'no'. This Bill, having again received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading on page 5. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13. We'll be going to Consideration Postponed when we get through with these."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13. This Bill has been read. The Resolution has been read a second time previously."



Speaker Redmond: "Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 1 was adopted in Committee. A motion to table Amendment 1 by Representative Totten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten. Have we moved.. Have we tabled 1 already? Representative Totten?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. HJRCA 13 was filed before the rules change which required the under lining of a Constitutional Amendments. We tried to do that in Committee Amendment #1 but LRB made an error and I'm correcting the error later so I'd like to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 1. Any further motions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Amendment 1 is tabled. Any further motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further motions. Floor Amendment #2, this Amendment has been read in full previously."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

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

I would move to w. ask to withdraw Amendment #2.

It's not proper..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, this Amendment has been read in full previously."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Totten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, Amendment 3."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 does the technical change that is needed by our rules by under lining all the language in the Amendment. It removes the substantive



changes that were made in error in Amendment #1 by LRB and removes some language from the Bill that was superfluous and I would move for its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien : "Amendment #4, Mahar, this Amendment has been read in full previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Mahar, this Amendment has been read in full previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 deals with the Section relating to home rule units. Now that Section says that home rule units of government can opt out by a referendum. It just seems to me that when you're amending the Constitution, you ought to have a Constitution for the entire state and it's all in subdivisions and this type of thing we're talking about taxation. We shouldn't be allowing local units of government to opt out. Take a community like Bedford Park which is a home rule community. That's 600 population. Has a special situation because they're an industrial community. They could opt out of the Constitutional Conven.. or this Constitutional Amendment if it were adopted or add to our Constitution. Take Rosemont, which is a special situation. I could go on and on. There are many municipalities and .. in the State of Illinois who would



gain.. could gain home rule status and could opt out of the Constitution. Now I ask you, 'Should we allow them to do that?' Should we have an Amendment to our Constitution which applies to each and every one of us and to each and every level of government? Or should we have a provision which would allow certain units to opt out? I ask that Amendment #5 be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any .. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #5. We considered very carefully the question that the Gentleman from Cook poses. The Illinois Constitution provides special powers for home rule units. Some of us may or may not agree with those powers. The provision in the Amendment that was finally decided on and submitted to the Committee and is now before you provides that a home rule community may by referendum opt out of the property tax provisions of this Constitutional Amendment. What.. What that says is that we recognize the special consideration given to home rule units of government in the Constitution. Although we may not necessarily agree with them, the way to change them is to remove the home rule Article from the Constitution. The referendum requirements that exist would allow the people in the community to decide whether they wanted to get out from under this provision or not. We think it's a fair provision. The Gentleman raises a policy question. I would oppose the question as one that's been considered and reject it and would ask for your 'no' vote on Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Mahar to close."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of the Amendment ... of the Constitutional Amendment said, this is



a policy question. This is why I raised the question before this Body. I do think that the question of the home rule municipality that we have now and which we can.. we can either opt out a home rule or we can become home rule communities by a referendum is something a little bit different. Think we're dealing with a Constitutional change of property taxes, they ought to be uniform throughout the state. I think that this Amendment if it's adopted would make the Constitutional Amendment stronger and I would urge that your.. urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85...86 'aye' and 51 'no' and the motion prevails and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 32. Just leave it right where it is. Bradley-Leinenweber. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 42. Johnson. Well, then you've got to say something about it."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #42, this Resolution has been read in full previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. I didn't... Well I thought you wanted it out of the record. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 32. Are there any... fiscal.. Request for a fiscal note on that one. Parliamentarian advises me that the ... Read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amend-



ment #32, this Resolution has been read in full previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. No, we're holding that because the Amendment has to be engrossed. We have to read it again. An Amendment was adopted ... Clerk tells me we have to engross it. Consideration Postponed."



Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 2. Out of the record. 59, McMaster. Out of the record. 101, Deuster. Representative Deuster, proceed."

Deuster: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to thank everyone who voted for Senate Bill 101 yesterday. There was a time when there was not full Membership. I want to thank you for voting for it yesterday and ask that all of you who voted for it yesterday vote again for it today and I think there will be more Members who will be supporting it too. Senate Bill 101 is a Bill, as you know, that provides that the school children in Illinois will enjoy the benefits of the school transportation services which will take them to the school that they lawfully attend whether they be a public school or a private school. I think that you can call this more of a public transportation Bill than an educational Bill, although it amends the School Code. It is Constitutional, there is no question about that. I think that it is a good concept and a sound concept. It is a concept that has been functioning well in another state, the State of Pennsylvania, for six years. The com...the questions that most Members will ask about any Bill or any idea is, 'Will it work?' And, 'Is it good?' 'Is it fair?' And, 'What are the cost implications?' 'Can we afford it?' 'Is it fair to all the taxpayers and will it promote a good public policy?' I think those answers can all be answered in a way that will lend you to vote 'yes' and support this. As to the cost, an actual survey has been conducted which indicates that approximately twenty-five thousand students would qualify at a cost of about one hundred and twenty-five dollars. I think the cost implications are three million. I will ask for your favorable vote and appreciate your...continuing to support Senate Bill



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Anderson: "Mr. Sponsor, you allude in the survey that you've passed out to Pennsylvania that the...that this has been at work for six years in Pennsylvania. Have you had a chance to...in your deliberations to check with Pennsylvania and see how it's been working and what the cost is out there?"

Deuster: "Yes."

Anderson: "And what is the cost?"

Deuster: "The cost is actually lower than our estimate here. We estimate that it...in Illinois it would cost one hundred and twenty-five dollars per pupil. In Pennsylvania the cost has been one hundred and twenty dollars. So it's less."

Anderson: "I see. For what year was that? Do you remember, Don?"

Deuster: "I think it is the most recent figure that they have."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Anderson: "Yes, well, this morning the Bureau of the Budget under the signature of Robert Mandeville called Pennsylvania and asked for some figures on the...you know, just what they have done. And the most recent year out there was 1977. And the total cost for non-public pupils in 1977 was between twenty-six and thirty million dollars. Now, the State of Pennsylvania only has five hundred and five school districts where we have a thousand and sixteen. So there is a lot more consolidation out there. Now what Doctor Mandeville had done, he took the figures that Pennsylvania had projected and the average cost for 1977 here in the



State of Illinois, compared it, added an 8% inflation factor, subtracted out the nonpublic school children that are being transported now in the State of Illinois and still came up with a figure between forty-six and fifty-three million dollars. Therefore, I believe that this Bill, this concept, although a good one and one that I would like to support, there is a difference. The Sponsor says it will cost somewhere around three million dollars, Mandeville says it will cost somewhere between forty-six and fifty-three million dollars. I would really, Mr. Sponsor, like to see you withdraw this. And I would be glad to go down and have a Bill drafted, put it in, anybody that wants to be a Chief Sponsor along with me, have some deliberate hearings this fall, know where we're going and come back and have something done. So until that time until we can see where we're going that we don't jeopardize transportation in the rest of the state, I urge everyone to vote 'no' or 'present'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the last Speaker went into the funding of the bussing in Pennsylvania and came up with a forty-eight to fifty-two million dollar figure. However, that is not only for bussing outside of the district in the private schools, it is also for bussing intradistrict. The ...if we're going to compare apples and oranges; that's one thing. If...if he went a step further and asked... has Mr. Mandeville ask the people in Pennsylvania they would have found out that out of the 39% eligibles that used the bussing, that 17% are involved in bussing outside of the district. This is exactly the figure that Representative Deuster gave to this Body yesterday. Compare apples with apples, not apples with apples and oranges. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I move the previous question on this excellent Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...the previous...the Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "I urge your...to vote affirmatively. I thank you for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize we debated extensively yesterday but I did wish to speak on this. It's one thing to call Postponed Consideration at a time way out of normal order so now they're going to have to recognize the person who wishes to speak on the issue. Again, we speak to Representative Keane's point. We're talking about, with the amending of Section of 29-3, it affects intradistrict bussing as well. And I think one of those things has got to be accurate. When Don Deuster talks about Pennsylvania, he can't have it both ways. He can't allow us to call ...not to call Pennsylvania, get accurate figures on the cost and then subtract off that...or not subtract off that portion of the number of kids involved and not give us credit for that. He also used his favorite adjective again yesterday was virtually...when it said it was virtually the same Bill as Pennsylvania has. And that's not accurate either. In...because of the... the Constitutional question, the accuracy of that statement is more closely related to the fact that the Pennsylvania court case was a challenge based upon the Federal Constitution and not the State Constitution.



And the Supreme Court ruled...ruling was without opinion that still raises questions relating to Article 10, Section 3 of the Illinois Constitution of '70. The 'Everson' case does not, in the judgment of some legal opinions, supersede Article 10, Section 3 of the Illinois Constitution. So the Constitutional question is certainly much up in the air. I don't think that we should support the Bill simply from a fiscal point of view but it also raises some Constitutional questions and I would still ask that the Membership vote 'no'. And of course, in the event of 89, Mr. Speaker, I would like to verify."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By way of explaining my 'no' vote, I think there are two points I would like to make here. First of all, if there's ever a case of the Legislature shooting in the dark, this is a classic example. We're being asked to vote on a Bill here and nobody seems to really know what this measure is going to cost. And we have some pretty wide ranging estimates and I think this is the wrong way for the Legislature to proceed. The other point that I want to make is that this House has not had an adequate debate and adequate hearings on this issue. I supported Representative Deuster when he moved to discharge Committee. And I frankly would not have done so had I known that this Amendment was going to be tacked on later. This is not following proper Legislative process. We should take this Bill back, put it on some kind of Interim Study and consider it at a later time when we really know the facts. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at one time in the State of Illinois there was absolute



discrimination against children attending nonpublic schools with respect to transportation. The Legislature then made it permissive with school districts as to whether or not they desire to transport nonpublic school students. The next step was for this Legislature to mandate, to require, local school districts when transporting their own students, to transport children attending nonpublic school students. The latest update was just two years ago when we provided that in transporting nonpublic school students within a district, the school district did not have to use the same route, that it could use another route if it was safer, more economical and expeditious. We have come, I think, a long way in eliminating discrimination against children who are attending nonpublic schools. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill will round the matter out and it will eliminate the discrimination that presently exists with respect to children who are attending nonpublic schools that accidentally are located outside a school district. Remember, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that school districts are determined by the public sector. And it is simply an accident that a nonpublic school is located outside the district in which the nonpublic school students reside. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the principle opponent of this Bill himself said, it constitutes sound, good public policy. His only concern was the fiscal aspect. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we know what the fiscal aspect is. We know that 17% will avail themselves of this. And all we have to do is multiply that times the average cost of one hundred and twenty dollars and we would come up to somewhere between four million and five million. This is not, fiscally, a significant Bill. But it is a Bill



that insures equity between children who attend public and nonpublic schools. It eliminates discrimination and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the present time we fund 80% of the transportation. We pay about 64% on the average over the last five or six years. And now then we are going to ask the school system which is publicly funded to go ahead and add to the deficit that they have in the transportation fund and have the local people to make it up and there isn't anything on this Bill to provide the money. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "In explaining my 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add one...one point which has not been brought up so far. We have discussed the unit cost of...of transporting a single pupil. Let's talk about the number of possible nonpublic pupils who would be eligible for transportation services under this Bill. According to our staff which has analyzed the Bill, it appears that Representative Deuster has been basing his twenty-five thousand nonpublic pupil estimate on Section 29-4 of the School Code, which currently limits eligible nonpublic pupils only to those located on regular public bus routes. However, Senate Bill 101 does not limit the provisions of transportation services to nonpublic pupil...located in regular bus...public bus route areas. Consequently, the Illinois Bureau of the Budget has estimated that this could add an additional twenty-four thousand pupils, almost double, of Representative Deuster's estimate. So, once again, I think we are being confronted with a low ball estimate on this...cost of this program."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for those of you who are waving as to how you want to vote on this, I have three children who go to a private school. One goes to St. Lawrence, one at DeLaSalle and the other at St. Daniels. Now it's costing me for my daughter, who is going to grammar school, three hundred and seventy-five dollars. For each of my boys it's costing roughly nine hundred dollars each plus their fees and their transportation. We had a terrible time getting bus transportation and it cost an additional thirty-five dollars a month just for bus transportation. So if you've got 'any' decency in you, will you help me out and give me some 'aye' votes on this because I can't afford all of these expenses? Well I'm sympathetic to the people who don't...my kids don't...I'm for the people outside of Chicago as well. They need this Bill and let's help them out."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 89...90 'aye' and 67 'no'. Representative...Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise?"

Walsh: "So that you'll recognize Representative Schneider for purposes of a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you, that's what I had intended to do. Representative Schneider. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "May I have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Collins...poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes. Gaines. Harris. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Kozubowski. Mahar.



Marovitz. Malloy. Neff. Oblinger. Pierce.

Stearney. E.G. Steele. J.J. Wolf. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, you had better wait until they turn the microphone on. Your voice isn't strong enough."

Schneider: "Now...the guy with the microphone is ready. Would you proceed to read the affirmative for purposes of a verification?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would one of the verifiers want to stand up here. That may be faster. All the Members please be in your seats. Hanahan's Rule provides that. Please be in your seat. Representative Schraeder. Representative Schraeder. Representative Tuerk, sit down. Giorgi...Tuerk, Giorgi, Hanahan, please sit down."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I've go to go see my Senator. Can I get verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Hearing no objection.. Proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bower. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Henry. Huff. Emil Jones. Keane. Kelly. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan. Margulas. Matijevec. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pouncey. Preston. Ronan. Schisler. Schlickman. Schraeder. Simms. Slape. Stanley.



Steczo. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duynes.
Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Williams. Sam Wolf.
Younge. Yourell."

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

Younge: "May I be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May she be verified? Representative Mahar, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Mahar recorded?"

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

Mahar: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Representative Skinner. Skinner, 'aye'. Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Schneider?"

Schneider: "No. Are we at 92, Jack?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 92. Representative Oblinger, 'aye'. Bill Harris, 'aye'. Representative Huskey, 'aye'. Representative Jones, 'aye'. Representative Jaffe, 'aye'. Representative...proceed in the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. What's the count now? 97."

Schneider: "All right, what are you...all right. Let's start off with...Representative Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Schneider: "Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Schneider: "Got her. We see her. Dawson."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Jack Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Jack Davis. Representative Jack Davis. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Oh."

Schneider: "Here he is. Doyle."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley here? He's in back."

Schneider: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "Farley, raise your hand. He's the little fellow there."

Schneider: "Ewell. Representative Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Ray Ewell here? Ray Ewell. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Skinner requests permission to be verified, Mr. Schneider. Representative Skinner requests permission to be verified. Is that all right?"

Schneider: "We acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker. We said okay. Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Schneider: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape. He's there, the good looking fellow back there."

Schneider: "Did we do McAuliffe? Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe. Is Representative McAuliffe ...will you turn Representative McAuliffe's chair around? Is McAuliffe there?"

Schneider: "He refuses to turn the chair around."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative McAuliffe."

Schneider: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew. I saw him a minute ago."

Schneider: "Doesn't count if we can't see him."



Speaker Redmond: "He's in the back seat there."

Schneider: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman is in his seat."

Schneider: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Kucharski, is he here? He's here."

Schneider: "Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Ewell is back. Return him to the Roll
Call."

Schneider: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Huskey here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Representative...no, he's here. Is Steczo
here? Representative Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Steczko. Representative Ray Ewell, for
what purpose do you rise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman has 'present'.
Representative Steczo is in front."

Schneider: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Broom is..."

Schneider: "McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Schneider: "Yeah. Representative Schisler. I couldn't
read that. I was wondering why...who now? Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler, is he here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Domico. Is he here? Remove him."

Schneider: "Representative Ronan."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ronan. He is over with Representative Stanley."

Schneider: "Which one...oh, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "They're arm wrestling."

Schneider: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Leon here? Middle aisle."

Schneider: "Representative DiPrima."

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

Schneider: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus."

Schneider: "Oh, there he is straight...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's Cullerton. Representative Margalus. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Is Representative Yourell here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, I heard his voice down here. Representative Margalus is back."

Schneider: "All right. No further questions of the Affirmative, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the count? Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise? Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Now what is the count? 90 'aye', 5 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms has moved the... reconsider the vote. Representative Bullock moves that that lie on the table. The question is on Representative Bullock's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. 168,



Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Board of Higher Education defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen. 168."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 168 directs the State Board of Higher Education to develop guidelines placing the emphasis on post secondary remedial programs at public community colleges and reducing the roll of the State Universities and offering remedial programs. And it requires the State Board to report the General .. to the General Assembly the progress made towards the change in emphasis. There was some confusion about this Bill on Third Reading before. I have a letter from the State Board of Higher Education which supports this legislation which indicates the problems in the misinterpretation that we had on Third Reading. The letter from the Executive Director of the State Board says, 'It's my understanding there are some misinterpretations about the intent of Senate Bill 168 regarding the de-emphasis of remedial education in public universities. The misinterpretations appear to be that the intent of Senate Bill 168 is to eliminate remedial programs to public universities while there is still a serious need and before any replacement programs have been developed.' The Board of Higher Education has no such intent and my reading of Senate Bill 168 indicates no such intent and I will tell you as Sponsor that there is no such intent. 'I would like also to point out', says Mr. Furman, 'that even though we may be able to reduce the public university remedial programs, we plan to maintain special assistance programs designed to integrate the educationally and economically disadvantaged into the mainstream of



university life.' This letter answers I believe most if not all of the objections raised on Third Reading about this Bill. It should reassure most if not all of the opponents. The Bill does not wipe out remedial programs at the university level, but it does direct the Board of Higher Education to develop guidelines so that remedial programs could be de-emphasized at the university level, not eliminated, but de-emphasized and emphasize rather the community college level where the programs are much less expensive both for the state and for the students and where they can be more appropriately taught. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in... Representative Schlickman? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 78 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive... Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of movement around the floor after that last Bill. Could we please poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Conti. Representative Conti 'aye'. Grossi 'aye'. Brummer 'aye'. Okay. Let's dump this Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 9 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 209. Representative Terzich. Representative Vinson?"



Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise for the purposes of an introduction in the gallery. On the west balcony is a fellow well known to many Members of the .. on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Pete McQue and his granddaughter, Jennie Traskee from Palatine, Illinois, represented by Roger Stanley, John Friedland and Richard Mugalian."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich on Senate Bill 209."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 209, the Bill amends the authority of the Illinois State Board of Investments to provide for an Executive Committee and authorized the Board to deal in covered options on securities owned by the Board. There was some misunderstanding with regard to the options. What it does, it grants the Board the authority to deal in covered options and that the.. there was opposition about the confusion between the covered option and contrasted to naked options. What this does is that there's no risk involved here on the covered options since the only way you can do it is make money by offering the covered options. The covered options, there's no risk involved to the Board. The method of investing has been approved by the United States control of currency, by the Illinois Department of Insurance, by the State of Alabama, Colorado, Vermont, Washington, as well as retirement plan of the American Bar Association. And I would urge your support of Senate Bill 209."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Terzich, for the record, is it not true that the language in this Bill means and that it is the intent of this legislation as well as the Board that the Board is here authorized to sell calls only as stocks it owns and can buy 'put' only to cover those calls?"

Terzich: "That's correct and that's all the Bill does."



Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 111. Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 111 would provide for red oscillating or rotating lights on the emergency patrol vehicles that operate in two jurisdictions, the Department of Transportation that patrols the.. the emergency situations where we have accidents on the expressways, and I would ask for your approval of this Senate Bill 111."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "The only thing I'd like to add to this is that Representative Leverenz is absolutely correct. It's a very good Bill. The employees who are affected by this have been undergoing unusual numbers of accidents because people don't pay attention to anything but red lights and I urge the adoption of this Bill."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to relate an experience that happened to two people that worked in Lyden township. Because of them not having a red light on them, one of my men was killed and the other one was paralyzed for two and a half years and was hospitalized for two and a half years. Those people who are working on these emergency vehicles on the Congress Street Expressway, the Eisenhower, or any expressway or any highway it's.. it's pretty rough on them especially when they ... they're working after dawn or early mornings in the rush hour."



And I think that even though the Illinois State police and everybody else is against any other emergency vehicle having a red light, I think it we could save any of the lives of those people who are working on our highways, I think it's imperative that we vote for this Bill."

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

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, somebody ought to say something against this Bill and there's a lot to be said against it. Right now the only vehicles allowed to have red are law enforcement, firefighting and rescue squad vehicles. We ought to leave it at that. The more. Once we open the door people keep saying, 'Let the camel get his nose under the tent,' then everybody's going to be coming in. Representative Conti just pointed out that some of his people would like to have red oscillating lights. Well it's supposed to mean. You're supposed to know exactly what the vehicle is that's coming and if it's got a red light, you know it's either law enforcement or firefighting or rescue squad. I think we ought to leave it at that way and continue to vote against this Bill."

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

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. As one who drives a vehicle that does have red oscillating lights, I don't know if they pay much attention to that, but I would have to be in opposition to this Bill as well. That.. There's been many, many years where people were confused as to the different colors of lights as to determine what type of vehicle is involved. And at the present time we do have fire vehicles and also police vehicles using the red lights. If they are having problems of this nature I suggest that maybe they go through some type of a strobe light, but if we keep on adding on this color to other vehicles that the people are going to be more confused with this. The



emergency vehicles do operate at a high speed responding to emergencies. I don't believe a tow truck or anything of this nature is there life or death involved and certainly I think they can use different colored lights to designate or ward off these here people."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All infavor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed. The previous question has been moved.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two prior speakers have talked against this and for the same reason it should pass. These people that drive these emergency trucks on the expressways are trained for taking people out of cars that have turned over or cracked up, rolled over or are on fire. These are emergency patrol vehicles. You would simply allow red oscillating lights on 62 trucks that operate for this purpose in Cook and St. Clair County. The workmens' compensation payments because of the accidents that have occured are mounting to almost 100 thousand dollars a year and you're killing these guys. If we don't pass this I think we'll promote that just a step further. They are equipped with emergency first aid kits that are almost as large as the Fire Department uses itself. I would ask for your favorable green vote on Senate Bill 111."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 111?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Boucek, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. The life you save may be your own. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula, to



explain his vote. Timer's on."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had the opportunity to talk to a Gentleman that works on emergency vehicles and he was telling me just last night that nine men have been hit while they are out on duty on emergency purposes. Eight of those men have been seriously hurt. One man has been hurt and has been in the hospital six months and there's doubt whether or not he'd come back to work again. So I urge each and every one of you put up a green light here. Thank you."

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

Winchester: "Well, in my decision on how to vote would be based on Representative Leverenz's answer. Does the Department of Transportation support this Bill?"

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the question, the Department of Transportation is in support of the Bill as well as the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission in support of the Bill."

Winchester: "Does the Illinois State Police support this?"

Leverenz: "No." "But we're going to be there to protect them with these big yellow trucks with red lights."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'aye', 47 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I. I'm definitely against this Bill and I will take another Roll Call. Otherwise I want a verification and just hit their own buttons please. Otherwise, I would like to have a verification. I'll take an honest Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 111



pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Kindly vote your own switch. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye', 42 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, wants a poll of the absentees."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Borchers. Bowman. Bradley. Capparelli..."

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

Bowman: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record him as 'aye'. Mr. McPike?"

McPike: "Could I be verified at this time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're not at that.. We're polling the absentees."

McPike: "Well, if you get leave..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Leave to be verified."

Clerk Leone: "Continuation of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please."

Clerk Leone: "Polling the absentees. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Domico. Donovan. Epton. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Goodwin. Hanahan. Harris. Hoffman. Huff. Kent. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. Leon. Mahar. Marovitz. McCourt. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. O'Brien. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Reilly. Robbins.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Borchers as 'no'.

Mr. Beatty as 'aye'. Mr. Huff as 'aye'. Mr. Darrow as 'aye'. Ms. Pullen as 'aye'. Mr. Anderson as 'aye'.

Mr. Hallock as 'aye'. Robbins as 'aye'. Mr. Hudson as 'aye'. Mr. Steele as 'aye'. Mr. Donovan as 'aye'.

Mr. Leon as 'aye'. Mr. Neff as 'aye'. Mr. Ropp as 'aye'. Mr. Huskey as 'aye'. Continue with the absentees.

No, we haven't verified yet. We're polling the absentees."



Clerk Leone: "Continuation of the poll of the absentees. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. O'Brien. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Reilly. Schisler. Schlickman. Skinner. Stearney. C.M. Stiehl. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson. J.J. Wolf and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's our count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 100 'aye' and 36 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, all I can tell you guys when you're going down the highway, don't pull over. It might be a tow truck. So I withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there's 100 'aye', 36 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And it's the intent of the Chair to complete the Consideration Postponed and adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning so the.. whatever your time schedule is I.. you make your own judgements. Senate Bill 296. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younger. Clerk, read the Bill. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, seek recognition?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could amend that when we come in tomorrow morning till noon. I've got something to get even with a few guys on tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Make it earlier in the morning. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younger, Senate Bill 296."

Younger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 296 amends the Illinois Housing Development Authority Act to require the Illinois Housing Developing Authority to establish a branch office in Springfield, Illinois. This is a form of the Bill that came out of the Senate with a 40 to 12 vote and I have withdrawn the Amendment which I attempted to add asking for a branch office in East St. Louis. So it's just for a branch office



in Springfield in order to give a better convenience to the downstate counties and cities so that they can have the assistance of this 250 million dollar agency to help in the 37 thousand units of housing that are needed downstate and I ask for your approval of this matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is... The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. J. Jones, J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. Many of the state agencies have moved or established headquarters in Springfield because this is where the action is and this is where they work between the various departments and I think it would be advantageous to the agency to be here. And it's a really small staff so it's not a pork barrel thing for Springfield, but I think for the agency to be located here would be good government."

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

Bullock: "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 Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to close."

Younge: "I ask for your support in this matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bil 296 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Leinenweber: "Well, this Bill keeps getting better and better. The more times she takes it back to Second Reading, and one time we had Springfield, Marion, Caro, and East St. Louis in addition to Chicago. Last time it was East St. Louis, Springfield and Chicago. Now it's Springfield. If we can defeat it one more time, maybe



she'll amend it and take out Springfield and return the law the way it is. That's the way it ought to be.

It will save the state about \$120 or 30 thousand dollars and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, a branch office of the Illinois Housing Development Authority is needed in Springfield, Illinois.

99% of the projects which are put up by this agency are built in Cook County. There's nothing wrong with that except that the needs of 37,000 units of housing outside of Cook County which need to be built are not being serviced and it places a hardship on the developers and the people in the rest of the state, the developers in the rural areas, and in the cities downstate. The

Senate felt very strongly that there ought to be an administrative office in Springfield, Illinois. There will be no new appropriation that will be requested.

The administrative budgets of the Illinois Housing Development Authority shows that they have adequate money in their budget presently, presently, to establish this administrative office in Springfield, Illinois. Just from the standpoint of common sense, there ought to be in Springfield..."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, noting Representative Jones' comment I think it's only fair to point out to him that I was in the mens room just a few minuts ago and nine rather lengthy Legislators were standing around talking about moving the capital to Joliet. And since he plans on expanding facilities down here, I though he should know about this. However, I think you're safe because then some of your people could buy this mens room and turnit into



a state museum."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. It's a good idea. It's a good concept. You know how I feel about it. I also supported their legislation. I disapproved much of it. But this time I think that the idea that Wyvetter had in terms of bringing that agency to Springfield would certainly help an area like East St. Louis when they can come here and have easy access to get the persons to get them help. So let's show support for it."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and very briefly, the notion had been advanced that IDA doesn't deal on a people to people basis. Such a notion is absolutely ludicrous. It does deal with the technical people from the various areas of the state and it does work a hardship for people here like in Dick Mautino's District to have to go all the way to Chicago to present applications. I think the Bill is timely and needed as much in Springfield or downstate areas as it is in Chicago. I support you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'aye', 51 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 450. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hanahan: "Just for a purpose of announcement. We have the Mayor of the second largest city of Illinois sitting here with us, Mayor Bob Magon. I'd like to introduce him



to the Membership here... of Rockford."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hello, Bob. Welcome to Springfield.

On Senate Bill 450, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "This is a Senate Bill that requires all state departments, agencies and institutions and state universities to purchase only passenger automobiles which meet certain minimum federal fuel standards. The House Bill has now passed. I would urge the support of the Senate Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 450 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Does this apply to the city of Chicago as well, Mr. Katz?"

Katz: "Units of local government are excluded."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, okay. Fine. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, the Mayor of Franklin Park, Mr. Conti. Elmwood Park. I'm sorry..."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, when they start making compact trains and compact trucks then I can vote for this kind of a Bill. Until the trains are as big as they are, or trucks, I think we'd better take a second look at this Bill."

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

Terzich: "Well, the simple explanation since there's already a House Bill, who needs the Senate Bill? So let's show them. We'll take the House Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 77 'aye', 59 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. Senate Bill 450, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 495. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

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



House. This Bill addresses the licensure requirements in the Department of Registration and Education. It provides for regulations which will provide for studying of new licensure regulations proposals and also a..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hallock?"

Hallock: "And also a review of current licensing requirements."

When we brought this Bill up a few days ago, there were some concerns expressed by many people. We have since worked those concerns out. The Bill has the strong support of the Medical Society, the Hospital Association and also the Department of Registration and Education. I'd ask for your favorable support. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? What is that?"

The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 495?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye', 4 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 622. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 622 is a Bill which has had I believe three additional Amendments put on it. The Amendments would delete any references to weapons that are guns and would apply to such things as bombs, broken bottles, other similar type, stiletto type instruments and so forth. There is no gun involvement. I think we have removed the objections of the people who opposed it on that basis. The law is restored to its existing situation under this Act and I would move for concurrence now and move for passage of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 622 pass?' All in favor vote



'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye', 7 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 746, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 746 provides that state funds cannot be expended in violation of the rules and regulations of the Fair Employment Practices Commission and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. We have amended it to include the new Human Rights Commission and we have also included a procedure for bringing these complaints and for the Human Rights Agency to determine whether funds should be withheld and to direct the Comptroller to withhold such funds if in fact they decide that they should be withheld. I ask for your support for this Bill. The major objection when it was up before was that it did not have a procedure. It now includes that procedure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Representative, you put an Amendment on this Bill. Just what did that Amendment do?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright, let's .. let's have a little decorum in the House and .. can't hear the questions or the answers. Please repeat your question, Sir."

Anderson: "There was an Amendment put on this Bill, I believe yesterday, or today. What did that Amendment do? "

Catania: "The Amendment which we put on the Bill I think the day before yesterday, maybe yesterday, says that we'll now have a procedure for bringing complaints. They will be brought to the Illinois Human Rights Commission and it will make the decision whether there is a violation and make the order to withhold funds if



it seems such an order to be appropriate."

Anderson: "Thank you very much. I think this is a good Bill, Mr. Speaker. It's something that's long needed. We have to put some teeth in this situation if we want people to respect the law. Therefore, I urge everybody to vote 'aye'."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to be the spoiled sport, but this Bill is no better than it was when it was up before and was resoundingly defeated and then put on Postponed Consideration. The Bill... What it does is prohibit the spending of any appropriated funds that is money appropriated from this Legislature that would violate the rules and regulations of the Illinois Fair Employment Practice Commission or the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as determined by those Commissions. Now, this is a tremendous ceding of power to federal bureaucrats which comprise the U.S. .. the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I do not think that we want ... We sit here as the Legislature and elected by the people back home to vote on appropriations . We vote for various programs and.. I don't think we intend, or hope we don't intend to allow a group of unelected bureaucrats who sit way off in Washington to tell us that, 'No, even though you appropriated money for this purpose, because we, in our own consideration have determined that that is in violation of our rules,' meaning the rules of the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. These are rules promulgated by bureaucrats who are unelected and appointed. And I don't think we want to cede this much of our power as a sovereign state among the fifty United States, to unelected bureaucrats sitting way off in distant Washington. And I urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leinenweber, did you have a question for Mr. Laurino and Mr. Hanahan and the northern gallery over there? Is there.. Was your question related to them?"

Leinenweber: "Did they wave their handkerchief?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "They're waving everything else. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, have them introduce their friends. I'm in charge of introduction. If they'll float their names down, I'll introduce them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sure they're constituents. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "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 Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This simply says that we are going to be serious about equal rights, equal pay for equal work. And it says that the Illinois Human Rights Commission which we all supported in a vote of 137 to something, is going to be the agency that's going to make these decisions. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 746?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, there are two points I want to point out to you. Number one; we're giving away tremendous power over our own finances to Washington D.C. Number two is that millions of dollars can be held up in appropriations for cases, might take 3 or 4 years to settle if we pass this Bill and thousands of people perhaps on payrolls would not be



able to get the jobs and plans for the state would have to stop till the courts decide the case. I think this is ridiculous."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 'aye', 46 'nay', 33 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 765. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to put this Bill on the Spring Calendar. I know many of the people would like to go out to dinner tonight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to put the Bill on the Spring Calendar. Hearing no objections, the Spring Calendar."

Terzich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 1316. No, I don't. Senate Bill 1316, Mr. Marovitz. The Gentleman on the floor?"

Marovitz: "Right here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1316 sponsored by Senator Chew is an Act which prohibit the pumping of gasoline from a storage tank containing a level or more than one inch of water or sledge to be administered by the Department of Agriculture. This Bill has.. It's similar to one that.. that was passed in New York, has worked very well in New York and will make sure that the citizens of the State of Illinois in this energy crisis, in this gas crisis, will receive clean wholesome gasoline for the dollar plus that they pay for their gasoline. And I would ask for your affirmative Roll Call for this very important piece of legislation to all the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'd like to point out to the Membership that the fine Senator, Senator Chew, has joined us



in the House chamber for this fine Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he will."

Katz: "Is that the same Senator Chew who voted for someone else for the Sweetheart of the Legislature, Mr. Wonderful Sunday night?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not sweetheart, it's Mr. Wonderful. Just as bad though."

Katz: "I knew that the time would arise when we could get even, Senator. Voted for Mr. Cullerton I understand. And they're a lot of candidates..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Charlie's always with the winner."

Katz: "....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Charile's always with the winner. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this Bill. It's just further government regulation. It's going to be costly. And it does not provide finances for the inspectors who have to make the inspection; and I think it's just unneeded legislation. It ought to go down to a resounding defeat."

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

Bullock: "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, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, first of all, this legislation .. fiscal note was requested. Fiscal note was filed for \$19,000. That was filed by the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture wants this legislation, has gone on record as saying that the legislative action is needed, to cure the problem. They



don't need any new inspectors because all they have to do is act on a complaint basis only. No new inspectors are needed. It want to make sure that every citizen in the State of Illinois gets clean gas... we've heard examples from John Matijevich. We heard examples from Mrs. Macdonald, from Representative Campbell. We know that there's... this happens across the State of Illinois. You want people to get clean gas for the buck plus that they pay? Let's make sure that they get clean gas. There's nothing regulatory about this state. The Department of Agriculture will only act on a complaint basis. It's important legislation. It answers an NBC exposé of 3 days that Senator Chew and myself are trying to respond to and I would certainly ask that you think twice and vote green on this good legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1316 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "The Sponsor referred to clean gas and wholesome gas. I don't know what wholesome gas is and I kind of wanted him to explain that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One that ignites."

Friedrich: "I understand that Cook County and Chicago have home rule and they can already check the gas tanks up there to see if they've got water and slush. Down our way we don't need it and I just hope this will not be passed because of the harassment to small business."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I personally feel that this is such a bad Bill I'd better let Charlie say a word or two on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's out of order. The Gentleman from



McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a Bill that I take some exception with regarding the Department of Agriculture. I think that it is totally unmanageable and if you really want clean gas, probably ought to add more water to it. It might be cleaner with water. If you really want clean in this, I think what you're concerned about is sediment in it and if you take a check with a dip stick, you're not going to get much sediment. That's the real concern, sediment more than water."

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

Borchers: "... you folks to look right up at that half circle. Now that is about the size of a tank. Right there, with the blue. The part that's blue. One inch from the bottom of that tank... Now just stop and think what that means to a operator of a station. One inch, that much from the bottom of that tank and that is what's going to be causing men to get fined and in trouble and most of them don't even own the station. The big corporations like Shell and Standard Central, they own them yet the operators are responsible. Now just stop and think about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Everybody look up. Now is it a six thousand, eight thousand, or ten thousand gallon tank, Webber? About all the same. Alright. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bower: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would echo the comments of Representative Ropp and take exception to Representative Marovitz's statement. I sat on the House Transportation Committee that originally heard the Bill regarding, I don't know if it was this Bill or a similar Bill that Bill had. The Representative from the Department of Agriculture said, 'Don't blame us with all of the red



tape that is going to be created when you impose this law.' It was not a law that they wanted. It's one that they'll live with if they have to, but it's certainly not a law that they want. It's more regulation of small business and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Kindly give the Gentleman your attention. Please proceed Sir. Mr. Huskey? You're on. Pardon me? You want to try another microphone? You wore that one out?"

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been in this business and related businesses for nearly 40 years. At any given time you can go to a gas station and stick the dip stick in there and find an inch of water. So what is this going to happen? It's going to be the poor guy that gets up at six o'clock in the morning that pumps your gas all day, that makes.. that barely eeks a living out of this station will get fined \$1,000 for that natural condensation in that gas tank and there's no way he can prevent it. And I think it's a horrible Bill."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This law would be similar to the law in New York. It's less restrictive than the law in New York and while it may present some mild problems for the Department of Transportation, Agriculture I don't think it would cause problems that are insurmountable. It is similar to the New York law and it's certainly less restrictive and I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've shown such concern for the poor little gas station manager who might have watered



down his gas or might have put slush.. you know, let slush develop in the bottom of the tank. We don't show any concern for those of us who drive back and forth 200 miles to Springfield and are apt to have our cars ruined by this situation. That's what..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly give the Lady your attention."

Dyer: "... government is supposed to do. No matter how laissez-faire you may feel about government. Our job is to be a referee and to see that customers get fair treatment. It's a good Bill. I recommend a 'yes' vote,"

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

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senator Chew has had some very expert advice. He has a brother who's a taxidriver and a mechanic and votes in the Republican primary for me. So I know that he has some good expert advice. Plus the fact that he drives the finest cars and he understands from all points of view. And I feel that this is a consumer Bill, particularly during this shortage. We don't know what's in the gas that we're paying a dollar somewhat for and I think we ought to at least have some kind of idea, and give the state the authorization to try to find out for us. So I appreciate some green lights up there."

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

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill and I quite frankly am surprised that the Bill doesn't have over 100 votes. Representative ... or Senator Chew and Representative Marovitz have an excellent measure that's going to provide some security for the consumer in relation to alcohol... or to gasoline and I think this is an excellent measure and you know, we're not even asking for damage that is done



to your engines and your cars with the watered down gas. I'm quite frankly surprised that we don't have more votes from some of the Members in the General Assembly. This is one of the better consumer Bills that have come up."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak from my experience as a sewer inspector. You know, a lot of times, water isn't the only natural condensation that will accumulate in these tanks. A lot of times we find a lot of pollutants and fluids that are not only dangerous, but volatile when mixed with gasoline. I think that.. I think that this complaint procedure that's embroidered in this Bill makes this a very necessary provision and a safeguard for the consumers' safety."

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

Marovitz: "Well, I think I ought to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, this is done on a complaint basis only. Some guy just driving through and getting this poor guy that Representative Huskey says gets up at six o'clock in the morning and finds water in his gasoline, he's not going to fined \$1,000. If he's got too much water in his gasoline, then all we're asking to do is to clean out the tanks so that the water doesn't get in your cars. Representative Ropp said, maybe we ought to have more water in the cars. You heard Representative Matijevich and others explain what happens when you get water in your gas. Your car stops. And it costs you \$250 to get the carburetor fixed and cleaned out. So it's going to cost you substantial amount of money. If we really want to do something, this is done only on a complaint basis and that's why the Department of Agricul-



ture went on television, on NBC, and said publically there is a problem. We're getting more complaints than we've ever had before. We need legislative action to solve this problem. This is our legislative.."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think Representative Dyer hit it on the head when she was speaking about the people. What about the people that's traveling throughout our state? Don't we want more people to come into our state to spend money to help cut down on our personal taxes? I think once the people in this nation know that Illinois protects the consumer more, I think we'll have more travel in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'aye', 62 'nay', 5 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Please poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're going to poll the absentees. I know we're going to have a verification."

Marovitz: "Senator Chew deserves every opportunity."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll poll the absentees then we'll go to a verification I'm sure. Right, Mr. Conti? Right, Mr. Conti. Mr... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "We could save an awful lot of time if you'd just dump this Roll Call and have everybody pull their switches. There are at least 3 aisles here. I see they're all voting and they're empty. There isn't 141 people in this General Assembly tonight. Now all these Bills had their chance. They had a hearing and they got soundly defeated. Now all of sudden, they're passing 135 to 40, 141 to 16..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, let's just discuss 1316. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Birchler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Birchler 'aye'. Kosinski 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Brummer. Capuzi.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi. Davis. John Dunn. Epton. Flinn.

Kane. Kozubowski. Mahar. Margulas. McBroom. McCourt.

Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. Pierce. Reilly. Richmond.

Robbins. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney.

E.G. Steele. Walsh. and Watson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 87 'aye', 62 'no'...Wait a minute. Watson wants to be recorded as 'no'. Record Mr. Watson as 'no'. Mr. Katz, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Record you as 'aye'. Excuse me. I can only you know, go one at a time here. Mr. Katz wanted as 'aye'. Mr. Flinn wanted as 'aye'. Dawson as 'aye'. Mr. Jones? Wants to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the count? On this question there are 89 'aye', 89 'aye', and 63 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I wish the fellow would either put it on the Spring Calendar or send it to a Conference Committee because I don't even need a sheet for a verification of a Roll Call. Send it to a Conference Committee if he'll do it, I'll be happy to accept that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can't send it to a Conference Committee."

Conti: "Alright. Then send it to a... put it on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, you can only send it there if it passes."

Conti: "Then I'll have to beat it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Spring Calendar?"

Conti: "Spring Calendar?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz?"

Marovitz: "It's my belief despite the fact that I'm the House Sponsor, that the House Sponsor should always act responsibly for the Senate Sponsor. And so I look to the Senate Sponsor and I'll do whatever he wishes. He'd like to have a Conference Committee, but you can't."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz. Let's make a decision or else we're going to go through a verification."

Marovitz: "Again, I want to act responsibly for the Senate Sponsor. My recommendation to the Senate Sponsor would be to put this on the Spring Calendar, Senator Chew. That would be my recommendation to the Senate Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Spring Calendar."

Marovitz: "But I want to see some.. I want to see some indication from the Senate Sponsor. If you want me to go through a verification I will. Spring Calendar. Leave for the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave for the Spring Calendar? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 1357. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly." "Thank you, Sir."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also ask for leave to place Senate Bill 1357 on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to put 1357 on the Spring Calendar. Hearing no objections, Senate Bill 1357 is on the Spring Calendar. Senate Bill 1364. (sic). The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that only applies to Lake County and DuPage County. After it was considered the first time I took it back and had it amended in response to a suggestion by Representative Bluthardt with the language given by the staff on the other side. This is a Bill that would allow townships at the request upon receiving a written petition of the owners of a majority of the shore line of a lake to adopt a regula-



tion which they could enforce concerning motor boat traffic. This does go have.. have to go back to the Senate. I would appreciate your affirmative vote. I think the Bill is in a form now that is absolutely safe and makes sure that nothing is done that the majority of those people owning the shore line wouldn't want to have done. It's needed in Lake County. And I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 1364. This Bill is entirely unenforceable. The townships do not have police authority to do what the Gentleman wants it to do. We already have the county authority to do what he thinks ought to be done. Many of these lakes that he's referring to are on private property and I don't think that this Bill deserves any consideration since there's no way in the world, no way in the world that you can enforce it. By the time you call a township official to have him do something, the alledged violator is long gone. Who's going to determine without the Department of Conservation there whether a boat has been licensed by the state? There's all kinds of things wrong with this Bill. We already have a county authority to come out and do the job if there's problems."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, this Bill creates a hell of a situation with us. We have a 14 mile long lake in four townships and we're certainly going to have a bad time in relation to authority and having four different police groups, lake police if you want to put it, take care of it. Now right now the city of Decatur has control and continue



... will continue to have control with the lake patrol, lake police patrol. And that's the thing for us to do is to beat this Bill."

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

Collins: "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 Lake, Mr. Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "Well, first of all, in response to my good friend Webber Borchers, this Bill only applies to Lake County and DuPage County. It does not apply anywhere else at all. The.. The Bill is enforceable in response to the other comment. The problem we have is that if you live on a small lake and you have rules and regulation of your property owner association concerning the curfew or something else or prohibiting motor boats there's no way you can enforce that cause it's not a law. What would happen under this Bill is where a majority of the owners of the property along a lake petition the township, they could adopt an ordinance. And then, when you have somebody dragging a motor boat into your lake or violating your rules and regulations, you can call the County Sheriff which enforces the law in our unincorporated areas right now. They would come out and you'd have law to enforce. This Bill is needed to protect the people who live on lake and who are interested in using their lakes in a reasonable proper manner. I live on a lake. We have 80 lakes or so in Lake County. I think it's needed. I would appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1364?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."



Johnson: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's so many things bad about this Bill that a minute to explain my vote is complete inadequate. Among other things we changed the whole process of the law enforcement and turned it over to the township which is ridiculous. The county has the authority to enforce the law now. We have the authority to pass state statutes now. It clearly can result in the loss of control over private lakes by their owners in terms of later ownership of the property along a lake. We already have powers now vested in the ability to abate nuisances in zoning powers. It's such a bad Bill that a minute is inadequate and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Deuster asked me to speak on this Bill for him, so I'm going to try to answer Representative Yourell's question. How do we get the law enforced from authorities around to the lake to enforce this? Well, we have this new parochiad program and these buses are going to be travelling all over and the cops can just jump on board the buses on the way to the Catholic schools and stop off there and do this. But in all seriousness, this is a Bill that we need in Lake County. I think it'll have absolutely no effect any place else in the state. We are the most populous lake county in the state. Give Don a chance and give him a vote please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape. Timer's on."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We already have our whole navy tied up with the war with Wisconsin. Unlike Representative Yourell we can't enforce this law. I urge a 'no' vote."

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



who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 46 'aye', 62 'no', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 1404. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

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

Senate Bill 1404 simply allows municipalities under 10 thousand the option of chlorinating their water or not chlorinating their water as long as they fall within the jurisdiction and the mandates and the auspices of the requirements of the EPA. This got 85 votes last time around. There was poor Membership and I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "The little town of German Town, Mr. Speaker, is in my District. They hvae well water and when they put chlorine with it, it really creates a lot of problems. There's no questioning the purity of the water or being portable or safe to drink because tests are repeatedly taken. But they certainly need to get rid of this putting chlorine in their water."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, this is a highly controversial Bill as was established the first time it was debated. We are dealing with the health of the people of the State of Illinois. I consider it a bad Bill. There are people who are in favor of it. However, there are not 85 people in this chamber to vote for it this time and I would suggest that the Gentleman might put it over to the Spring Calendar and I hate to do it at this time of night, but I certainly would ask for a verification if it gets 89."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "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 Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to close."

Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that Mr. Collins hates to put this.. verify this, but I'm sure there are some that don't. I would just ask for favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I point out to the Membership, kindly vote your own switch only? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1404 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Lee, record me as 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'aye', 35 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority... The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're just going to have to verify.

I'm not going to go through the Roll Calls again.

Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "I mistakenly voted 'no' and I should have voted 'aye'. Will you change me, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Dunn as 'aye' please.

Kindly change Mr. Dawson from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Margulas.

Change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Leon as 'no'.

Alright. Please poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes. Capparelli.

Catania. Chapman. Conti. Currie. Daniels. Davis.

DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing.

Farley. Flinn..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr.



Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave right now. We won't waste any more time. There's been honest Roll Calls all night long and a lot of good things happened in the last hour and a half. I would ask leave to put this on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Spring Calendar? The Gentleman asks leave. No objections. The Bill's on the Spring Calendar. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino. One moment, Mr. Conti. Mr. Laurino please."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd ask leave to waive the ... suspend the appropriate rule for posting to have an Election Committee meeting tomorrow at one o'clock in the Speaker's Office."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Use the Attendance Roll Call...the attendance Roll Call will be used. The Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti. We're not through yet, please. So don't get restless. We have to go the area of motions yet so please.."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman, I rise for the purposes of an introduction. Tonight we have with us, we're honored to have with us, Lenora Bateman and Ruth.. I mean Lenora Davenport and Ruth Bateman Members of the DuPage County Board up on the right there, standing on the right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome Ladies. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. She moves to suspend the rule 35-G on House Bill 870. Oh, is it Senate Bill 870? 870. And to put it on the Spring Calendar. The Bill is presently on Third Reading. Hearing no objection, the Lady's motion prevails and Senate Bill 870 is on the Spring Calendar. Also by Mrs. Braun, a Bill 1337 which is located on the Calendar on Second Reading. The Lady moves to suspend rule 35-G to place the Bill on the Spring Calendar. That's Senate Bill 1337. Hearing



no objection, the Bill is on the Spring Calendar. Now Senate Bill 942, Mr. Vinson has Senate Bill 942. He also moves to suspend 35-G. Asks leave to put Senate Bill 942 on the Spring Calendar. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on the Spring Calendar. And we'll use the attendance Roll Call on all 3 motions. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. Moves to place Senate Bill 760 on the Spring Calendar. Hearing no objection, Senate Bill 760 is on the Spring Calendar. Use the attendance Roll Call. We have just a few more matters to take care of. (On the area of motions, page 11, of the Calendar. Is Representative John Dunn on the floor? The Gentleman... Mr. Kornowicz moves to place Senate Bill 967, and Senate Bill 1338 on the Spring Calendar. Hearing no objections, both of those Bills are on the Spring Calendar using the attendance Roll Call. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have leave to take from the Table 1069 and place it on the Spring Calendar. Senate Bill 1069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We can do that anytime Bob. We don't have to do it tonight. That Bill's on the Table. On the area of motions, Senate Bill 222, Mr. John Dunn.

John Dunn? Mr. Woodyard had a motion. Mr. Woodyard. Alright. Both of them are not here. Wait a minute.

Mr. Woodyard? The Gentleman from Edgar, Mr. Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Mr. Speaker, that's not my motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, it's your Bill."

Woodyard: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "But John Dunn's got the motion. He's not on the floor. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 455. That's fine. 455. Is Hoxsey on the floor? It's her Bill. Mr. Keane? Take it out. Moving right along. Senate Bill 1239. Mr. Cullerton? And Mr. Giorgi. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion on the Calendar to .. having voted on the prevailing side on Senate Bill 1239, I move to reconsider the vote by which it passed. I have the agreement of the Sponsor who's in the area and his intention is to put it on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Bill has passed. As you know, when a motion is filed, the Clerk holds the Bill until the motion is considered. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Clerk.. of the Chair. Maybe the Clerk can answer it. When was the Bill passed and when was the motion filed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill passed 89 to 74 and was verified on June the 20th."

Totten: "When was the motion filed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The motion was filed June 20th."

Totten: "June 21st."

Speaker Lechowicz : "Pardon me?"

Totten: "June 21st? The Digest shows."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can only go by the notations on the Calendar. Mr. Giorgi. I'm sorry. Mr. Marion... Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Winchester has for about a week had a motion on file up there and everytime we get to it, it gets by-passed. Now we get on the business of putting things on the Spring Calendar and we get consideration for everybody including Senator Chew who failed to get his votes passed and we even then let it be put on the Spring Calendar. I'd like your consideration of calling this and letting him put it on the Spring Calendar. Certainly it's no different than the others."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's on the Table, Sir. There's on deadline. I'll be more than happy to get to it. We're just trying to clear up some stuff. Mr. Giorgi, what do you want? Mr. Daniels."



Daniels: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "Mr. Giorgi, what we have is Senate Bill 1239 that's passed and you want to reconsider that and then the intention of the Sponsor... to move it to the Spring Calendar?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that if you review the Bill carefully you'd be extremely supportive of this excellent motion. This is a Bill that was hotly contested that passed the House by only 89 votes with a price tag of a considerable amount of money and one that would give a deduction to renters for their rental that they pay on their property. We felt that the Bill was improper because it didn't have a cap where a previous Bill that had been passed had a cap of \$750. I think it's an excellent motion. I would be totally supportive of it and I congratulate the Gentleman for bringing it to our attention."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1239 passed?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye', 3 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. The House does reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1239 passed. Now it's back on Third Reading. Mr. Giorgi moves to put the Bill on the Spring Calendar. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? The Bill is on the Spring Calendar. 1239. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. David Jones."

Jones: "On Senate Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman to put Senate Bill 140 on the Spring Calendar. Hearing any... Are there any



objections? Hearing none, use the attendance Roll Call. Put Senate Bill 140 on the Spring Calendar. The ..Mr. Birchler on the floor? Birchler? Okay. Mr. McGrew. Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Joint Resolution 32 was adopted. The Gentleman is not on the floor. Take it out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suspend the appropriate rule and put 1340 on the Spring Calendar and take it from the Speaker's Table if possible."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's out of order at the present time so you'd better score it away with the Clerk. They've got a new couple of procedural matters. Any.. Any other announcements? Any other announcements? Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn till ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Ten o'clock. Except for some time that the Clerk needs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Clerk 15 minutes for perfunct."

Giorgi: "Fifteen minutes perfunct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "At which time the House will stand adjourned till ten a.m. tomorrow morning. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? The House stands.. after 15 minutes perfunct the House stands adjourned till 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Good night."

Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate; A message from the Senate; by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills the following title to wit: House Bills #
2642, 15, 129, 413, 525, 551, 611, 753, 956, 1083, 1363,
1564, 1763, 1768, 1774, 1777, 1901, 1966, 1986, 2298,
2332, 2376, 2540, 2548, 2740, 2779, 382, 1171, 1172,
1168, 1174, 1177, 1205, 1288, 1351, 1538, 1614, 1630,
1634, 1635, 1636, 1170, 1637, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1643,



1644, 1645, 1647, 2201, 2098, 1648, 1649, 1655, 1656, 1902, 1646, 1804, 1531, 1653, 1657, 1682, 1652, 2649, 834, 2547, 2564, 2567, 2618, 2192, 2658, 2678, 2686, 2730, 2750, 1916, 2004, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2486, 2574, 2575, 2577, 2578, 2579, 1641, 1642, 2766, 2767, 172, 222, 226, 4, 21, 229, 265, 292, 320, 339, 387, 512, 444, 453, together with Amendments and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed by the Senate as amended June 27, 1979

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, the following title to wit; House Bill #430, passed by the Senate June 27, 1979 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, the following titles to wit: House Bill #513, passed by the Senate June 27, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, the following title to wit; House Bill #593, 523, 570, 591, 593, 672, 684, 700, 706, 716, 733, 774, 793, 822, and 796, Together with the attached Amendments and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed by the Senate as amended June 27, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, the following title to wit; House Bills #324, 458, 532, 742, 832, 866, 941,



963, 1537, 1543, 1551, 1604, 1677, 1743, 1757, 1913,
1915, 1965, 1978, 1979, 1991, 2053, 2065, 2091,
2323, 2324, 2327, 2385, 2390, 2392, 2422, 2472, 2643,
2746, 2780, 1132, 1175, 1176, 1191, 1580, 1776, 2202,
2282, 2566, 2573, 2576, 2590, 2613, 2644, 2659, 2718,
2719, 2736, and 2737 passed by the Senate June 27, 1979.
Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business. The
House now stands adjourned."



DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 27, 1979

HB-0079	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	11
HB-0666	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
HB-0676	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
HB-0828	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
HB-0905	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
HB-1104	3RD READING	PAGE	207
HB-1123	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
HB-1325	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	39
HB-1470	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	12
HB-1478	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
HB-1526	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
HB-1560	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	38
HB-1623	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
HB-1686	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	34
HB-1693	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	40
HB-1769	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	41
HB-1771	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	41
HB-1782	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
HB-1790	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
HB-1802	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
HB-1804	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
HB-1805	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	52
HB-1812	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-1840	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
HB-1841	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
HB-1873	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
HB-1888	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
HB-1921	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	57
HB-1922	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
HB-1939	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	61
HB-1968	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
HB-2041	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	12
HB-2129	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
HB-2132	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-2161	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62
HB-2184	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
HB-2204	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
HB-2206	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-2228	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
HB-2233	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	64
HB-2237	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	67
HB-2240	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
HB-2268	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 27, 1979

PAGE 2

HB-2291	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	67
HB-2308	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	75
HB-2309	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
HB-2310	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-2357	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
HB-2358	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
HB-2373	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	77
HB-2414	MOTIONS	PAGE	30
HB-2485	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
SB-0093	3RD READING	PAGE	89
SB-0101	3RD READING	PAGE	243
	MOTIONS	PAGE	256
SB-0111	3RD READING	PAGE	259
SB-0140	2ND READING	PAGE	199
	MOTIONS	PAGE	291
SB-0157	2ND READING	PAGE	148
SB-0168	3RD READING	PAGE	256
SB-0188	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	32
SB-0209	3RD READING	PAGE	258
SB-0244	2ND READING	PAGE	96
	2ND READING	PAGE	147
	3RD READING	PAGE	215
SB-0278	3RD READING	PAGE	223
SB-0296	3RD READING	PAGE	265
SB-0389	3RD READING	PAGE	98
SB-0450	3RD READING	PAGE	268
SB-0495	3RD READING	PAGE	269
SB-0505	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	3
SB-0565	3RD READING	PAGE	203
	3RD READING	PAGE	207
SB-0578	2ND READING	PAGE	186
SB-0617	3RD READING	PAGE	204
SB-0622	3RD READING	PAGE	269
SB-0667	3RD READING	PAGE	227
SB-0746	3RD READING	PAGE	270
SB-0760	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-0765	MOTIONS	PAGE	273
SB-0768	3RD READING	PAGE	204
SB-0854	3RD READING	PAGE	98
SB-0870	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-0873	3RD READING	PAGE	107
SB-0939	3RD READING	PAGE	100
SB-0942	MOTIONS	PAGE	289

SB-0950	3RD READING	PAGE	120
SB-0955	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	32
SB-0967	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-0971	3RD READING	PAGE	121
	3RD READING	PAGE	237
	MOTIONS	PAGE	235
SB-1038	3RD READING	PAGE	80
SB-1069	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-1072	3RD READING	PAGE	87
	3RD READING	PAGE	237
	MOTIONS	PAGE	205
SB-1239	MOTIONS	PAGE	290
SB-1316	3RD READING	PAGE	273
	MOTIONS	PAGE	281
SB-1331	3RD READING	PAGE	129
SB-1337	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-1338	MOTIONS	PAGE	289
SB-1342	3RD READING	PAGE	6
SB-1357	MOTIONS	PAGE	282
SB-1364	3RD READING	PAGE	282
SB-1404	3RD READING	PAGE	286
	MOTIONS	PAGE	288
HR-0408	3RD READING	PAGE	2
HR-0409	3RD READING	PAGE	2
HR-0410	3RD READING	PAGE	2
HR-0411	3RD READING	PAGE	2
HR-0412	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HR-0413	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-0414	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-0415	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-0416	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HJR-0062	3RD READING	PAGE	2
*HJR-0013	2ND READING	PAGE	238
*HJR-0032	2ND READING	PAGE	242
*HJR-0042	2ND READING	PAGE	241
SJR-0039	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SJR-0059	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SJR-0063	3RD READING	PAGE	2

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 27, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	1
EXCUSED ABSENSES	PAGE	4
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	31
EXCUSED ABSENSES	PAGE	31
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	292
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	292
HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED	PAGE	294