

TRANSCRIPT -- 77TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NOVEMBER 1971 SESSION

NOVEMBER 3, 1971

PASTOR: Reverend Dennis R. Grohn, Concordia Seminary, here in Springfield.

PRESIDENT:

Reading of the journal moved by Senator Newhouse. The reading of the journal be dispensed with. All in favor by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Swinarski, Chairman of Elections reports out Senate Bills 1294 and 1295 with the recommendation do not pass. House Bill 13 with recommendation do not pass. House Bill 331 recommendation do pass. Senator Romano, Chairman of Labor and Commerce, reports out Senate Bill 1090 with a recommendation do pass. Senator Smith, Chairman of Welfare Committee, reports out Senate Bill 1130 with recommendation do pass. House Bills 567 and 2520 with the recommendation do pass. House Bill 598 with recommendation do pass as amended. Senator Course, Chairman of Revenue Committee, reports out House Bill 806 with recommendation do pass, and House Bill 1555 with the recommendation do pass as amended.

PRESIDENT:

We have a motion...

SECRETARY:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 13 I move to take House Bill 13 from the table and place on the order of second reading. Senator Terrel E. Clarke.

PRESIDENT:

Is Senator....Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, this is a motion relating to a bill that was reported out I believe, was just read by the Elections, by the Election Committee. I don't know if you want to take it up at this time or a little later, but

this is just another example of...might we insist we just abolish all the committees and put all the bills out here and discuss them, because I suggested to my people that when they feel they are unfairly treated they ought to file a motion and then we'll discuss it a second time. Our bills that get killed, if don't like them, your bills get passed out whether we like them or not, and I think we'll just take time on the floor of the Senate to discuss all the bills one way or the other. Your pleasure, as to when you want to take up this motion?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well its your motion Senator and I would be suggestive that you take up your motion at a time that you desire to take it up. While I'm on my feet and talking about the time its now 11 o'clock and I am disturbed that your caucuses run past the hour of starting here. We have the hour of 10 o'clock of starting, and I've noticed that those persons who are most anxious to get home are those persons that are late in getting to the floor of the Assembly. And I would ask you to see if it is necessary even to start them earlier, so that we could start on time here because this delays us a great deal.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Cherry.

SENATOR CHERRY:

Addressing myself to Senator Clarke's motion. When was that bill heard before Committee, yesterday? I would suggest Senator, the Chairman of the Elections Committee is not present.. hold it at least until he gets back. You filed your written motion, is that correct?

PRESIDENT:

We have consent of the body for the Senator to take it up

at a later time either today or some other day. Senator Walker, is Senator Walker on the floor...you yesterday wanted to take up a bill on consideration postponed, and I told you could do it at time of motions today. What is the number of the bill Senator Walker?

SENATOR WALKER:

11...ah...thank you Mr...President. House bill 1149.

PRESIDENT:

House bill 1149 on postponed consideration.

SENATOR WALKER:

Mr. President, members of the Senate ah..House Bill 1149, ah...requires units of local government except counties...it does include school districts...causes them to register their appointed or elected officials with the state department of Local Government Affairs and the Superintendent of Public Instruction respectively. Bob Lehnhausen, Director of State Department of Local Government Affairs, supporting the bill as is Superintendent of Schools, Bakalis, and the purpose of the bill, as I stated when I originally called it, is to provide a central source of the names of local government officials...ah...when I called the bill the other day a question was propounded as to whether the Secretary of State's office, at the present time didn't, ah, do this; and its done insofar as county officials only is concerned. I've checked with a former Township Clerk who was the secretary of Cook County township officials, and there isn't any source of information as to names and addresses of the townships officials who have been elected. I was further informed that it is very time consuming. If you wish to ascertain who holds these respective positions in the township to make the phone calls...At one time...the...thank you...The township officials sometime print a list but due to death and resignations, these are often out dated. So I say the bill has been

Schlickman bill out of the House, and in conclusion I can only say at the present time there is no centralized, accurate source for this information. It'll...there are about 6450 officials in this state whose names would be compiled in this list. It would give anyone so desiring a list of these officials. I can't see anything wrong with the bill. I can't see where it's going to entail any additional help or too much additional work. It merely provides that within 30 days, as I recall it, that these names be furnished, too, within 30 days after the election or appointment that these lists be made public and a centralized list be printed thereof. I think it's a good bill and I'd appreciate your support.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

I just don't think this is a good bill, and let me tell you why...We have too much printing now. We have more things printed that we don't have the time to read nor does anybody have the time to read, and I'll tell you when I get home every week I have a shopping bag full of mail which does not relate to anything in which most people are interested. There are many of our institutions that feel an unmet need to print a House organ which has absolutely no meaning to the general populus. And all of these things cost money to do, and I see absolutely no need to have a list of these people. If there's anybody that wants to know who is on the Board in a particular place, it is a simple matter to writing a letter or picking up the phone, and calling the person in charge of that area, and ascertaining and determining the name of the person. It's like getting Christmas cards from people that you don't even know. It's a nice gesture, it's a wonderful kind of thing, but I think we've reached the point where we have proliferated these kinds of printing assignments to a point where we are emanated with nonentities and nonentities

and nonsensical kinds of things. I see no reason for this. I don't know of any demand for any such list such as this to be printed. It's only another expense, and you keep adding those expenses; and I was always taught that pennies makes dollars and we're dollars short now, and I'm going to vote against it.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Walker may close the debate.

SENATOR WALKER:

I'm somewhat surprised at the opposition on the other side of the aisle. They say ah.....

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Let's, please, gentlemen. Right around Senator Walker there's all kinds of noise.

SENATOR WALKER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm somewhat surprised at the opposition on the other side of the aisle, because as I previously stated ah...Mike Bakalis thinks its a good bill...that takes care of that side of the aisle. Bob Lehnhausen, former mayor of Peoria, now the Director of Local Government Affairs, thinks it's a good bill. That ought to take care of this side of the aisle. I would appreciate the last favorable roll call, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas,

Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Carpentier aye. Sours, aye. Merritt, aye. Carroll, aye. Davidson, aye. On that question the yeas are 16, the nays are 12. The bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is declared defeated. Are there further resolutions?

Senator Horsley?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. This is a very simple resolution. It merely provides for the electorate at the next general election to vote on the constitutional amendment to do away with annual sessions. Now I have the figures and I'll present them later on to show how much these annual sessions are costing the taxpayers of the State of Illinois.

PRESIDENT:

It's a resolution being introduced by Senator Horsley. It has not been introduced previously. It is being introduced right now and has no number as of right now.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I have conferred with the members of the Rules Committee and they have no objection of having this introduced, having it give a resolution number, bypass the Rules Committee, and waive the rules and have it heard in Executive Committee this afternoon; and I would so move, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Is there...the motion is for the suspension of the rules and reference of the resolution to the Executive Committee rather than the Rules Committee. I think the Chair would rule we don't need suspend the rules. That that would be the procedure on a resolution.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

All right then I will move...

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Knuppel arise?

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Mr. Horsley is one of the severest critics of this body taking any action without adequate knowledge, and I don't even know what his resolution is before I can vote on it. I don't have a copy of it on my desk, and I don't know what he's talking about.

PRESIDENT:

Well, he is not asking for a vote on the resolution. What he has requested is that it be heard this afternoon in Executive Committee. I think that is the...there be waive of notice on that. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

I think technically, though, we should suspend the rules to accomplish this because it comes at a time after the final date for the filing of resolutions. I don't think there is any objection to it, but I think it a matter of technicality, and we should do it that way.

PRESIDENT:

Thank you. Senator Partee is correct. We have been conferring here. The problem is that there is a date limitation on the introduction of constitutional amendments, so that we do have to suspend the rules for the introduction of the resolution. Motion is for the suspension of the rules for the introduction of the resolution. Is there objection to the suspension of the rules? Is there objection? There is no objection to the suspension of the rules. Senator Horsley now requests that it be heard this afternoon in Executive Committee. Is there objection to that? There is no objection. Senator McCarthy.

SENATOR McCARTHY:

Along a similar line, I would like to have leave to have

Senate Resolution 252 heard in Executive this afternoon. Senator Cherry has agreed to that.

PRESIDENT:

There is no objection...it will be heard. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 11 number 1311.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. What purpose does Senator Newhouse arise?

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I'm sorry Mr. President, I was distracted and I was prepared to vote for Senator Horsley's resolution, and I am wondering why I can't do so now.

PRESIDENT:

Well, it's being held in Executive Committee this afternoon. It's being heard in Executive.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Is there any way it can bypass Committee and get it on the floor?

PRESIDENT:

I think this is a constitutional amendment. I think it ought to go.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

There seems to be some objection, so I'll....

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill number 1311, introduced by Senator Sours. A bill for an act making supplemental appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Senate Bill number 1312 introduced by Senator....

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I am wondering if we couldn't have that placed in the

Appropriation Committee immediately, so we can have it heard at its next possible meeting?

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection to that? Chairman of the Appropriations indicates he has no objections.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill number 1312, introduced by Senators Saperstein, Partee, Cherry. A bill for an act to add Article 14C to the School Code. Senate Bill number 1313, introduced by Senators Saperstein, Partee and Cherry. A bill for an act to add Article 14D to the School Code. Senate Bill number 1314, same sponsors. A bill for an act to amend section 18-8 of the School Code. First reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

We have...if I may have the attention of the body...We have a lengthy message from the Governor. Is there objection to journalizing that rather than reading it? It will be journalized. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. Selcke, Clerk. Mr. President, I'm directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following preamble and joint resolution in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Senate to-wit. House Joint Resolution 103, pertaining to Chicago Cook County Hospital.

PRESIDENT:

The resolution in connection with the Cook County Hospital.. Its a resolution from the House in connection with the Cook County Hospital...should we...we don't have to...We'll refer it to Executive Committee if we can get a sponsor otherwise it will remain on the Secretary's desk. Executive Committee.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House, Mr. Selcke, Clerk. Mr. President, I'm directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed bills of the following titles and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Senate to wit: House Bills 206, 701, 1611, 1851, 2079, 2351, 2422, 2396, 2703, 2780 through 2786, 2788 through 2790, 2802, 2803, 2806, through 2817, 2882, 3063, 3064, 3572, 3597, 3596, 3639, 3642, 3643, 3647, 3654, 3680, 3681, 3734, and 3736.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President, Senators, I should like to refer to House Bill 3597 just reported. It's similar to a certain license plate bill we've had here for ceremonial vehicles. Senator Partee and Senator Chew, I understand, are in agreement to advance it without reference, and we will amend it on second reading. Can I make the proper motion?

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? Is there objection? Leave is granted. Senator Palmer. 3597 Senator. Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. I make reference to House Bill 206 which is a companion bill to House Bill 205 which was deliberated by this body and passed. 205 refers to the Election Code, and 206 refers to the Alcohol Code, both on the same subject matter, and I make the proper motion to have to waive the rules and have it at second reading.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection. Leave is granted. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

President, members of the Senate. I would move that House Bill 3574 be discharged from the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill is in the amount of 445 dollars. Its World War II bonus bill.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? Leave is granted.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Soper.

SENATOR SOPER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, House Bill 1611 just come over. It is a bill that deals with the..deals with the names put on the primary ballot...It's been okayed on both sides of the aisle. I move it to second without reference to Committee.

PRESIDENT:

Is there, is there objection. Leave is granted. Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

House Joint Resolution number 94 is presently pending before the Executive Committee. I do not believe there is any opposition to this resolution. It urges the Board of Higher Education to look in to the possibility of establishing graduate centers in Peoria, Rockford and Chicago, in addition to the quad cities center that is in operation. I talked with Senator Cherry, and I believe there is agreement on both sides of the aisle. I would move to discharge the Executive Committee from consideration of this resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? Leave is granted. You want to adopt the resolution now or...all right. Senate bills on second reading. 674 Senator Kauepfer. 675. 675.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill number 675. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1296..1296.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill number 1296. Second reading of the bill. One committee amendment from Executive.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty moves the adoption of the Committee amendment. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Amendment number 1 was adopted. This is amendment number 2.

PRESIDENT:

Well no amendment has been adopted yet.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

All right. Move the adoption of amendment number 1.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty moves the adoption of the Committee amendment. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Now we have amendment number 2.

PRESIDENT:

Can you explain the amendment briefly?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

It just provides that the amendatory...this amendatory Act of 1971 shall take effect upon its becoming law. I've discussed it with Senator Graham, the co-sponsor, and he's in agreement.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary advises that he does not have...We have it now. Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Now on third reading.

PRESIDENT:

Third reading. 1302, Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Now, I was going to move this bill to third reading, but we do have some other bills on the subject and I had hoped that 674 and 5 would remain on second reading, so that perhaps tomorrow or Monday any amendments that might be desirable to offer to any of these bills could be done...we could do that. But I assume Senator Knuepfer would not object to returning it to second. I'm going to leave 1302 on second and I assume that 3700 will also be left on second, so that we can have all of them on second simultaneously so that all amendments to all bills could be considered at one sitting.

PRESIDENT:

Third...Just a moment, please. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

That's what I was going to suggest you to do. It's absolutely impossible in here about two-thirds of the time to hear what's going on. I think it is a great disservice to the speakers to put them in a place of a shouting match, trying to explain their position on a bill; and I think that we ought to ask you to continually use that gavel a little more than you have...perhaps on some Senators' heads if they don't want to behave.

PRESIDENT:

I'll try to be bi-partisan in that approach, Senator Graham. 1309; Senator Davidson. 1309.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No Committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1310. Senator Horsley? 1310.

Senator Dougherty?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

With the sponsor's permission, I would like to call back House Bill 485...Oh no...Senate Bill. I'm sorry. Sorry.

PRESIDENT:

We...we'll get to that when we....

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

That's all right.

PRESIDENT:

82. Is Senator Harris on the floor? 130, Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the body, I respectfully urge your consideration of Senate Bill 130. This is an effort on the part of myself and a good many others who are interested in fairness to provide the tools whereby, in those cases where a taxing district overlaps into more than one area there will be equalized or fair treatment...fair treatment of the taxpayers in all areas of that taxing district. Essentially what it does is bring the assessment level...Boy, to compete with a teenage queen would be absolutely impossible.

PRESIDENT:

Essentially Senate Bill 130 is merely a tool to provide the mechanics whereby a degree of fairness can be achieved in the support of a taxing district and particularly the schools. It's restricted to schools. This has been considered at various times; we've never been able to come up with a solution that's seemed to be somewhat practical. The present bill may not be an ideal solution; however, it does have the saving grace of not being discriminatory; and for that reason I would urge your serious consideration and hopefully your aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Senator Berning, as I understand your amendment, this provision applies only to school districts.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

That is correct.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

And no other taxing districts are included within it except school districts.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

That is correct.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty? Is there further discussion? Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President and members in the Senate, Senator Berning is addressing himself in this legislation to a problem which does in fact exist; and I don't know the answer to it either, but I feel compelled to point out that what the possible effect of this bill would be, if enacted. It in effect establishes classification of property for taxation in counties under 200,000 and that's an authority not granted by the Constitution of 1970. Now if this bill had said that the county of over 200,000 would reassess its property to meet the same standards as the county of less than 200,000. I don't think you'd have a constitutional question, because I think they'd have that power to do it. The fact is that this has got to be, I think, in

violation of the Constitution, and the second point I'd simply make is that if a new classification is established in a county of less than 200,000, and if, for example, this county lies next to the county of Cook, there will be a shifting in the tax burden within that portion of the school district which is in the county of less than 200,000; and consequently some will pay less, and some will pay a heck of a lot more. For that reason, I object to this bill even though it addresses itself to a real problem.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, Senator Berning has labored long in this area. He's dealing with a subject matter that is very dear to the people's hearts on the county of Lake. There's not so much interest in my county right across the line. In my new proposed senatorial district, my village of Barrington is in both counties. I happen to live in Cook. If this bill passes, I'm asking that taxes in that town be increased for the purposes of maintaining our school. I think that Senator Laughlin has a good point. I do, however, think that perhaps the Lake County people, too, have forgotten years ago before the Hodge-Downing Act or the Butler Bills became part of the law, that the actual participation in taxes, dollar wise, was the exact opposite of what it is now. I feel there, too, that there is a constitutional question here, and I feel that Senator Berning is aware of this. But I think in deference to Karl Berning who has addressed himself squarely and sincerely to this problem, I think it would be no more than fair that we pass this bill out of this body, hopefully out of the General Assembly, and let the proper authorities in the State of Illinois rule as to its constitutionality. And I intend to support

Senate Bill 130, even though if it becomes law I can expect an increase in my real estate tax on the Cook County side of Barrington.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Bruce?

SENATOR BRUCE:

Senator Berning, would you yield to a question? It's been amended and I do not have the amendment in my book. Could you briefly describe what the amendment did? Evidently it limited it to school districts, but what else did it do?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

It, in addition to restricting it to school districts, provides for the mechanics of the two counties involved to determine the level of assessment which will be utilized, which is, then, a common level. And in that regard I feel impelled to take issue somewhat with the allegation that this is classification of real estate. I think that is a...a...an interpretation, and not necessarily a proper one. There is not classification of real estate going to occur. All that this does is provide for the...the counties wherein this situation may arise to establish a uniform level of assessment at the lowest existing level. Now, I can't see that that is classification, and I'd rather suspect that it is not a constitutional problem. The sole objective is to achieve only, in any school taxing district, the level of assessment for all people of the lowest level; thereby, treating all of the residents equally.

PRESIDENT:

Senator...Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

You say the bill now only applies to two counties. Is

that part of the amendment also?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning. Just a moment, let's...please...please.

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

No, I did not mean to imply that it applies to only two counties, but where two counties are involved with the same taxing districts, it would apply uniformly throughout. Apparently, from the studies of the Legislative Reference Bureau, and I refer back to their file number 7411 of November '69. One hundred one of the one hundred two counties have school districts extending into at least two counties. So this does have application elsewhere, but I know of no place in the state where it is quite as critical as it is and has been for a long time in the Barrington area, and I repeat that this does affect Cook, Lake, McHenry, and Kane Counties. And as an example, there has been development of territory on both sides of the Lake-Cook line where identical homes have been built, sold, and occupied, costing exactly the same purchase figure. People on the one side of the line will have a tax bill supporting that school district somewhere in the area of 3 to 5 hundred dollars less than those supporting the same district on the other side of the line, and I submit that this is, if anything, unconstitutional... certainly unfair, and this bill is designed, hopefully, to correct this by bringing the assessment level...for schools only... on the real estate down to the level of the lowest assessment figure.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Well, Mr. President and members of the body, I oppose this

for a couple of reasons. First of all, I don't know what affect this is going to have on school districts throughout the state. When we say to every school district that if any county which comprises the district has a lower assessment than any other county in the district, all counties have to go at that lower assessment. That will mean, I believe, a substantial loss in revenue to most school districts, and we're going to find ourselves next year with a problem of funding those more at the state level. Secondly, when you limit this bill only to school districts, when you add in the fact in Illinois we have the multiplier, I believe that when there's an underassessment in a county, and we have a problem there, and they do not assess properly, the people who do assess properly, because when they put on a multiplier are affected more severely, it's only going to make the problem much more difficult when we separate out school districts. The solution to the problem is get an adequate system of assessments...a statewide, perhaps, program..and this bill, although it would solve a problem in the northern part of the state, I believe, given my own district, for instance in the county in which I reside are parts of 4 school districts. Some of those school districts, I am sure, have counties that assess lower than mine, but we have the major portion of the students within my county. We would not be able to assess at the higher rate. For that reason, I'll have to oppose it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

No, I'm done.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert? Senator Berning may close the debate.

SENATOR BERNING:

O...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

I have a question for Senator Berning, if he'll yield.

PRESIDENT:

He indicates he will.

SENATOR LYONS:

The amendment that I have says that the bill was to be amended by striking on page 3...striking line 8 and all that follows thereafter, and inserting certain other language. The.. I had thought, when the bill was in Committee, that what the amendment did was restrict the operation of the bill to school districts, and say that if for purposes of the school levy only where one county classifies and the other county does not..for purposes of that levy alone..the clerk was suppose to use the lower of the two assessment levels. Now that's what the bill said originally...from line 8 downward on page 3 of the bill. Now I notice that that language is stricken and there is inserted in lieu of it some language to the effect that the assessment levels shall be uniform as between the two districts, and that is a horse of a vastly different hue from the original bill, and I'm wondering if I'm wrong. I hope I am.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

You obviously have the amendment, and this was the amendment that we agreed to after original objections and, I thought, helped to answer the questions and the problems. Yes, it does establish a uniform level of assessment, and the only way that that can be done is to achieve the lower level of assessment, and it is accomplished as follows: If one or more such counties classifies property, the uniform level of assessments provided

in this Section shall be uniform for such classes throughout such school district. Assessors shall use sales ratio studies and all other necessary information as provided by the Department or their offices in making their determination. The assessors shall report their finding to the County Clerk of their respective counties and to the Department of Local Government Affairs, within 20 days of so convening and the County Clerk shall compute the tax rate for such school districts only on such assessments. I suppose there is no such thing as a perfect piece of legislation. In fact, I would even go so far, Mr. President, as to say, I know of no such thing as a perfect specimen, even including our teenage queen, and certainly none of us here on the floor is perfect. If we are, then, bound to struggle with imperfections, I would hope that my colleagues would allow the voters and the citizens and the taxpayers of the Barrington School District to attempt to achieve some degree of fairness, and I believe that this bill will do that.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Uh, I'd like to say this. The thrust of the original bill was evidently satisfactory to us. We thought that that was as plausible a solution to a problem that everybody knows exists and everybody is looking around for a solution for, although I thought it came as close as close as anybody was likely to come to a resolution of the difficulty by using the lower of the two assessment levels. Now, all this says, and, and, and, if you want to go back to that, I'll support the bill. But I'm not going to support it now when it says uniform, because that is not what, uh, I thought the purport of the amendment was. If the amendment had just said, uh, if, if, it had done no more than confine the operation of the bill to school districts, we

would have no objection; but it did something else. It took out the provision that the lower of the two assessment levels should be used, and interpolated this language about uniform assessment level with no guidelines as to who was to do this classifying, and, uh, vesting vast, way much more power than is appropriate in the hands of the County Clerk when he runs this levy. If Senator Berning is willing to call the bill back, and restore into it the language having to do with the lower of the two assessments levels, I don't think we'd have any problem. At the moment, the bill, I, we, I, I can't support the bill. And, I vote it, vote it out, vote the bill out do pass on the understanding with the thought that the bill did what it originally started to do, and the amendment only confined its operation for school district.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR McBROOM:

Mr. President, and members of the Senate. I move the previous question.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the previous question. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. By a vote of one to nothing the previous question prevails. Uh, Senator Berning may close the debate.

SENATOR BERNING:

Uh, Yes, Mr. President and the body. Thank you for your indulgence. To me this is a critical measure only because it affects my area particularly and, uh, knowing that it affects other areas. The amendment was offered in good conscience, I offered supportive documents, and I call the Senator's attention to one from Mr. Cushman, Attorney Robert Cushman, labeled Senate Bill 130. This was all in support of the amendment, and I thought

accomplished what most of us felt had to be in there. I'll abide by the decision of the body. Let it go up or down. We have lived with inequity in Lake County for some time and I suppose we'll have to do it again. Roll call, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I, too, like Senator Lyons, I was chairman of the Local Government Committee, and we let this bill out of committee for the purpose for providing the necessary amendment. I was under the supposition the same as was Senator Lyons that the lower rate of assessment would prevail. And then when Senator Berning told me that it applied only to school districts, I had grave doubts as to its constitutionality because it was class legislation. My first synopsis of the bill in it's original form was that it was unworkable. I was under the opinion that the amendment offered by Senator Berning put it in a more promising position, and I really felt that he was applying to uniform rule. And he mentioned about inequities, I'm informed that some of the area in Cook County, under the classification of counties over 200,000, that the greater share of the tax burden will be in Cook County rather than Lake County. Therefore, I cannot vote for this bill in it's amended form due to that reason. If he clears the amendment, I would be very happy to support it, but at this juncture I must vote no.

SECRETARY:

Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Mitchler, aye. Knuepfer, aye. Collins, aye. On that question the yeas are 17 the nays are 10. The bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is declared defeated. Senator Mitchler.

SENATOR MITCHLER:

Uh..Mr. President, and members of the SEenate. Uh, on more important business this morning. It is a very distinct pleasure that we have visiting the Illinois State Senate, Miss Mary Ann Grabavoy, who a week ago Sunday was crowned Miss Teenage Aurora for 1972. Miss Grabavoy, by virtue of winning this crown, will now compete in Fort Worth, Texas for the title of Miss Teenage America. Miss Grabavoy is on the podium with Lieutenant Governor, and I think it would be nice at this time if we could meet her. But before we do, I would introduce Attorney and Mrs. Anthony Salerno of Aurora who are the co-sponsors of the Miss Teenage Aurora Pageant. (Applause) And also before Miss Grabavoy speaks, so that we have this on a non-partisan basis, inasmuch as Miss Grabavoy, although she is Miss Teenage Aurora, she is a senior student at Joliet High School from Joliet; and I am going to give, yield to Senator Baltz, who, will show the non-partisanship here by introducing her father who is also on the platform. I call attention to the other side of the aisle to this.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Baltz. Senator Baltz.

SENATOR BALTZ:

No light.

PRESIDENT:

You're you're on, even though the light...

SENATOR BALTZ:

I'm all lit up now, thank you. Mr. President and members of the Senate, it is a great honor and a good deal of pleasure for me to be able to address myself on this happy occasion to this very gracious, and very beautiful, and very talented young lady who is a member of my district. She certainly deserves her wonderful and great honor, and I want to wish her every success in her future ventures and future competition, I might add as, uh, a word, uh, of self satisfaction, uh, that Mrs. Baltz has taught, uh, Miss Grabavoy in school and always told me what a wonderful, beautiful, uh, girl she was. Her, uh, mother and dad have been old friends of mine..they are very active in community affairs in my home community of Joliet. Ned, her father, has been a distinguished member of the City Council of Joliet and her mother presently is a member of our High School Board, and is serving with great distinction. They are a fine family; they are solid citizens; uh, they are the type of people, uh, certainly, that, uh, would raise, uh, fine children such as Mary Ann. They're to be congratulated too, and I certainly want all the Senate to join me in this happy occasion in wishing success to Mary Ann. I know that she's gonna just go all the way..she can't miss. Thank you. (Applause).

MISS TEENAGE AURORA:

Thank you Senator Mitchler and Senator Baltz. Lt. Governor Simon, and all the Honorable members of the Illinois Senate, good morning. (German words _____). Useless Olivick, the German Organic Chemist once said that, young people are not receptacles to be filled, but fires to be kindled. Here before me, and every girl competing in the Miss

Teenage Pageant, lies a golden opportunity to kindle that fire, for youth today are concerned. I can't say that I represent everyone my age, but as Miss Teenage Aurora and as a candidate for Miss Teenage America, on December 3, in Fort Worth, Texas, I represent those who are concerned about maintaining a good image for our country; those who are sensitive to the need for peaceful change; and those who are willing to strengthen our government and society without dissolving it. This summer, I worked as a staff member of the United States Cheerleader's Association, Camps All-American. I found a great need and satisfaction, helping to instruct over 4,000 girls who attended camp this summer. During the preparation months for the pageant competition, relationships became close. You'd often strain during tense moments, however, through this all you learn to adapt yourself, and others learn to adapt and relate to the other girls. And so the experiences of the pageant helped me to become more aware and sensitive of the needs and frustrations of the girls I taught this summer. I found that meeting new people is like building a bridge. You extend and you listen and you understand. And if they are extending and listening and understanding also, then you have bridged all gaps, whether they be generation, political, or racial. Entering the pageant, I am more aware of the broadening affect it will have on my life. The pageant is a fine example of teenagers working with adults, cooperating and uniting. It creates an atmosphere which enables one to go out in the world and become a better person, a better citizen, a better individual. The pageant creates this teenage image that girls strive to follow. It's a golden image of that representative girl. Many people feel that language is a barrier that cannot be overcome. I feel I have found one thing that all people understand, no matter what language they speak, and it is a symbol for many things; peace, hope, friendship, understanding. It's a smile...

For a smile is a cheer to you and me
The cost is nothing..it's given free.
It comforts the weary, gladdens the sad,
Consoles those in trouble..good or bad.
To rich and poor, beggar or thief
It's free to all of any belief.
A natural gesture of young and old,
It cheers on the faint, disarms the bold,
Unlike most blessings for which we pray..
it's one thing we keep when we give away.
Miss Teenage Aurora, Miss Teenage America
Is giving, is reaching out.
So with a smile of friendship, a smile of hope,
A smile of pride in America today,
This teenager says a warm thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Mitchler.

SENATOR MITCHLER:

Uh, if they would please remain on the podium,uh, so we don't disappoint anyone, you know Senator Mitchler wouldn't miss this opportunity to have a resolution prepared, and, uh, with leave of the Senate, if we could have this resolution read and adopted at this time, I would appreciate it.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will read the resolution.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 254, introduced by Senators Mitchler and Baltz. For as Mary Ann Grabavoy, the charming 16 year old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ned Grabavoy, and senior student attending Joliet Central High School, was successful in being selected Miss Teenage Aurora in final competition on October 24, 1971; and whereas, Miss Mary Ann Grabavoy has distinguished herself in scholastic achievement by maintaining a grade average of 3.80 to rank third in her class of 494; and whereas Mary Ann Grabavoy has attained special honors, including the 1971 international Grand Champion of United State's Cheerleaders Association; National Honor Society; 1968 Physical Fitness Award; International Thespian, first runnerup in the 1971 Miss Teenage Aurora Pageant; and whereas, Mary Ann Grabavoy had been active

in numerous extra-curricular activities including membership in the Joliet Central High School Student Council; Captain of the Varsity cheerleaders, Section Editor of the "J" Yearbook, member of Acapella Choir, Volunteer Candy Striper at St. Joseph's Hospital, member of the Joliet High School gymnastics team, and the school operetta, and active member of the Girl's Athletic Association; and whereas Miss Mary Ann Grabavoy has excelled in tumbling, acrobatics, snow skiing, water skiing, gymnastics, bicycling, jogging, and cheerleading; and whereas Mary Ann Grabavoy will reign as Miss Teenage Aurora for the year 1972; and whereas Miss Mary Ann Grabavoy will represent Illinois in the Miss Teenage America Pageant at Ft. Worth, Texas, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 77th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we congratulate Mary Ann Grabavoy upon her being selected as Miss Teenage Aurora of 1972; and we wish her success in her competition at Ft. Worth, Texas, for the national title of Miss Teenage America for 1972. And be it further resolved that we congratulate the parents of Mary Ann Grabavoy, Mr. and Mrs. Ned Grabavoy, the co-chairmen of the 1972 Miss American, or the Miss Teenage Aurora Pageant, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Salerno of Aurora, Illinois, and the sponsors of the 1972 Miss Teenage Aurora Pageant, the Cosmopolitan Club of Aurora; and that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to Mary Ann Grabavoy, Mr. and Mrs. Ned Grabavoy, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Salerno, and the Cosmopolitan Club of Aurora.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor of the adoption of the resolution...Senator Baltz.

SENATOR BALTZ:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I would like leave to suspend the rules and ask for the immediate adoption of this resolution, and also invite all Senators in this body to join as co-sponsors.

PRESIDENT:

All Senators will be shown as co-sponsors. The rules are suspended, all in favor of the adoption of the resolution indicate by saying aye. Contrary minded. Resolution is adopted. (Applause) Senate Bills on third reading. 485, Senator Knuepfer. 488, Senator Rock. 808, Senator Lyons. Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Uh, Mr. President, and members. In order to clarify, uh, some questions that were raised yesterday, I wonder if I might move this bill back to second reading for purposes, uh, of appending an amendment to it. The amendment has been distributed to the membership.

PRESIDENT:

808 is brought back to second reading for the purpose of amendment. Can you explain the amendment?

SENATOR LYONS:

The purpose of the amendment is to make it unconditionally clear that permanent registration and re-registration..., permanent registration is not intended to disturb re-registration or reassignment of license plates, and to make it clear also that the purpose of the bill is to insure that the registration follows the owner rather than follow the vehicle. That's all the amendment does and I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the adoption of the amendment. Is there any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Amendment is adopted. Third reading. Do you wish to call it on today? We'll get back to it then shortly. 890, Senator McCarthy. 1002, Senator Carpentier. 1164, Senator Berning. 1224, Senator Donnewald. Joint nomination. 1280, Senator Donnewald. State Treasurer facsimile signature. Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Well, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This is a bill that is required or needed by the State Treasurer in order that he can go ahead with the bond issue or the bonds, signing the bonds. Its the statute which can power the Treasurer to use a facsimile, not a stamp but a facsimile of his signature. And that's all it does and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Well, Mr. President, I only wonder, Senator Donnewald, are we leading to where this is what we are going to have on all other bond issues possibly throughout the state, that we'll set a precedent here.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment, can you repeat your question? Senator, please.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

I just wonder if we are setting a precedence here that might be followed through all the school districts and other groups that have public bond issues. Now they'll say well you can use the facsimile signature, just send it under the care of someone up to our office and we'll stamp it on these bonds.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

This, of course, Senator, applies only to the State Treasurer and it applies..., and the need for it is the, the road bond issue.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

I realize that, but I am wondering what we are leading into here, later on possibly.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Groen aye. Horsley aye. Coulson, aye. Collins aye. Soper aye. Carroll aye. Rosander aye. Laughlin aye. Gilbert aye. Latherow no. McBroom aye. Merritt aye. Carpentier no. On that question the yeas are 33 the nays are 2. The bill is declared passed. 1283, Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Mr. President I'd like to revert back to 1224 if, if I have..., I'd ask for leave of the Senate to pull that bill back to the order of second reading for the purpose of an amendment. And, very briefly, if I have that leave a, Mr. President..

PRESIDENT:

1224 is pulled back for second reading.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

The amendment does..., it strikes all references to the..., where the Governor and Lieutenant Governor run together, and this would automatically let them run separately in a primary election. I move, therefore, Mr. President, that the amendment be adopted.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? All in favor of the adoption of the amendment signifying by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Senator Lyons you ready on 808? 808, Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

A, yes Mr. President and members. Senate Bill 808 was discussed at some length yesterday. I don't know that there is any point in going over all that again or reading the lengthy list of organizations which support the bill. I think that the questions that were raised yesterday have been answered, and if there are any more I will attempt to answer them, but if there aren't, any I just ask for a favorable vote of the membership.

PRESIDENT:

Is...Senator Carpentier?

SENATOR CARPENTIER:

Mr. President, we did discuss this quite at length the other day. Even with the amendment that was put on this morning and still the clarifying language in the amendment, I'm not real positive about; but I would also like to point out to the members of the Senate that way back in 1953 we adopted the slogan Land of Lincoln. We are the only state in the Union that has their slogan in the Congressional Record. Under this bill we will now delete Land of Lincoln on the license plates and for an extra 50 cents you can buy a little tag to attach that to your license plate. States such as Nebraska just got done repealing their act of a three year registration because of loss of money. I talked with the Chicago Police Department yesterday and with our Secretary of State's Office and in a matter of three months the big computer in the Chicago Central Headquarters will be connected with ours. Within a matter of ten

seconds they will be able to trace any license plate on any vehicle. We now have this communication system throughout the state with our local authorities and state police. I actually see nothing ahead of us but headaches, because when you buy a plate one year at a time you are going to collect the revenue. It's going to be every month road blocks setting up because they are going on a monthly basis distributing plates and at the end of that year, say in May, the police will be chasing them until August. This way we have a cut off date of February 15th. We have one of the best systems in the country, one of the most inexpensive systems in the country and therefore I think this bill should be defeated.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Lyons may close the debate.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, I don't want to...I did not talk to the Chicago Police Department yesterday. I don't know whether its a fact that within three months when this computer system is put into effect they will be able to do anything within ten seconds. I don't know anybody on the Chicago Police Department who is any more qualified than anybody else to predict the future. All I know is what happened in the past. And in the past one-third of the requests come back marked not in file. That's what happened in the past and that's what's happening now. Whether the Chicago Police Department or anybody else thinks three months from now something is going to change the order of events is another story. The bill does what we represented that it does. It does not in any way inhibit or harm the practice of reassignment and further than that I don't know what else to say. It calls for permanent registration so that identification of motor vehicles through the use of the license plate system is possible. As far as the

Land of Lincoln thing is concerned, that's a technical omission if its omitted at all and that can always be put back in the House. Nobody wants to delete the Land of Lincoln legend on the license plates. That is not the intent of the bill. I ask for the support of the membership.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Knuppel aye. Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Mr. President, I'd like to move to postpone consideration of this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to postpone consideration. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion to postpone consideration prevails. 1224, Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Mr. President, this is a bill that I just amended which deletes any reference to the Lieutenant Governor and Governor running together and it places it in the position that it presently is and I would ask for a most favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary....Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, just to be sure. Now I am sure, I am not sure that everybody else is as sure as Senator Donnewald is. But in affect his amendment to this bill allows the Lieutenant Governor and the Governor to run separately as they currently do. That's the effect of the bill now. In the primary.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

That's correct.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? The Secretary will call the roll. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

I'm sorry, Mr. President, may I ask the sponsor a question? I thought that under the new Constitution the Lieutenant Governor and the Governor run together. Do I understand that you are now providing that they run separately?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Senator, only in the primary.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga,

Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Latherow aye. Knuepfer aye. Walker aye. Johns aye. McBroom aye. On that question the yeas are 47. The nays are two. The bill is declared passed. 1283, Senator Groen. Hold. 1292, Senator Lyons. 1292? Hold. 1293, Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. I'd like leave to return this to the order of second reading for purpose of amendment, please.

PRESIDENT:

1293 is brought back to second reading for purpose of amendment.

SENATOR EGAN:

Senator Bidwill has an amendment. This bill had an objection from the Governor's office which was cleared up with Senator Bidwill's amendment. The clerk has it. I'd ask that he move for its adoption, but he is not on the floor.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bidwill? He was here a few moments ago. All right. He'll be here in just a moment. Can you explain the amendment, perhaps, Senator Egan, while we wait for Senator Bidwill?

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, I'll explain the amendment, Mr. President. The bill originally required that the Governor's office report to the members of the General Assembly on amendatory vetoes, line item vetoes and reduction vetoes. And the objection that they had was that it would cost their office too much paper work. So the amendment now requires that the Governor file with the clerk any action that he takes pursuant to those three categories of bills. And the clerk will distribute the amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Motion by Senator Bidwill for the adoption of the amendment. All in favor signifying by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopting. Any further amendments? Third reading. 1297, Senator Sours. Senator Sours on the floor? 1303, Senator Groen. Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. This...Senate Bill 1303 has one purpose. It's a lengthy bill, but it's repetitive in that the same provisions apply to different systems. It has the approval of the Pension Laws Commission. It would authorize, under very limited and strict regulations and control, the investment by funds in the..., in certain state of Israel Bonds. And I understand there are two different kinds of bonds. The one which is referred to in this bill is the one that is guaranteed by the State of Israel and in which they have a 90 day redemption authorization. They maintain, and I believe it's in Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, a fund in excess of \$600,000,000 for the 90 day redemption of these bonds if the holder desires. They are institutional type bonds and they are authorized only under the provisions and the restrictions as contained. I'll read those. They are direct obligations of the State of Israel. The conditions are; one, that the total investment in the obligation shall not exceed 5% of the book value of the aggregate investments owned by the fund. Two, that the State of Israel shall not be in default in payment of principle or interest if any of its direct obligation bonds on the date of the investment. C, the bondsmen and the interest thereon shall be payable in currency of the United States, and the bond shall contain an option for the redemption thereof after 90 days from the date of purchase. And the next one is that the obligation or that the investment has been approved in writing by invest-

ment council employed by the board, which council shall be a national or state bank or trust company authorized to do a trust business in the State of Illinois or an investment adviser qualified under the Federal Investment Advisers act. And the final, the funder system making the investment shall have at least \$5,000,000 of net present assets. This is in keeping with the policy of the commission to broaden the investment authority under controlled and restricted provisions. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (HALL)

Any further discussion? Roll call.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow,

PRESIDENT:

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Mr. President, I have been assured by a member of the Senate that this is a good bill. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

Laughlin.

PRESIDENT:

Donnewald aye. Neistein no. Palmer aye...I'm sorry. Continuing the roll call.

SECRETARY:

Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

SB 485
Recalled

PRESIDENT:

Carroll aye. Horsley aye. Hynes aye. On that question the yeas are 37 and the nays are 1. The bill is declared passed. For what purpose Senator Dougherty arise?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Mr. President, I would like to call Senate bill 485 on third reading back to the order of second reading for the purpose of offering an amendment. The amendment is on the clerk's desk. I have talked to the sponsor of the bill and he is amenable to the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Did you wish to explain the amendment very briefly?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

The amendment merely provides...The bill in it's original form excepts Cook County. This bill puts, this amendment puts Cook County in to the degree that it will make the bill...it will not be class legislation. Makes the bill a stronger bill, I believe.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? All in favor of the adoption of the amendment indicate by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Third reading. 1293, Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Very briefly, this bill allows for the distribution of the veto messages--line item vetoes and amendatory, ah, executive amendments to bills that have been--these new powers have been granted the Governor under the new constitution. In order for the membership to be appraised of that action this bill with its amendment will allow administratively to do this and all of the objections have been met that I know of. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Bidwill aye. Laughlin aye. Johns aye. Knuepfer aye. Horsley aye. Nihill aye. Clarke aye. Latherow no. Sours no. Egan aye. Carpentier no. Weaver no. On that question the yeas are 30 the nays are 8. The bill having received a constitutional majority is declared passed. While we are on Senate bills, Senator Partee, I understand you have a motion in connection with some Senate bills.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Yes I do, Mr. President and members of the Senate, and I would certainly like the attention of the membership on these motions because I think they are quite important to all of us. They're especially important to Senators Weaver, Merritt, and Gilbert. And these motions that I am going to make, Mr. President...would you gentlemen hold it down a little bit please. These motions relate to a subject over which we have agonized here for quite a few days and it relates to the higher education budget. As you will recall, Mr. President, on 3 separate attempts we on this side of the aisle made an attempt by way of amendments and by other parliamentary maneuvers to bring to the higher education budget a \$22,000,000 additional appropriation. Then we cut it to 7 and we didn't get the votes that we needed for the 7 million. Then we cut it to 3 million out of general revenue and we still were not able to obtain the kind of support

across the aisle that was necessary to restore that small amount of funds. Now it does not escape my notice that after the first attempt that the persons on...who were sponsors and the Governor and others reacted to some of the reaction that took place in this state about these bills and proposed a 7.1 million dollar transfer bill which came from capital and from some of the building funds. And we were, on this side of the aisle, very much opposed to that and voted against those transfers on the basis that the representations had been made in appropriations hearings that these monies were absolutely essential and we couldn't see taking those monies and transferring them to this point where we had established that there was money available to take care of the needs of our universities and to restore the scholarships and open up the libraries and do all the things that had been diminished..., services that had been diminished by the lack of funds. I think there comes a time when we sometimes have to re-assess our position. There comes a time when we must necessarily look at the long range proposals that are involved. And it distresses me to make these motions, in one respect, because it would give the appearance that I am pulling the rug from under some of the members on my side who have worked so long and arduously and diligently in this area. And I would especially say that for Senator Tom Hynes who has worked very hard in this area and who has the kind of integrity that we all strive for and who believes very strongly in the positions, which he had taken. I think the overriding consideration is that we must be at all times responsible and I certainly would not want any university president or any student to feel that because it was not done the way we wanted it to be done, which we still think is the right way; that we would do nothing at all. For that reason, Mr. President and members of the senate, my motion is to discharge the appropriations committee from further consideration of three bills.

Numbers 1286, 1287 and 1289. I am asking that the roll call show favorably that we have discharged those bills from the committee and that they then be put on the calendar.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? Leave is granted. Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

I might say to Senator Hynes, when the bill comes back on the floor, as I stated the other day, I will put the amendment on that eliminates any use of tuition funds. That was my statement and some of your people support it on that basis and I will do that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

If...House bills on second reading so that we can advance those to third reading. On page 2 of your calendar. 789, Senator Berning. 789.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1317, Senator Latherow. Hold. 1318 hold also? 1467. We do not.. 1467, 8 and 9 we do not show a Senate sponsor for here. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

How does a bill get on second reading without a Senate sponsor?

PRESIDENT:

I have to confess, I don't know. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Mr. Chairman, those bills were picked up last May, I believe, by Senator Chew. Senator Chew should be shown as the Senate sponsor;

PRESIDENT:

Alright, we will check with Senator Chew on that. 1693,
Senator Rock. 1693.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. One committee amendment from
judiciary.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock moves the adoption of the committee amend-
ment. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded.
The amendment is adopted. Any further amendments? Third read-
ing. 1694.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1695.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. One committee amendment in
judiciary.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock moves the adoption of the committee amendment.
All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amend-
ment is adopted. Any further amendments? Third reading. 1747.
Is Senator Knuppel on the floor? 1767. 1767.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1769
Senator Savickas. Hold. 1770 and 71 hold also. 1882, Senator
Rock. 1882.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1883.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2374, Senator Gilbert. 2374. 2374.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. I am advised by Senator Savickas that his three bills can be called to second reading, also. 1769.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. Four committee amendments from judiciary.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas moves the adoption of the committee amendments. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Amendments are adopted. Any further amendments? Third reading. 1770.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1771.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2615, Senator Dougherty. Senator Dougherty. Hold. 2716 Senator Carroll. Hold. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I have an amendment to 2716 which is amenable to Senator Carroll, I believe. The Home Rule amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Well, he is holding it right now. We will put it on when he calls it. 2871, Senator Harris. Senator Harris. 2871. 2871.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2872. Do you want all of these called, Senator. Alright 2872.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2874. Senator Dougherty, do you have an amendment on 2874?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I don't know whether this is amendment number 1 or what it may be. It is the home rule amendment, is what it is.

PRESIDENT:

This is on 2874?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Yeah...

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Senator Dougherty moves the adoption of amendment number 1. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Amendment is adopted. Third reading. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I also have an amendment to this bill and I have discussed it with Senator Harris.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock offers amendment too. Can you explain the amendment, Senator?

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate. We heard this bill in the...committee and in committee Senator Harris agreed to accept an amendment at this time. It would amend on page 3 of the bill. This bill would call for a hearing. The bill as introduced said such hearing officers are not bound by strict common law or statutory rules of evidence but shall proceed in accordance with rules and regulations of the department. Now

I felt that because there was administrative procedure and administrative review that they should follow the rules of evidence so we have deleted that provision. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Any further amendments? Third reading. 2878. Senator, 2878.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2879.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 2886.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3552,

Senator Rock. 3552.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3560.
3560.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3638,
Senator Graham. 3638.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

I'd like to ask Senator Rock a question on the previous bill.

Do we have, in this bill, any amendment with regard to the signatures for members of the General Assembly?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes, Senator, what this bill provides is that for nominating petitions for members of the General Assembly. We will require a minimum of 200 and not more than a thousand. Now Senator Romano and I just this morning, as a matter of fact, contacted the Secretary of State's office and determined how many signatures we all needed the last time and it averages out to about 200, so we're...this is a one shot deal.

PRESIDENT:

3638.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3640.

Senator Graham?

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Is Senator Smith on the floor? Senator Smith questioned this bill. He wanted to know what word was left out that precipitated the introduction of this bill. On line 17, the second page, the original bill passed in the last session and amended, they left out the word "equal." This bill really reinstates the word equal in this procedure; so it is explained to Senator Smith. If he isn't here, I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT:

3640.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3641.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3652.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3700,
Senator Coulson is recognized.

SENATOR COULSON:

Mr. President, I should like to call 3700 and invite anyone who wishes to, to offer amendments. I have no intention to move it today. I should like to call it again on second reading tomorrow, next week each day, and encourage everyone to become familiar with the subject matter of it. This is the product of the Ethics Committee in the House. It is the substantive ethics bill. It will probably wind up in a joint conference committee, but meanwhile, mimeographed copies are available today and we hope the printed copies will be available tomorrow or so. I would urge everyone to be familiar with it to save their own time. It's your November I'm thinking of if we don't work on it quickly, and of course, we hope to come up with a bill which will allow each of us to enter the Kingdom of Heaven upon displaying to St. Peter our credentials as former members of the Senate living with a proper ethics bill.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments? The bill will be held on second reading. 3732, Senator McCarthy. 3732. 3732.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 3735,
Senator Gilbert. 3735. 3735.

SECRETARY:

Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. Senator
Merritt is recognized for advancing a Senate Bill on second
reading. Senator Merritt.

SENATOR MERRITT:

Well, Mr. President and members of the Senate, in checking
with the President Pro Tem, since the three bills that were
discharged are now on second reading, I would ask consent to
move them to third.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? The...Senator Merritt is requesting
the advancement to third reading of the three bills that Senator
Partee moved to discharge from committee. Now I assume this
will be done since Senator Partee referred to an amendment
with the understanding that they can be called back to second
reading for amendments. Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Mr. President, if that is being done at this time, I would
like to put on the amendment that I referred to a moment ago
when I was addressing my remarks to Senator Hynes. This is the
amendment to Senate Bill 1286 which takes away the right to
spend any money obtained by an increase in tuition, and I have
agreed that this be taken off. The bill, as introduced, has
an authority to spend \$1,000,100 of tuition money if the university
starts collecting it January the 1st. I have agreed that we
will not authorize the spending of this money. I assume they
will not collect it. They collected it in September. They have

returned it to the students and certainly, under the circumstances, they would not do this. Senator Hynes, I'm putting the amendment on now. The bill is being advanced to third today. I'm putting the amendment on now that I directed... Do you have a copy of it? And if there's any question about it after you check it, we can call it back tomorrow and have it changed.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

This is the one without the tuition increase money.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Third reading. All three bills are advanced with the understanding that they can be called back to second reading for further amendments. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I'm in order, but I see on page 2 that House bills on first reading, there is a bill there, 1555. I thought yesterday I made a motion to have it read a first time and be heard in Revenue Committee. Now, as a matter of fact, it was heard in Revenue this morning and was recommended out Do Pass, so I would ask at this time to have 1555 advanced to the order of second reading without reference to a committee, I suppose.

PRESIDENT:

I think that we'll journalize this properly. It may be just an error on the calendar here. 1555. Alright. Well, anyway... Motion is to advance to second reading without reference. It was heard in committee this morning. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary... Leave is granted. House

Bills on Third Reading. We'll get back to House Bills first very shortly. Senator Johns is recognized for 1508, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Now...should these be taken one at a time, Senator?

SENATOR JOHNS:

One at a time, yes sir, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

1508.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Lady and gentlemen of the Senate. As you all will recall, just a few days ago I introduced these bills and I ran into objections, and they were justified. And I met with Senator Horsley, Senator Dougherty, and talked with these gentlemen and each of them have received from one of our sources a description of the problem. Senator Graham, I understand you have a copy, sir...of the letter describing the problem with 1508. So I would ask that we bring 1508 back from third to second for the purpose of amendment. May I have leave of the body to do so?

PRESIDENT:

You're pulling the bill back to second reading for purpose of amendment?

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, sir. 1508.

PRESIDENT:

1508. Can you explain the amendment?

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, sir. The amendment strikes the word elected on page 1, line 17 and permits it, to meet the objections of Senator Horsley and Senator Graham and Senator Dougherty, whereby should an elected official die after he's been just recently elected, that the county board would have the proper procedure set forth to handle the situation. In the opinion of Mr. Bobbitt, these

bills is merely a restatement of the present state of the law and constitutes no change, but we set it into an amendment to make sure that it didn't. And I would have leave of the body to move this back from third to second for purpose of making this amendment, which is on the Senators' desks.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Johns moves the adoption of amendment number 2...

SENATOR JOHNS:

That would be number 2, I believe...Yes, sir.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary does not have a copy of the amendment, Senator.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Alright sir, I'll have them to you right now. I'm sorry, Tipper.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment, indicate by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Third reading. 1509.

SENATOR JOHNS:

It is in the same category as the series of bills. It, too, had an objection whereby we might have a problem after the election of the officer.

PRESIDENT:

Senator, are you basically making the same amendment on all those bills?

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, sir, basically the same, I believe, except on 1510.. Yes, 1510 is a little leakier, but for purpose of bringing it back...

PRESIDENT:

Well, let's take 1509, 11, and 12. Senator Johns moves

for the adoption of the same amendment on those three bills.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. 1510.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Now, Mr. President...On 1510, alright, sir. 1510 reads such as this in the amendment. The County Clerk in counties having a population of less than 60,000 inhabitants shall be the Recorder of Deeds in this county. In counties having a population of 60,000 or more inhabitants there shall be elected a Recorder of Deeds, as provided by law, who shall hold his office until his successor is elected...is qualified. We eliminated the elected and permitting this office to be handled dutily.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? All in favor of the adoption of the amendment signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Now, Mr. President...

PRESIDENT:

Now 1508 is on third reading and that is before the body.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I would like to have that one placed before the body. Our problem was to prevent any vacancy in the office and then our real desire was, of course, to prevent... I mean, to implement part of the Constitution. I'm looking for my notes here, I'll have them with you in just a second. Alright, under Article IV, Section 10, I believe I was working...Oh here,

here I am...Lady and gentlemen of the Senate, as I attempted to express to you the other day, these bills are intended to make provision for the continuance of the offices of County Clerk, Recorder, Coroner, and Treasurer, and to spell out some of their powers and duties. And we have made provision for the oath and compliance with the new Constitution. We have provided for the term of office to commence on the first working day in the month of December following election. We have provided that the functions and powers of the various officers named shall be uniform in the various counties of the state. We have provided that these elected officials shall have the right to appoint deputies, assistants, and personnel, to control the internal operation of their offices, and to procure necessary supplies, equipment and services to perform the duties of the office. We also provide for monthly accounting of all special funds with which to purchase revenue stamps and so forth. We provide for the deposit of fee income with the County Treasurer monthly. We have also provided that the salaries of the deputies and assistants shall be set by the elected county officer subject to budgetary limitations set by the county board. None of these powers, functions, and duties apply to home-rule counties. I hope that I can have a favorable roll call on 1508.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Senator Johns, does this bill...does amendment number 2 call for the monthly payment of these funds? That's the problem.. you know the discussion we had with Senator Berning, and some of us objected. We felt that there ought to be some wording to the effect that they had to pay at least monthly; that they would have the right to pay at any time in the meantime. This would...and he was changing his bill to that effect, so that if

they wish to make daily deposits or weekly deposits they could, but that they must make them at least monthly.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

---Alright.--- Senator Gilbert, I appreciate your comments, sir. Let me read you an amendment prior to this. It was built into the bill as it was amended. This was amended in the House, and it says of the County Treasurer, monthly by the 10th of the month following. Would that meet your criticism, sir?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

That's the way that Senator Berning's bill was worded, exactly that same way, by the 10th of the following month. Some of us felt that possibly there ought to be some wording that they must do it at least by then, but that they could do it as some...I believe it was pointed out, in some of the counties in some of the areas that they are making daily deposits from these incomes that they have. It wouldn't require them, Senator, it would just say that, make it clear that they could deposit them, I don't know that there's anything in the bill that says that they can't and it might be a matter for local custom whatever they want to do, but we did raise the question on Senator Berning's bill and that's why that I raised it on this one. He called it to my attention. I hadn't realized it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Well, I think in reference...in the same vein that Senator Gilbert was in, Senator Lyons is not on the floor at the moment, but he raised the question of the monthly...constitutionality

of the monthly payment in view of the rather specific language of the new Constitution. Now, I don't know the answer to that, but he was up on Senator Berning's bill just the other day on exactly that same point. Senator Lyons, I see you're on the floor now. The bill before us, 1508, talks about payments on the 10th of the following month from the Treasurer's office to the county. You raised a question as to constitutionality when we were discussing that same issue on Senator Berning's bill and I suppose the issue would be similar here. The language in the Constitution is related much more to immediacy than is 30 or 40 days which these payments would be and I'm wondering how you feel about this particular one.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, I have no opinion. I just...the question takes me by surprise. I don't know, Senator Knuepfer, I'll have to look.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Perhaps this could be resolved if I called the attention of the body to House Bill 2618, which I'm handling for Representatives Hall, Madigan, et al, which provides for the timely deposit of, with the County Treasurer, fees collected by any elected or appointed county official. And I'm having an amendment drawn which provides that it may be deposited daily, weekly and shall be deposited in any event, shall be deposited monthly. This may handle the whole problem for all of them and in which case would eliminate the necessity of amending these series of bills. Now if this meets with the approval of the body, I recommend that we act on these measures as they are and then pass 2618.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

In response to Senator Knuepfer's remark, I would agree with him that the immediacy of the Constitutional dictum, if you will, is that these bills must be passed in order to insure continuity in the office of these particular officials. The spin-off question about deposit of funds, of course, is of moment too, because it is contained in this act. And however, Senator Berning's bill is in a sort of a limbo at this particular time, unless it is amended to meet the objections. It does point out in Senator Johns' bill that they could hold it for as much as 40 days, the same as the objection to 2618. However, I don't see anything crippling about these if we let these bills out. Then the subsequent passage of the bill 2618, if passed, would take care of that. That would be my opinion. Now, frankly, I don't know.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mithler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Sznarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 41 the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. 1509.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Just a parliamentary inquiry. When we began this session Senator Coulson made the point that on gubernatorial vetoes, that a roll call should be taken on each of those. Now we have continued that through bills on third reading. Now is that going to continue? Why do we not..., why are we not able to have the most favorable roll call on a bill?

PRESIDENT:

Well, that...what...We are in a situation, as Senator Coulson pointed out, where there is a literal record being taken of what we're doing. And there would be a constitutional question of whether we, in fact, have voted favorably. Prior to a record being taken of what we're doing the Journal simply showed a favorable roll call. Now it would be a constitutional question whether we have had a favorable roll call. I think, and I have discussed this with Senator Knuepfer and Senators Partee and Clarke. I think that Senator Knuepfer's idea for a, some kind of an electronic board may have to be considered for the session next year, because we are going to get bogged down in hundreds of bills. But, I think that Senator Coulson's point is a very important one from a constitutional viewpoint.

On that question the yeas are 46 the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. 1510.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Again, lady and gentlemen of the Senate. This bill, number 1510, is in relation to Recorders, and I think that it's easy enough understood. We do have an amendment which I have passed out to you and I hope that you will favor me with another roll call such as you have just given me.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier,

Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Collins aye. On that question the yeas are 45 the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. 1511.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Lady and gentlemen of the Senate. This is just a little different because it concerns the fees and salaries of these officers. And I hope that you have studied this bill and you will favor me with a roll call just as you have given me.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning:

SENATOR BERNING:

I would like to ask the sponsor what relationship there is...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment please. Gentlemen, and in this case the lady, too. Senators Hynes, Saperstein, Savickas, Neistein. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

My question has to do with the elimination of the fees of the office of County Coroner and how that is related to the fees prohibited for the extension and collection of taxes. What's the rationale here in 1511?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I will attempt to answer that. Article X, Section 10, of the Constitution of 1870, which required county officers to earn their fees before they could receive their statutory salaries. An effort was made by the legislature to charge the Coroners' fees against the estate of the deceased. Not every case had an estate in probate and it was unfair to charge the deceased for a benefit conferred upon the public generally. So, no benefit was conferred upon him, and he was dead. Of this was caused much resistance and criticism over the years, but nothing could be done about it because of the Constitution. Some County Boards took the position that the Coroner may not receive fees for his services from the county even though he earned them. They said he had to collect them. That they didn't care for or from whom. House Bill 1511 recognizes that the Coroner renders services to the public generally, and since most Coroners receive their fees for services performed from the county, not the estate of the deceased; it provides that these fees shall be abolished. Inasmuch as most counties are now paying for these services as fees earned out of the general fund of the county, House Bill 1511 corrects a wrong inherent in the Constitution of 1870. It is endorsed by the Illinois Coroners' Association and the Illinois Funeral Directors' Association.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Well, I take issue with the fact...or the statement that the Coroners' office does not collect fees. In my county the returns have been substantial. And I also take issue with the statement that it is the public's responsibility to pay for these services. I care not whether the service is for a dead body or a living one. If we are going to go completely into the concept that everything that the government can provide

shall be done at public expense, we may as well eliminate anything in the way of charges for hospital service, court costs and everything else. I submit there is very little relationship here between that concept and the long time-honored concept that we, the beneficiaries, ought to be paid. Now, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the position that the Coroner's compensation should not be tied to the earnings of the office. That is fine. The County Coroner is a county official and should be paid out of the county general corporate fund just as the rest of the county officers are. But the office ought, and I maintain should, produce any and all fees that it possibly can, and I, for one, would resist the elimination of the right of the Coroner's office to assess fees on the beneficiaries of the services of that particular office.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Latherow. Senator Laughlin, I mean.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Yes. Will the sponsor yield here? I can't find an amendment. How did you amend this bill? Are you talking about 1511?

PRESIDENT:

1511. Apparently, I was just discussing with the Secretary. Well there is one amendment. There is not an amendment today, added.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

It's the Home Rule amendment, the Secretary advises me.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer?

SENATOR KNUEPFER.

Yes. I want to suggest that I think Senator Berning on this bill is totally right. The counties have lost a very substantial amount, 3%, due to the collection fees. We got another blow the other day when we have to have, at least in

my county, an extra election, I don't see why, what the necessity is for requiring the elimination of fees in the Coroner's office. This will be number three to reduce the county revenue. I am in accord with Senator Berning that the Constitution says that the fee-earning offices are eliminated. You did not eliminate the fees as collected by the County Clerk, and I'm glad you didn't, because if you had eliminated that, you would have cut county revenues even more. But, it seems to me, and I frankly can't support the bill this way. I could support the bill in the same posture that this...If you put this bill in the same posture as the County Court bill, then I think it is supportable. But I see no reason to, in addition to resolving the problems of the new Constitution, I see no reason why we had to eliminate the fees and I think we ought to oppose that posture.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Johns may close the debate.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I would ask for a favorable roll call. However, as you know me, gentlemen, if you think that we can improve on this bill, I'd be glad to withdraw the motion, work on it, and improve it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer?

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

I think we can improve it in one day. I don't think it will take any more than one day. We simply make it a parallel structure with the other bills, and it's fine. So, if you will give us one day, I think we can work it out.

PRESIDENT:

So you wish to hold 1511.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I sure do, and I am glad for your criticism and I will be glad to try to work it out with you.

PRESIDENT:

1512.

SENATOR JOHNS:

1512 stands in the same category as the other bills that I have introduced to you. It's a constitutional implementation.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any...Senator McBroom and Baltz, you are bothering the Senator immediately behind you there. Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

The reason for me getting my head through that pipe smoke was so I could ask a question. Senator Johns does this have the same proposed amendment now that will allow the County Board to fill the vacancies? Thank you. You just got a vote.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

May I ask the sponsor one question? Page 2, Section 4.2, where the Treasurer shall file a monthly report with the County Clerk. There seems to be no provision here for the filing with the County Board, and it seems to me that is the primary body that ought to be interested in the reports, and I must admit that I didn't catch that in the Clerk's report. Is that filed with the County Treasurer?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I'm just checking here, Mr. President. Section 4.2, the Treasurer...I don't know that I can answer that question right at the moment. Would you repeat that question, Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

I will. I do notice in 1508, under the County Clerk's bill on page 2, Sec. 1.2C, the County Clerk shall file a monthly report with the..., it just says file it. On summarizing the financial status of his office in such form as shall be determined by the County Board. The assumption would be that he would be filing with the County Board. That certainly is rather a vague provision. However, then, my question was necessarily triggered by bill 1512 where, on page 2, Section 4.2, it says the Treasurer shall file a monthly report with the County Clerk and I am questioning why that is not with the County Board.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Maybe I can help both here. I think it's kind of a long roundabout way, but on 1512 on page three it..., there is another provision. The Treasurer shall make month, shall make account, well, the English isn't very good, the Treasurer shall make accounting monthly to the County Board through the County Clerk of all special funds. No, that's a different provision. I'm sorry about that. Can we hold this for one day, Senator Johns? I think we can make a better bill out of it?

PRESIDENT:

1512 will be held. 1463, Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Let's hold that.

PRESIDENT:

Hold that. 662, Senator..., is Senator Collins on the floor? Senator Collins is not here right now. We have a couple of motions...Well before we get on to motions let's get to House Bills on first reading on page two of your calendar. 22...Senator Saperstein wishes to call 2209. 22...I'm sorry

2209 and..., Incidentally, if you notify the Chair on one day that you want a bill called and then don't renotify the Chair, that bill is not automatically called. 2209, Senator Saperstein.

SENATOR SAPERSTEIN:

Mr. President, and Senators I would like to move 2209 back to second reading for the purpose of amendment.

PRESIDENT:

2209 is brought back to second reading for the purpose of amendment. What is your amendment, Senator?

SENATOR SAPERSTEIN:

Senator Sours, has the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President, Senators, I submitted the amendment yesterday and the Secretary has it. I can assure everyone on our side that whatever evils or ills were in the bill before amendment are now cured. I'd like to join in moving its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Could we have an explanation of the amendment?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

This amendment refers to the employees, female, who are enchant. That's a French word. Here is the explanation which I think will satisfy everyone here. In the period of 13 to 8 weeks before childbirth most women will show a definite and steady decline in available energy reserves. Any women who voluntarily quits her job in this period can probably be assumed to have quit, at least in part, due to the growing discomfort of pregnancy. Therefore, she should not receive unemployment compensation. On the other hand, a large minority

of women are exceptions and can continue to work efficiently up to within 8 weeks of childbirth, but there are relatively few women who can fully and efficiently discharge their duties within 8 weeks of childbirth. The second sentence of this amendment will allow employers to present the fact of advanced pregnancy along with other proof to the Director, that's of Labor, in order to show that they have not unfairly discharged a women employee who is in within 8 weeks of childbirth. If that proof plus the fact of advanced pregnancy does indicate the women is in fact, unable to work efficiently, then the Director would certify that she should not receive unemployment compensation because her disability is due to her pregnancy. Senator Bruce, we are now talking about the rationale of proximate cause.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? All in favor of the adoption of the amendment signifying by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. 1314, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you Mr. President and members of the Senate. 1314, House bill 1314 is a similar bill to House Bill 1311 that Senator Knuppel, which passed, handled last week. This bill simply provides that an agreement to repre..., that any agreement to represent any person they claim for fire damage is voidable. An agreement signed within 5 days of a fire is voidable by a written notice. This bill is designed to protect persons fraudulently induced to sign fire adjustment contracts by claiming to be able to have electricity and gas turned on again. Often persons represented to be officials of the fire department induce widows and old persons to sign up with fly by night agents. This is a consumer protection bill and I would ask your most favorable support.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Mr. President, very briefly I want to rise in support of this bill. This bill is very similar to the bill that was passed out of here a few days ago with relation to lawyers. I think that was Senator Knuppel's bill. And I would certainly support it and I hope the body will do likewise. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Is there...? Senator Knupefer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Yes, this, this sounds like the kind of a bill where you could get in a bidding contest between lawyers as to who's going to handle your case. I can understand perhaps more closely in the automobile situation, what's..., what really is the need for this? Why should you, when you have a fire it doesn't seem to me there any great urgency about signing with any lawyer. The damage is done. If you got out safely you've got 5, 10 days, a month before you..., or even longer before you have to decide to go to suit. What is the real necessity for the privilege of signing an agreement and then the privilege of being able to back out of that agreement. It would seem to me that you would create the situation where you would have all the lawyers on your back door bidding for your job for..., to handle your case.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, let me give you an example. This really relates to fraudulently obtained construction contracts for damages after the fire has..., fire... For example let me give you a case. A building burns, the people in the building do not have light, water, heat. Alright? The adjustor comes out and says x number of dollars then sends an emergency person

around to do certain things. Reconnect the lights and so forth. Alright? Many times the person is then forced to sign on with that person who did the initial work. In many cases that work is done at a highly inflated cost and you get perhaps \$2,000 worth of construction work on a \$7,000 settlement. And this bill would permit that person to be able to avoid that bad contract and get signed on with a contractor of his choice. That's the purport of this bill. It doesn't relate to lawyers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

As I understand it he would have 5 days to back out. Now he can't...The construction isn't going to be done probably in 5 days. How's he going to know within that time period whether the job is a bad job or a good job. It seems to me most cases a construction might be done within 20 or 30 days. It would be too late to do them any good under this act in any case by the time he suddenly found out he got a bad deal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

In the case that I just cited, Senator, that is the emergency hook-up. Within 5 days after that work is done he can make some determination as to whether or not he's got an honest guy on his hands, for example.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

• Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Yes, Senator Newhouse, I'll direct this question to you if you don't mind. I don't understand how under your example, you'd be affected by this bill; because as I read the thing, unless there is an amendment that I don't have, says any person who within 5 days after a fire makes an agreement with any

other person to represent him in his claim for damages... Doesn't have anything to do with somebody coming in to contract to repair his building or anything of the sort.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

That is the Washington Bill, right? Can we hold this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Mr. President we'll hold this and confer with him and bring it back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Collins I have a note 2662 and 2663.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. 2662 is a bill, I think its noncontroversial. It has some clarifying language in the fishing code with minor provisions, and it's a Departmental Conservation Bill and I think that perhaps there will be no opposition against it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any discussion on this bill? House bill 2622. 2662. Please change the number. It is 2662. Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpenter, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Cherry aye. Kusibab aye. Course aye. Senator Graham.
Senator Graham aye.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Aye instead of no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Merritt aye. Dougherty aye. Hynes aye. Request for the
call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bruce, Carpentier, Chew, Clarke,
Davidson, Donnewald, Egan, Fawell, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley,
Johns, Knuppel, Latherow, Lyons, McCarthy, Newhouse, Ozinga...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

I'm just very inquisitive to the sponsor. On page 14,
line 9, what kind of a fish is that, Senator Collins?

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, thats apparently a scientific game phraseology.
And the same in the next line.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

The Secretary will continue with the call of the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Lyons, McCarthy, Newhouse, Ozinga, Palmer, Romano, Swinar-
ski, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Romano. Romano aye. On that question the yeas
are 33 the nays are one. The bill is declared passed. House
Bill 2663, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

...Bill for the conservation department.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any discussion on 2663? Senator Neistein?

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

What does it clarify?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, the conservation department has rewritten this particular provision of the law and I am not familiar with all the changes, but a short synopsis is, as it says, the amendment to House Bill 2663 clarifies language concerning game animals and mammals, establishes the Illinois standard shooting timetable, clarifies the definition of a water fowl hunting area permit making it less restrictive...The bill, but I am sure that there is no controversy over it. Same roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any further discussion on 2663? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Senator Collins is this the bill that establishes the uniform hunting time in Illinois?

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator Donnewald had some question on that and I understand that he has agreed to the bill, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

My question is, though, is this..., is this the bill that sets up the uniform hunting times?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, I don't know as I can answer that except in the short resume that they gave me of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

If it does I wish to stand in opposition to this bill. If it does not I do not wish to. It's a very long bill, I can't find it. It runs 63 pages.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

For Senator Bruce's edification, this is a good bill. I receive many many letters from my district on this and the people want it and I think this is a very very good bill. I checked with my staff, is Walter here? He isn't here just now, but I'd say the same roll call. I join Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Senator Collins, again I have one question. What is the fee for wild turkey life hunting license? Is it..., it's in this bill, I think.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

I wonder if the Senator would yield to a question. I wonder if that provision is in this bill where we Indians do not require a license to shoot these fowls?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Collins. Senator Soper.

SENATOR SOPER:

Mr. President, would the sponsor answer a question. First of all why do I have a cigar in this ashtray? I want to ask you that, I don't smoke these cigars. I resent that... Now I'll get on with the question. Now, is this, is this the bill that requires that you use an artificial or imitation call instead of a live turkey call? Well, how are you going to call a turkey?

I've seen many turkeys passed around here and we've got to know how to get rid of them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Carpentier.

SENATOR CARPENTIER:

Senator Collins, is this bill to clarify where the wild goose goes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry.

SENATOR CHERRY:

We were making a lot of fun of this bill and certainly there is no objection to that on occasion. I want those hunters to know, I'm not a hunter, but the bill provides, it has been amended and the amendment provides that any person who imports into Illinois wild or semi-domestic animals from other states for the purpose of providing hunting with bow and arrow or gun with or without dogs must obtain an exotic game hunting area permit. I want you to listen to the cost of this permit. It's a very minimal \$1,000. That's the only comment I want to make on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any further discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper,

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Soper.

SENATOR SOPER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Now we were having a lot of fun with this bill, but in order to answer the question or the comment made by Senator Cherry I would tell you that the purpose for that high fee is to protect exotic game that would be brought into this state that are not, that are not native to this state and be put into a game preserve and just be slaughtered. For instance, we have game preserves here where they raise pheasants and so forth that are natural to our environment and they are regular shooting farms; but they want to prevent people from bringing in elk or the way they have these..., maybe you've seen television where they had that buffalo slaughter. I guess the game is not native to Illinois. That's to prevent that sort of thing. That's why they made the game permit so high. So, I would urge you to think this thing over and vote for this bill. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Motion to postpone consideration? Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Chew, Donnewald, Dougherty, Fawell, Groen, Hall, Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Mr. President, this is a very comprehensive bill and I think any department which shoves a bill like this at us without any explanation or any summary deserves to have their bill defeated. Now this bill has not been properly explained and I

don't blame Senator Collins. Its a long complicated bill of some sixty-seven, sixty-three pages plus amendments. Now I think this ought to be held up until tomorrow and the department ought to give us a summary, a short summary of what it does so we all know what we are doing; because I can remember when they shoved at us another bill that had to do with the hooks, as you'll recall, along the river for the fisherman. And we got so much mail and telephone calls we had to rush back in here and amend it and correct it. So I think for that reason they ought to tell us what this bill does before we're called upon to cast our vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

...Senator Horsley, and let the conservation department get busy here and do a little explaining.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Motion to postpone consideration. Consideration will be postponed. House Bill 2209, Senator Saperstein.

SENATOR SAPERSTEIN:

Mr. President and Senators. House bill 2209 sponsored in the House by Representative Chapman and Dyer deals with unemployment compensation for pregnant women. It provides that women who are eligible for unemployment..., otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation shall not be denied unemployment compensation before..because of pregnancy. There was some question about the bill and Senator Sours presented the amendment which I think clarifies it thoroughly. I, therefore, move its adoption and seek your support..

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I want to say this in aid of Senator Saperstein's statement. The problem of pregnant women and employment becomes a real time killer not only for an employer but also for the board which ultimately hears some of these cases and this sort of narrows it down and limits the items of dispute. I think this is fair to the pregnant women, its fair to the woman who quits not because of pregnancy and its also fair to the employer. This is a good bill now, and I think so far as our side is concerned it does have virtue for an employer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any further discussion? Senator Saperstein may close the debate.

SENATOR SAPERSTEIN:

I think that the bill is a simple one. It has been clarified by the amendment and I just hope it receives your support. It is a bill and the situation that most women who are unemployed are supporting. And I think it will add to the stability of employed women.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Davidson aye. Collins aye. Saperstein aye. Sours aye. On that question the yeas are 45 the nays are none. The bill

is passed. Senator Hall. House bill 1314.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you Mr. President, members of the Senate. In answer to Senator Clarke's question over there, that the time we were discussing, we were talking about the adjustors. Senator Newhouse has a similar experience and I'd like to refer to him now and let him explain his...He has dealings with this particular... This is on bill 1314.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President, and I apologize for defending a bill when I did not have it before me. I have talked to Senator Laughlin and to Senator Knuepfer. The problem here is that after a fire or damage to a house, the adjustor comes out to the house and there has to be emergency service, hook-ups and so forth. In the authorization of these hook-ups there is sometimes a contract preferred for the total construction afterwards, and it's this contract that we want to have the opportunity to avoid in the event that one decides that it isn't the contractor that they'd like to do business with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any further discussion? Senator Walker.

SENATOR WALKER:

Is this bill back on the call, Mr. President? 1314? Representative Hall, I have a communication here from the Illinois Bar Association, and I haven't always gone along with all their recommendations nor of the Chicago Bar Association, but they do have a reference in here that the bill references in this report are those which have been introduced by organizations other than the Illinois State Bar and the Chicago Bar Association and we hope this report may be helpful to you in considering

the mass of legislation pending before you. And I noticed that the recommendation of the Illinois State Bar Association that 1314 do not pass. Could you or Senator Newhouse advise me as to what their opposition to this bill is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Hall. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I have no idea Senator. As a matter of fact, based upon my experience I would consider that a recommendation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any further discussions?

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I would consider that a further reason for voting for the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER (ROCK)

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well, I have this statement from the Bar Association do not pass and that does not trouble me. But what does trouble me is that this bill ought to have, it seems to me, if its going to be capable of enforcement, the same kind of amendment that we put on the other bill that's in this same vain which relates to ambulance chasing, for the lack of a better expression. And if we would put that same amendment on it I think we would be a lot better off. Senator Horsley is the one who was interested in that other amendment and we put it together and I think we can do it again. We should have the same kind of amendment here to clarify this bill because it is not in the tightest language form. To put it another way, it's sloppy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

I'd be happy to hold the bill and have such an amendment put on it.

PRESIDENT: (ROCK)

The bill will be held. House Bills on first reading. Yes. Turn to page two of the calendar, house bills on first reading. 1555 is mine and has been moved to second. House bill 2128. House bill 2346, Phillip Collins. 2532, Representative Mann. Senator Coulson. 2562 through 2565, Representative Friedland. 2646. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

I'd like leave to move Senate Bill 2646 to second reading. I talked to Senator Partee about it's exactly the same as a bill that passed out of this body last year, Senate Bill 261.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

House bills on first reading. House bill 2646, Senator Partee. There has been a request that this be moved to second reading without reference to committee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

What does it do? Tell me about it, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Senator, I believe this has been cleared with your staff its exactly the same as Senate Bill 2...it's the same as Senate bill 261. I understand you have given your consent to moving it to second reading on those grounds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Earlier today, Mr. Chairman and Senators....

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Sours, is this with regard to 2646?

SENATOR SOURS:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Excuse me, we're not quite finished with that. Senator Pattee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

If Senator Knuepfer would tell me briefly what it does, because nobody seems to know here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

It is related to dental assistants. Dental hygienists, dentists, and the dental assistants which presently are presently practicing. If you...Senator, if its important to go to Committee, it can. I understood it had been cleared through you and that was...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

I remember the bill now. I talked to a Miss Percel who is the lobbyist for that group and I did make that arrangement. It's all right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

If this bill is the same as one that's already passed or the same as another bill, what do we need this bill for? It'll just clutter up the calendar. Or does Dr. Douglas want pride of authorship as the dentist to take care of the dentists?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

In the last minute scramble in the House there was some cause, some interparty fight, that caused Senate bill 261 to go down the drain. It did not pass, and this is a revival of that. That's the reason that it didn't pass, and that's the reason we need it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE: Is the motion to by-pass Committee and go to second

without reference?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

That's that's what's before us.

SENATOR BRUCE:

I make an objection to that. Whoever..., however we need, I make that objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

If there is objection, we'll have it heard in Committee. I don't want to take anybody's time. I don't have any objection testifying in Committee in behalf of it. So be it. Let 'er go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

3080 and 3081. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

I've just been informed of another problem. There is no Welfare Committee meeting. Now that puts this bill in limbo and I would like to get it out of limbo, and that's the only reason that I have asked for this. Now, if Senator Smith wants to call another Welfare Committee meeting or if there is some other way I can get this bill moved, I would be very happy to. Can you send it to a Committee that is going to have a meeting, even though it may not be pertinent to that Committee's activities? If it hadn't been heard before, I wouldn't ask for this; but it has been heard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Senator Knuepfer, what is the urgency on this bill? As I understand, this is the one about exempting oral hygienists from the bill. I remember the newspapers tore out after that bill and said that we shouldn't do this and this is just to take care of a certain segment. And so what's the urgency? I mean

who wants this bill? I didn't get one letter on this Bill. Nobody in my district says this is earthshaking. I thought we were here to pass Governor vetoes and to pass ethics and implied consent and that criminal code. I didn't know that taking care of some oral hygienist and getting him exempted from the bill is so important to the people of the sovereign State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Well, Senator, I think it's less for the oral hygienist. It simply permits the use of dental assistants which are neither dentists nor oral hygienists. I think it ought to be passed at this session. I'm willing to have it be heard even by Judiciary, Senator Neistein, if that would be the proper place to put it. But I would like to get a hearing, if at all possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Well the question is, I would assume you would have to take this up with the Assignment Committee. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Can I only ask, if you insist on having a hearing. I don't object to the hearing. I would simply ask the Committee on Assignments then to please assign it to some committee that meets tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry indicates that will be done. House bill 3080 and 3081. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. Representative Barry ask me to handle these bills. These are highway easements in the county of Henry and I'd like to have the rules suspended and move this from first reading to second reading without

reference to a committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Partee there is a request before the floor to move House bills 3080 and 3081 to second reading without reference.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Ah! Leave.

PRESIDING OFFICER (ROCK)

It will be done. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Senator Partee, these are two bills that were given to me by Representative Barry and they're highway easements in Henry County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

It's ok. No problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

House bill 3543. House bill 3545. House bill 3621. House bill 3622. House bill 3660. Senator Romano.

SENATOR ROMANO:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. This is a pension bill that ah...for the General Assembly and I would like to move this second reading without reference. This has the approval of the Pension Laws Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Second reading. 3621 and 3622. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you Mr. President and members of the Senate. President, I would like to have leave that these bills...I've checked with the Chairman of the Appropriation Committee and all. I would like to have leave that they might be advanced to second reading without reference to a committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

3621 and 3622. There's a request that they be moved to second reading without reference to a committee. Any objections? Senator Sours. There is objection. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Now did I understand that there is objection to these bills by-passing committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

There was an objection raised by Senator Sours. Yes, sir.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well I, of course, cannot influence whoever objected, but I would say this about these bills and I think maybe you ought to know this before you make that kind of precipitous move. These are bills which came at the suggestion of the Governor of this state. The Governor of this state made a promise in East St. Louie during a certain Mayor's Campaign down there, when he came on behalf of the person who was eventually the successful candidate, that he was going to build this building down in East St. Louie and we want to help him do that. He said he was going to do it so we want to be on the side with him to help him do it. So that is why we're not objecting it go to second reading and we're gonna vote for him. Now that's just the reason, sir, and I want you to know that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I haven't changed my position.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

May I have leave to have them heard this afternoon? Leave to be assigned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any objection to have them...to having them heard this afternoon. So ordered. 3660. Senator Romano. 3690 and 3691 Representative Harpstrite. Senator Harris. 3707, Representative Blades. 3708 through 3715. Senator Clarke. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I'm suppose to be the sponsor of these bills and I understand the Revenue Department has talked to Senator Partee. These are bills having to do with the relationship with the Auditor General the Revenue Department regarding the confidentiality. They just want these in order to protect themselves from possible prosecution and I'd like to..., understood that they talked to Senator Partee about advancing to second reading. I'd like to ask if that's alright.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

3708 through 3715. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Are these bills...they are appropriation measures are they? They are Revenue measures? What committee were they ordinarily assigned to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Clarke:

SENATOR CLARKE:

Ah!, there just on the first reading. They don't have appropriations in them. They are just matter...

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well, let me say, I spoke to the young lady who is the second in charge of the department and I told her at that time that I thought we would move them to second reading without reference. Since I've spoken with her we've had, not a second thought, but I've had some conferences, some members on my side who want

to see the bills. There are members on this side and perhaps on that side who are a little suspect of anything the Department of Revenue wants to do. I don't have that problem with these bills but I do have to recognize that there are members who do. So I think we'll let them go to committee. If we could get unanimous consent to have them heard today, I think it would speed along the process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Can I inquire as to what committee they would go to?

SENATOR PARTEE:

Executive I would think. There is a meeting of Executive today. We could send them to Executive. It's a policy consideration.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Alright.

PRESIDING OFFICER (ROCK)

So ordered. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Mr. President, I undoubtedly was distracted when we were on House bills second reading and I wonder if I might have the privilege of calling 2732 and offering the amendment which was requested in committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I just wanted to inquire as to whether we got unanimous leave to waive the time period and have them set for Executive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Yes. It was so ordered. Senator Berning has requested House bill 2732 on second reading and he's offering an amendment. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

This...Mr. President and members of the Senate. The amendment to 2732 is in conformance with that requested by the members on the other side and your advisor Mr. Swartz and in fact its his amendment and I would move for the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning has moved the adoption of amendment number one to House bill 2732. Is there any objection, any discussion? Senator, Senator Cherry.

SENATOR CHERRY:

Are we on 2732?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

We are.

SENATOR CHERRY:

And Senator Berning is seeking to amend the bill? Do we have a copy of the amendment or what does the amendment do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Yes, a copy of the amendment is on the way over. This is the amendment which was agreed to in committee and was drafted by, in essence, by your Mr. Swartz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

I'm told there's a committee amendment on this also, Senator Berning. Senator Dougherty. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Mr. President. Senator Berning did submit the amendment to me, but I in turn filed the original amendment to be offered was the usual home rule amendment. However, Senator Berning had another amendment drafted that to some degree did make a home rule application, but the language is such that our staff was not completely satisfied that it does that completely. Is

this the amendment that Mr. Swartz gave to you? The second amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Senator Dougherty, the original amendment drafted by the Department, which I submitted to you, was amended by Mr. Swartz. We then proceeded to redraw the amendment to incorporate Mr. Swartz' recommendations and that's what has now been given to the Secretary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I would agree because I see therein "or Park District or successor thereof." That means any, if we would revert..ownership would revert later on to protect them also. I would agree it's a good amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning we still have to dispose of the committee amendment. Is there...?

SECRETARY:

Amendment number one by the Committee on Local Government.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning moves the adoption of amendment number 1.

SENATOR BERNING:

That's correct. And now this is amendment number 2. I will take up with Senator Dougherty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

And this will be amendment number 2. Amendment number 1 is adopted and amendment number 2 has been moved...Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Just a moment now. Senator Berning you are putting the

home rule amendment also...is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Amendment number 2. The one I just gave you. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

The committee amendment that we agreed upon was that we would apply the home rule amendment, as we call it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning. Senator Berning, I wonder if we might hold this until tomorrow.

SENATOR BERNING:

It's my understanding from ah, talking to Mr. Swartz and to you, Senator Dougherty, that this amendment does accomplish that being with out saying home rule because it says no district may include any part of any territory of any forest preserve district or park district or successor thereof for any land which was leased from the Department. In other words, it excludes everything else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Berning, I wonder if you would get together with Senator Dougherty and we could put this on tomorrow.

SENATOR BERNING:

Alright.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Fine. House bill...there's been a request for House Bill on third reading. House Bill 3556. Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. In order to facilitate cleaning up the calander I would like to dispose of House bill 3556 which is Senator Hynes bill in the House. It

appropriates \$164.00 to a constituent under the Veterans Bonus act in World War I. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

On that question the yeas are 45 the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. Resolutions. Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

President, earlier today I'd asked to call House bill 1463 and we had some discussion of it among ourselves about some possible error in the bill. This has been clarified through the first amendment. Now the bill that this is talking about is the triple saddle mount bill that we introduced and had left on the calander at the end of the session. I think we've removed all objections to that and then last week we took amendment number 2 to it which was put on by Senator Course that has to do with the overall length of a trailer not to exceed 45 feet. I'd appreciate a favorable roll call on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any discussion? House bill 1463. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill,

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Nihill.

SENATOR NIHILL:

Mr. President and Senators. This bill has been up for... This is the third year. There was an assertion made here on the amendment here a short time ago that the unions was with this bill. That is not true. It is not true. Somebody on the air says the unions are with this bill. This bill, if it's passed, there is a lot..I wish I would have some order here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Yes, Senator. Senator is entitled to be heard.

SENATOR NIHILL:

For every 100..., for every 100 trucks if this is passed you will loose 7 drivers. For 10,000 trucks you will loose 73 drivers. The additional load will be put on there. You get into/Chicago or any big city or small city you better get back off the curb when they're making a turn. They'll run over your feet. This is a bad bill. This here bill smells to the high heavens, as high as you can go. This is a drastic bill. Use your own conscience. You gotta live with it for a long time and I'd like to see, like I heard Senator Groen say one day here what judge gave the injunction where certain parts of the State can run this...where these trucks can come in...certain trucks. This bill...suit yourself...I know how I'm gonna vote. I'm voting no. You gotta live with your conscience, I don't I live with my own. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Fawell aye. Senator Course.

SENATOR COURSE:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. This is a good bill and I did not misrepresent anything when I said that the unions had no objections to this lengthening of the trailer. They have withdrawn their objections...they do not object to it. Now this is a great benefit to the farmers of the state of Illinois. Now, Senator Nihill, being an old meat man, he knows the cost of meat today and if this can reduce the cost of meat one cent a pound I think this is worth it. It's a benefit to the farmers of the state of Illinois. And it's not only a benefit to the farmers of the state of Illinois its a benefit to the people who are hauling commodities that have no weight. They do not exceed the limit of the truck, but because of the bulk they are forced to reduce the size of their loads. This three feet will give them an advantage to compete with the out-of-state truckers. Now you have been informed before that there were injunctions...
PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Are you explaining your vote, Senator?

SENATOR COURSE:

Well, its a good bill and I would appreciate your favorable vote on this bill, Ladies and Gentlemen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Call the absentees, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Berning, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Davidson, Groen, Hall, Harris, Hynes, Johns, Kosinski, Kusibab, Lyons, Mohr, Palmer, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Swinarski, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Move to postpone consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Latherow. Senator Latherow. On that question the yeas are 30 the nays are 4 and the bill is declared passed. Senator Carpentier. Senator Carpentier moves to reconsider. Senator Latherow moves to table. Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Before you get on to resolutions I would like to have leave to call Senate bill 1286 back from third reading to second for the purposes of tabling an amendment and adopting a new one. I move...do I have leave to call it back to second?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senate bill...

SENATOR GILBERT:

1286.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senate bill 1286.

SENATOR GILBERT:

This is the bill for Southern Illinois University. Senator Hynes is familiar with this. I would move to reconsider the vote by which amendment number 1 was adopted for purpose of tabling the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Gilbert has moved to reconsider the vote by which amendment was..., number one on Senate bill 1286 was adopted. Any objections? So ordered.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Now I move to table the amendment. Now I move to adopt... now I move to adopt amendment number 2. I've given a copy of

this to Senator Hynes. The import of this amendment is to strike \$1,100,000 from the appropriation which was the money that would have been allowed them to spend from tuition funds. There will be no tuition money allowed to be spent in this appropriation and I move the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Is there any discussion, any objection? The amendment is adopted.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Now back to third reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Third reading. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate resolution 255 by Senator Neistein. Consent Calendar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

We have...Senator Cherry.

SENATOR CHERRY:

We have three committee meetings. The first of which was scheduled to be at 1:30, the Executive Committee. We have some important bills and I'll now move that we adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator, I wonder if we could hold that for just a minute. We have got two motions, requests for...motions...

SENATOR CHERRY:

We were going to work until noon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator, can we hold that a minute? We have got 3 requests for motions and I'm told they're brief. Senator Saperstein.

SENATOR SAPERSTEIN:

Mr. President and Senators. I would like consent to have a Senate bills 1312, 1313 and 1314 heard before the Appropriations

Committee at 3:30 on the Senate floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President, Senators. I should like to make the proper motion with reference to House bill number 3596, which came over today on a message, to have it referred immediately to Judiciary to be heard tomorrow and I'll tell you what the bill does in one sentence. It changes the term illegitimate with reference to a child in the probate act to anti-nuptial child.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any objection? So ordered. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Mr. President, I asked for the time to make a motion. I'll withhold that motion, but I would like to, because of the time factor, but I would like to make an inquiry of the leadership on both sides. Senator Groen's off the floor. House bill 1568, there has been a committee that worked a long time to put this in some kind of shape. They have gotten an agreement within the industry to support an amendment to the bill to get it out of here. The fellas over in the House who worked on it and got it out want the bill. We're in the waning days of the session. With this amendment it's going to have to go back over to the House and I would just like to make an inquiry whether or not this bill is going to be called.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Groen is the sponsor and he's off the floor. I don't know...

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

But the Senate Sponsor says he's holding it because one Senator objects to the bill and I'm wondering if the leadership on both sides have objection to this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator, I think this would be more properly addressed to Senator Groen, Senator.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Alright, well I want to get it into the record and I have addressed it to Senator Groen and Senator Groen's says to me that he is holding up the bill because of this side because of opposition of one individual. That doesn't make any sense to me at all. It's an extremely important bill and I think it ought to be heard and voted up or down. Now, Mr. President I want to serve notice, I want to serve notice now...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I'm aware that Senator Groen intends to call that bill. We've talked about it in our caucus within the last 48 hours.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Newhouse for the purpose for serving notice of motion, I guess.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Yes, I want to serve notice, Mr. President, that I will move to take Senate bills 450 and 451 from the table. I want to give you the courtesy of notice on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry has moved that we adjourn until....

SENATOR CHERRY:

One o'clock tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry moves that we adjourn until one o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

SENATOR CHERRY:

And the Executive Committee meeting scheduled for room 212 will be heard in the Senate Chamber.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Motion to adjourn, any...Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Just want to remind the membership that tomorrow will be

the last day we'll work this week and that we have reversed the schedule and the committee hearings will be in the morning.

Transportation and Local Government meeting at 9:00 and Judiciary at 11:00 and that the session will commence at 1:00.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry has moved to adjourn. The Senate stands adjourned until...can we, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Mr. President, I, and members of the Senate. I understand the objection to moving my bills to second reading without reference to committee has been withdrawn and I'd like to have approval of the body on that. On House bills 3621 and 3622.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Any objection? So ordered. Senator Bidwill.

SENATOR BIDWILL:

I wish to announce there will not be a Republican caucus tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Just an announcement to the members because you may be receiving telephone calls from judges around your respective districts this evening about what has happened to the judicial pay raise. The House refused today to concur with the Governor's revisionary veto. Now the effect of that is, that the bill is now returned to us. By the new Constitution we now have the option of overriding the Governor's veto on that matter which means the bill would be passed as we passed it out before he revised it and that revision was reduced the pay of magistrates. But I believe you may receive some telephone calls this evening. If we do not override that veto or unless other legislation is introduced; no judge, not just the magistrates, but no judge of

Illinois will receive a pay raise. They will all stay at the pay they now have except for the Associate Judges who became Circuit Judges. I only tell you that because I believe some of the willy nilly judges may call you this evening inquiring about that. It will be on the news this evening I am sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (ROCK)

Senator Cherry has moved we adjourn. The Senate stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.