

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives  
The House will convene in five minutes. All persons  
not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the  
gallery."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and  
the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy  
service this day. Amen. Monday of next...week next,  
is Memorial Day, therefore let us observe this  
commemoration in our prayers today. It is written in  
the 12th Chapter of the 2nd Book of Maccabees: In those  
day, the noble Judas made a gathering throughout the  
company and sent it to Jerusalem, in that he was mindful  
of the resurrection: for if he had not hoped that they  
that were slain should have risen again, it had been  
superflous and vain to pray for the dead. Let us pray.  
Almighty God, our heavenly Father, in whose hands are  
the living and the dead; We give Thee thanks for all  
those Thy servants who have laid down their lives in the  
service of our country. Grant to them Thy mercy and  
the light of Thy presence, that the good work which Thou  
hast begun in them may be perfected; through Jesus  
Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ropp in the Pledge of  
Allegiance."

Ropp: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States  
of America and to the Republic, for which it stands,  
one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and  
justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Only your own  
switch. Have all voted who are here? Take the record.  
Give me the sheet. Dump this Roll Call. Senate Bills,  
First Reading."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 30, Farley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 44, Cullerton. A Bill for an Act to restrict licensure to operate an ambulatory surgical treatment center. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 47, Cullerton. A Bill for an Act in relation to abortions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 80, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 123, Kornowicz. A Bill for an Act relating to wages of employees. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 140, Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 154, Katz. A Bill for an Act to recompense criminal victims. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 172, Totten. A Bill for an Act to reallocate state use and occupation taxes on motor fuel to the state road fund. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 930, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 955, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to regulation of the rivers, lakes and streams. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1086, Currie. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1110, Currie. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1200, Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act creating the Municipal Housing Finance Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1360, Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1389, Pierce. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1404, Mulcahey. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "We decided to go from that list we had yesterday. And if you have any noncontroversial matters that we're not on...let's try...the first one would be ...House Bill 926. Representative Schlickman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 926. A Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. A new day has dawned. House Bill 926 amends the Senior Citizens Circuit Breaker Act. As you know under the present law, a person may not qualify for a grant until the year following the individual's 65th birthday. On the other hand, a person at 65 receives and is entitled to Social Security benefits. What House Bill 926 does is to provide that the senior citizen will commence receiving his grant at age 65...the intent of the Act and the desire of senior citizens wanting to receive that to which they are entitled upon becoming 65. An Amendment was offered in Committee which eliminated the objection, the opposition of the Department of Revenue. The Bill was reported out of Committee by a vote of 22 to 0 and is in accord with the principle of House Bill 1408 which this House passed the day before yesterday by 139 'aye' votes. I solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 837. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I'd like to put House Bill 2275 on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "That's not the motion here Representative



Waddell. It will be taken care of automatically.  
837."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 837. A Bill for an Act to amend  
the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

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

In the 79th General Assembly we enacted a law which said that departments could have flexible scheduling in up to 10% of their positions. Flexible scheduled jobs are jobs which are conducted in a different schedule than the ordinary work schedule or are part time jobs or are shared time jobs. And the Bureau of Employment Security and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation have had excellent experience with it and are now up to their 10%. This Bill would take off that limit but would require that the Department of Personnel evaluate their effectiveness and efficiency and authorize them if they want to go to 20%. And then again, if the Department gets to 20% they have to again go and be evaluated by Personnel in order to be authorized to go beyond that. It says the Director of each department will establish goals. Now those goals could be very low, as low as 0 as a matter of fact, if it was a small agency where flexible time simply was not efficient. But they will establish these goals with the Director of the Department of Personnel so that when this will enhance efficiency and effectiveness in state government this will be a procedure that will be established as a goal. This was very carefully worked out in Committee. It's supported by the Department of Personnel, the Department of Public Aid and so forth. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'ayes' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 179. Representative Pierce. 179."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 179. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 179 is an important Bill. It passed Revenue Committee, I think unanimously. It produces a level of assessment for real estate in Illinois from 33% of fair market value to 25% of fair market value. It's needed in these times of fast inflation, fast growth. We worked out an Amendment with Representative Skinner that...that does moderate the impact to a considerable extent by using a one year average rather than a three year average, that's Amendment #2. What the Bill does is recognize that with the great inflation of home values the 33 1/3% fair market value level has cost state equalizers to be put on property in counties...in counties that do not classify...real estate...that is counties other than Cook, that has caused considerable damage to homeowners. With the current levels of assessment around the state this will not cause much of a reduction in real estate assessments, but at least it will cause them to remain about where they are with maybe some slight reductions. This Bill is endorsed by the Lake County Board, by the Lake County Board of Review and by the County Board. It is endorsed by taxpayer groups throughout our area and I ask that the House give me support because it is certainly my important Bill of this Session...my most important Bill of this Session...to vote for House Bill 179."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those



in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Sponsor of this measure has done a good job of explaining it. But we must, and I would reiterate you should be aware that by the approval of this Bill we will be reducing the property tax base of all of our local governments from the current 33 and 1/3% to 25%. This is a pretty important piece of legislation and when you can...when you consider the number of units of local government and our schools which will be effected."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I think Representative Ewing's words ought to be very well considered because when you get home the 'taxeaters' of the world are going to be screaming bananas if this Bill passes. Now I'm voting for this Bill and it does...but it doesn't do quite as much as Representative Ewing would have you believe. It only cuts the tax base by 12% statewide."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 97 'aye' and 19 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1261. Representative Currie."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1261. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1261 is a clean-up Bill. It cleans up the emergency aid program operated by the Department of Public Aid and it cleans up the questionable uses of the Public Assistants Emergency Revolving Fund. First is to the substance, the Bill does not change the eligibility standards for the program. It is concerned with AFDC eligible families. What it is concerned to do



is to provide a timely manner for department response to people who have critical need for food, clothing and shelter. Currently the Department of Public Aid response to people in emergency situations is little, is late, is sometimes not at all. 1261 establishes firm time limits for the departmental response. A 24-hour period for critical response to need for food, clothing and shelter. It permits the department to contract out on weekends and on holidays with private and public social service agencies. For less critical emergencies, we've established a five day limit for the department to respond. This is a Bill which now has, with Amendments, support from the Department. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye' and 10 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 745. Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 745. A Bill for an Act to amend..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "...to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to take this back to Second Reading, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't hear you."

Pullen: "May I have leave please to take this back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections..."

Pullen: "No, wait...wait, wait. I just remembered today is the day, isn't it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, it is."

Pullen: "Well, okay, I'll run with the Bill then."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Explain the Bill."

Pullen: "House Bill 745 would make changes in the way that school boards can issue working cash fund bonds. Currently if a school board wishes to issue working cash fund bonds they are subject to a backdoor referendum. The signature requirement for that is 20% of the registered voters in 10 days. This is absolutely impossible. It makes the law a joke. House Bill 745..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, for what purpose do you rise? Okay, go ahead, Representative Pullen, my mistake."

Pullen: "Thank you. House Bill 745 would change the signature requirements to 10% of the registered voters and would extend the period for filing to 30 days. This is the same provision as would take place for the issuance of other types of bonds. The Bill was approved by the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education by a vote of 15 to...I don't recall the vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "None."

Pullen: "...it was ahead 15 to nothing, yes. Now I remember. I'm getting it mixed up with another, 15 to nothing. There was an Amendment put on on Second Reading which I have informed the Chairman I will have removed in the Senate because this was not in accordance with my intentions when I introduced the Bill or when it came out of Committee. I would urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill...Representative Anderson. Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "For a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Anderson: "Penny, the Amendment you're talking about removing is that the one where the recreation of the fund takes a referendum or what?"

Pullen: "There was an Amendment put on which would require the local districts to update their education tax levy



by the same amount."

Anderson: "What about the one, once the fund is used that you have to...if you want to recreate it, you have to go to a referendum?"

Pullen: "Well, I do...I have not had a discussion with anyone about that Amendment, but the..."

Anderson: "You're going to leave that one on, Amendment 3?"

Pullen: "Depending upon the will of the House and the Senate."

Anderson: "But you're not going to try and take it off yourself over there?"

Pullen: "No."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Unknown: "Three is not on?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope it isn't necessary to ask that we open this up to full debate in order to kill this Bill. This Bill in its present form would never have been approved by the House Education Committee. The form in which it came out of the House Education Committee called for a backdoor referendum and it was a little Bill to which none of us had any objection. But once on the floor, the Sponsor accepted an Amendment to put it back in its original form. A form in which it clearly would not have been approved by the House Education Committee...and I heard Representative Walsh say the Sponsor has no objection to this Bill. On the floor the Sponsor accepted an Amendment which put a frontdoor referendum back in to this Bill. This...this is not..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen..."

Chapman: "I'd like to have some demonstration that is isn't true."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen, I would suggest..."

Chapman: "I would represent..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen, I'd suggest that you



take it out of the record. You don't want to go on Postponed Consideration cause you can only do that once. And talk to Representative Chapman and...if we can straighten it out. You say she's wrong, she say's she..."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Bill that says anything about a frontdoor referendum."

Speaker Redmond: "Talk to Representative Chapman and convince her and we'll come back to it."

Pullen: "I would like..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm trying to tell you there's no way you can get 89 votes on it. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "When are you going to get back to Representative Pullen's Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "I said...I said that I would get back, Representative Ryan. And I don't need any encouraging from you, I said I'd get back there."

Ryan: "I don't care what you would...what you figure you need from me. I...Representative Pullen wanted to run with this Bill. I want to know if she's going to get a call on it today or..."

Speaker Redmond: "She will be called on it. She will be called on sooner if you'll be very quiet. 1302."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1302. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Interest Rate Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't take up a lot of your time on 1302. A lot of you have received mail from your constituents in the district in reference to the Installment Loan Interest Act and it basically clears up some of the discrepancies in the Act and makes money more viable for people to borrow. And I'd ask for your favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'."



Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 13 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2354. Representative Gene Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2354. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2354 amends the State Finance Act to limit the lapse period expenditures to the payment of liability incurred for goods and services received during the fiscal year. I...this Bill is one of the series of Bills that will be coming up and has been recommended to the General Assembly by the Comptroller's office and or by the Auditor General...in this series. I would move for the adoption of House Bill 2354 and would solicit the House support and stand for any questions relative to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 0 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2356."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2356. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2356 allows the Comptroller, upon approval of the State Treasurer, to transfer money within the same fund between funds without the use of the voucher warranty system. This is really a clean-up measure. What it does is to allow the transfer on magnetic tapes, which I understand is the current



practice within the office. And I would solicit the support of the House on House Bill 2356."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2355."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2355. A Bill for Act to amend an Act in relation to uncollectible claims and accounts receivable of state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2355 amends an Act in relationship to uncollectible claims and accounts receivable and it permits the Attorney General to authorize the Comptroller to remove claims of 100 dollars or less which are more than 3 years old where collection is not economically feasible. And also permits the removal of other claims which are unlikely to be collected for any reason. This is again a recommendation Bill offered by the Comptroller, a recommendation by the Auditor General and I would solicit the support of the House on House Bill 2355."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 0 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2603. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, by way of information, could you tell us or give us some idea to what schedule you're going to



follow today?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll probably..."

Collins: "I'm not trying...."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll probably go to no debate as soon as I get through with this list, Third Reading, no debate."

Collins: "Alright, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Pro...Representative Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 26...."

Speaker Redmond: "2603. 2603."

Barnes: "Thank you very much...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2603. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2603 amends the State Finance Act... Act creating the Bureau of the Budget and adds and defines the printing and items of budget and appropriations. It provides for an electronic data processing to be treated as a function within the line item...break down the funds to provide for that purpose. This Act is effective January 1st of 1980. It was amended. The amendatory language added that no expenditures may be made for electronic data processing from such lines. They deleted the language providing that data processing is treated as a function within a line break down of funds provided for the purpose. This was a recommendation of both the Comptroller's office and the Auditor General's office and I would solicit the support of the House on House Bill 2603."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 0 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2213. Representative



Gene Hoffman. Ebbesen on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2213. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2213 is to some degree a clean-up Bill from the special education legislation that we had last Session in regards to conforming with 94142, the federal legislation. House Bill 2213 is introduced at the request of the Illinois Office of Education. The contents of the Bill which there was some disagreement have been worked out by the Illinois Office of Education and the Illinois Association of Retired Citizens and another small group of people I put together in a Subcommittee...kind of setting with Representative Satterwaite being Chairman. What it provides is that a school district is not financially responsible for a handicapped child that attends another district unless it has placed that child in another district program. It puts the financial responsibility on any individual and agency that causes the child to reside in another school district other than in the district of residence. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "There's a comment or is it literally a question. How would this effect those 20 or 30 school districts that provides students to submit?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "In terms of our discussion in regards to submit it wouldn't change that relationship any in terms of the financial support. This has to do with students who are placed by agencies other than the school district in residential facilities from let's one area of the state into another area of the state and the sending



school district becomes the responsible district for the educational costs. It doesn't effect the other cost."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 4. Representative Ebbesen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4. A Bill for an Act to require truth in advertising. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4 is what you might call a watered down version of House Bill 2626 that this House passed out of here that got locked up in the Rules over in the Senate last Session. And in its present form, it came out of the Judiciary I Committee as amended unanimously and the Bill...I worked with the Attorney General's Office, the Consumer Fraud Division, to put the Bill in a posture that would comply with the Federal Trade Commission regulations. And the Attorney General.. I'll just quote from his testimony in Committee and he has said that the Attorney General submits that the advertising requirements of House Bill 4 are necessary to prevent deception and unfairness and unreasonable... and are reasonable and not burdening to the dissemination of information. Now the Attorney General Consumer Fraud Division does recommend this Bill for passage. It's something in the past years since the advertising in this particular field has become much more blatant, there's much more room for fraud in advertising and he finds it is necessary to have this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman." Bowman.



Bowman: "Could I ask a question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "What are the penalties for violation?"

Ebbesen: "Well I don't have a copy of the Bill here, but I ...the penalties for violation are...let's see, any optometrist or physician convicted...convicted of a violation of this Act is guilty of a business offense and shall not be fined less than 5 thousand dollars in addition there to shall be subject to revocation of his license as such an optometrist requisition and of course there's a category in there for the optician or the manufacturer of optomic lenses with the same penalty."

Bowman: "Okay, thanks. This...if I can speak to the Bill briefly, that...that was the one provision of House Bill 2626 of last year that I had a problem with. It seems like not less than 5 thousand dollars is...is awfully...high minimum fine and may very well make optometrists a little nervous about advertising at all. And...and so I think that...that's a little imprudent. I would hope that if this gets over to the Senate that that could be cut down a bit. It seems to me a thousand dollars or 2 thousand dollars. . . would be adequate."

Ebbesen: "I'd be very happy to take that in to consideration to the Senate, but I will say this, if it makes them a little nervous, it should if they're advertising fraudulently."

Bowman: "Well, they should be advertis...I mean, the point is that that we want advertising in order to give consumers an idea of what's going on in order to give consumers a basis for making comparisons. If there is no advertising at all then we're back with the same kind of situation we had before the FPC ruling. So...I think they should be nervous but I sure think that they should not be petrified to the point of not...of not advertising."



at all. And that's my main problem with the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like...and I think I have some serious reservations about this Bill and I wonder if ten people would join me in taking it off Short Debate?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's...what's the..."

Stanley: "I asked if ten people would join me in taking House Bill 4 off Short Debate. I have some questions about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, ask your questions."

Stanley: "Representative Ebbesen, isn't this Bill just really a bag for the optometrist to prohibit Sears and other companies from using mass marketing techniques for the purpose of selling eye glasses that in most instances are cheaper than they are from the ones you buy from an optometrist?"

Ebbesen: "Representative, what do you think about that? You answer that for me."

Stanley: "I'm asking you that question. You're the Sponsor of the Bill."

Ebbesen: "The answer is no."

Stanley: "I would encourage, Ladies and Gentlemen, a 'no' vote on this. The Federal Trade Commission has rules now and the Attorney General all he has to do is enforce those particular rules. I say this Bill is not necessary and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Alright. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just would say that I worked for a year with the Attorney General's office. They were opposed to the original legislation that was much stronger than this one that passed out of here a year ago. And he finds this necessary to...in this particular category and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."



H865

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 19 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.  
65. Representative Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 65. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 65 passed this House with 118 votes four years ago and 117 votes two years ago. It is a Bill that says that we cannot classify Americans by any artificial standards, that we cannot use age as a standard and lump America...and lump people by any standard other than their own individual characteristics and their own individual abilities. Mandatory retirement has a most dilatory effect on the emotions of people as well as on their physical well being. Older workers...older workers are well able to carry their share and the standard of older workers should be the standard of younger workers. Can they do the job? Companies like U.S. Steel, companies like Banker's Life have long ago rid themselves of mandatory retirement based on age alone. More than 15 states have passed similar legislation. This Bill was the first one filed in this country, in the American Legislature, five years ago...six years ago. And I hope that it will pass today...it's been bogged down in the Senate. And since the federal actions have been taken, we have changed somewhat the importance of this. It is even more crucial because unless this Bill passes the Fair Employment Practice Commission will not have any kind of vehicle to...to hear age discrimination cases. I have made Amendments to the Bill which are



...sweeping in a sense, different and have essentially put in to meet the demands of the business community. I've tried to meet those demands by my Amendment. I ask that you vote for House Bill 65 and end mandatory retirement in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

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

Representative Greiman, two years ago you had this Bill in my recollection at that time it applied only to the private sector, is that correct?"

Greiman: "That's right, Harry."

Leinenweber: "It's my understanding that the Bill now applies to the public and the private sector."

Greiman: "That's correct, Harry. You raised that point yourself and...I read the transcript from last year and I took many of the points that were raised in the debate, even though it had a great number of votes, and I..."

Leinenweber: "This would apply to all units of local government and the State of Illinois?"

Greiman: "That's right, absolutely."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not really...I would not be in opposition to the Bill. I was two years ago because I thought it was grossly unfair for us to push something onto the private sector when we weren't ... as Representative Greiman now recognizes that the private sector ought to be treated no differently than the public sector from the employment point of view. I would certainly urge support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterwaihthe."

Satterwaihthe: "Just a moment of the House's time. I see that the Bill has a lot of support, but I wanted to mention that today in Champaign a 92 year-old old woman is being ...feeded at her birthday party. She is still working



15 to 18 hours a week in a clothing store where she has worked for a long time. She's very complimentary to her employer who was open-minded enough to keep her on because she is still able to do her job. And I think that sets a good precedent."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 350. Representative Stearney."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3..."

Speaker Redmond: "Jack, be on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 350. A Bill for an Act to amend Criminal pro...Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 350 would amend the Criminal Code as to the provision regarding searches and seizures. This is an off-shoot of an expansion on Representative Greiman's Bill which passed out of the House here approximately 1 month ago. However, it goes one step further and that is that it extends to the individual citizen the same privileges that it would extend to the press. And if I may say, this here...case revolves around the situation of a Stanford-Zircher decision in which certain items and records were seized from a newspaper office without a prior hearing. And the court ...and the Bill tries to rectify that by providing that in certain situations the...the authorities should proceed by subpoena duces tecum rather than a warrant. So...for those reasons I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote...wait a minute, Representative



Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, I have just a few questions to ask the Sponsor of this Bill. Representative Stearney, why don't you outline for us right now what the law is in regard to issuance of search warrants and what can be seized in some home."

Stearney: "Well the present law provides that the evidence that may be seized would be contraband, the fruits of a crime or the instrumentalities used in a commission of a crime. And from whom, a search warrant may be directed against anyone."

Leinenweber: "Well currently a search warrant can be issued to discover evidence of a crime rather than just the fruits and the instruments, is that correct?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Alright and from whom can it be seized? Or who can a search warrant be issued to?"

Stearney: "A search warrant can be issued against any person or place."

Leinenweber: "Your Bill seeks to change the current law in some respects, is that correct?"

Stearney: "Yes it does."

Leinenweber: "And it seeks to limit the ability of a court to issue a search warrant, is that correct?"

Stearney: "Yes it does."

Leinenweber: "And would you tell us in what way it seeks to limit the issuance of the search warrants?"

Stearney: "Well it would limit the authorities in seeking a search warrant to make certain that either the person against whom the search warrant is issued is believed to have in his possession the fruits, the instrument...or fruits of the crime, contraband or instrumentalities used in a commission of a crime. And if it is not such an individual then the authorities must believe that that particular person would destroy the evidence if the



authorities were to proceed by subpoena duces tecum. Now mind you, Sir, the reason for this here and I wish to point out to Members of the General Assembly..."

Leinenweber: "I don't think I asked you the reason, I just asked you what your Bill would allow the issuance of a search warrant. I have a few other questions. Is it after...if we adopted your Bill, would it be possible for a court to issue a search warrant to discover evidence of a crime as opposed to contraband and things of that nature?"

Stearney: "No, the evidence would consist of the contraband, the fruits of the crime or the instrumentalities used in the commission of a crime."

Leinenweber: "But not just evidence of a crime, is that correct?"

Stearney: "Well remember the U.S. Supreme Court and the Illinois courts have dealt with the question of mere evidence and disposed of that particular terminology. So really we are only dealing with contraband, the fruits..."

Leinenweber: "Wait, wait, wait, hold it."

Stearney: "...of a crime or the instrumentalities used in the commission of a crime."

Leinenweber: "When you say they disposed of it, what they said was that a search warrant may be issued to discover evidence...mere evidence of a crime, isn't that correct when you say disposed of it? And in fact, your Bill seeks to reverse those Supreme Court rulings, isn't that correct?"

Stearney: "No, it doesn't."

Leinenweber: "Now wait a minute, are you sure of that?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Alright, currently you are adding a Section to the Bill authorizing issuance of search warrants, isn't that correct?"



Stearney: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Alright now your Subsection B or whatever it is, completely negates Subsection A, does it not?"

Stearney: "No."

Leinenweber: "Under what circumstances could a court issue a search warrant pursuant to Subsection A after the addition of your Subsection B?"

Stearney: "Well I'd imagine you could...may construct a number of hypotheticals in which they may proceed under A."

Leinenweber: "Would you try to do one for me please?"

Stearney: "Well, why don't you...I...since you thought up the question perhaps you have an example in mind."

Leinenweber: "Alright, alright. I cannot think of a single instance under Subsection A where it would be possible for a judge to issue a search warrant if we adopt your Bill and add Subsection B. So in effect, it appears to me, and I would ask whether you agree with this, that you are in effect repealing Subparagraph A."

Stearney: "Well, can you suggest to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House an item that may be considered evidence that would not be considered contraband, the fruits of an offense or the instrumentalities used in the commission of an offense?"

Leinenweber: "Certainly I can. I can suggest the cancelled check..."

Stearney: "Suggest it."

Leinenweber: "The cancelled check, a photograph, a memorandum, all sorts of things which could be evidence of a crime but not contraband and not an instrumentality. Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the Bill. This is an extremely far reaching Bill. I'm surprised that it is being called at this time of day on this particular Calendar which I thought was reserved for those Bills which are



not controversial. This Bill would not...you recall there was some discussion, Representative Greiman's Bill which was a response to the question of issuing a search warrant to a...to a newspaper office. Well this Bill has...as the Sponsor has kindly pointed out, extends the concept of the Greiman Bill far beyond protection of freedom of the press but to cover every single possible instance in which a search warrant can be issued. No longer would a court be able to issue a search warrant to go out and discover evidence of a crime but merely the instrumentalities and the contraband, but only under extraordinary limited circumstances. The courts would be left in the posture...in a criminal proceeding of a civil proceeding and everything would have to take place by a subpoena or a subpoena duces tecum. I think this is extraordinarily far reaching and I don't think we should go this far."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I have to echo the words of Representative Leinenweber. This is a most significant Bill. It's a great Bill for defense attorneys like Mr. Stearney. I think if he had his way, we'd throw out the entire Criminal Code. This is a very significant Bill. It will greatly hamper law enforcement and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "...Gentlemen of the House, we just heard the mentality of the prosecution. You've just heard him insinuate that here I would toss out the Criminal Code. Well mind you now, after I introduced this Bill, and mind you these Bills were introduced last year at the instance of Governor Thompson and other Members of the House, Bills were introduced merely to protect the press against searches...third party searches. However,



just last month in the American Bar Association Journal... and I ask you Gentlemen to pay attention, there was a warrant...a search warrant was issued in the State of Minnesota to seize records in a lawyer's office so that the authorities could prove a perjury count against that lawyer's client. Now what we have here, we see the state going a step further. They are even going to the point that they would go into a lawyer's office under the guise of a search warrant to seize records in that lawyer's possession that belong to his client in hopes of proving a criminal case against his client. And remember if we're going to ever restore any sanity to this proceeding any sanctity to the attorney-client privilege this is a Bill that would do such a thing. And it is not meant to destroy the Criminal Code, do away with it or anything of the sort, it's meant to plug a loophole. And this is...what I've done here is gone a step further. I do not believe that we should give to the press any greater rights than we give to any individual in this...citizen in this state. The first Amendment stands on an equal part with the fourth Amendment. The fourth Amendment protects individuals against unreasonable searches and seizures and the first Amendment protects the press. If you can pass a Bill a month ago to protect the press I think you can pass a Bill today that would extend the same privileges to an individual citizen. And I'm saying the authorities would still have the right to seize evidence of a crime, to seize contraband, to seize the fruits of crime, the instrumentalities used in the commission of a crime. But I say this here, that if they are attempting to find evidence against 'John Q. Citizen', they cannot go into anyone of your homes to seize evidence to prove a crime against 'John Q. Citizen' unless you too are believed to have participated in the crime or that they



believe that you would destroy the evidence of that crime. I say this is a reasonable approach to a serious problem. Remember this, if they can raid any lawyer's office to seize evidence against...to prove a crime against one of his clients then there is no safety for all of us. I say vote 'yes'. This is a reasonable measure and do not be...do not be frightened by the hysterics of the former prosecutor. We've seen what the prosecutors have done across the years. They are not interested in proving a crime against this little kid from 63rd Street, that is page 42, they are seeking to prove a crime against an individual public official, which is page 1. That's the type of mentality they have. I ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Greiman to explain his vote. One minute."

Greiman: "Well, just to explain my vote. I believe that although I passed a Bill that was more restrictive than this Bill, I think this Bill is a sound Bill. I think it is a protection of both the first and fourth Amendment as well and I believe that it is a significant piece. And it now has 99 votes and I'll shut up."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Explain...I want to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "I...I can't believe there's 104 green votes up there. Now the...Representative Stearney is a very eloquent criminal lawyer and we all know that. But certainly this is going to make it more difficult for the state's attorneys and the law enforcement people..."



1576

27.

this is an anti-law-and-order Bill and the element of surprise is part of the...part of law enforcement. If you give the people time to destroy the evidence, obviously you're not going to have enough to convict anybody. I think you're making a great mistake, but if you persist I hope the Senate has more sense than we have."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'aye' and 46 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1576, Representative Jaffe."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1576. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 1576 is a Bill that amends the School Code. And it requires that a reinstated teacher shall be assigned to school board to a position substantially similar to the one held prior to the suspension or dismissal after that individual has had a hearing with an independent hearing officer. The Bill also corrects a technical error and it passed out of Committee 20 to 2. I think a simple procedural do process and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "In explaining my vote, I just want to point out you're seriously restricting the powers of a school board to make proper, logical decisions and I think it's a big mistake."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, I should like to call to your attention that a tenure



teacher who has not been subject to a dismissal proceeding can be reassigned within the school. By this Bill we would be giving more preference to a tenure teacher who has been subjected to a dismissal proceeding than a tenure teacher who has not been subjected to a dismissal proceeding. I think it's discriminatory and I think it gives preferential teach...treatment to a teacher who has been subjected to a dismissal proceeding, and I'd urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 37...Representative Conti."

Conti: "There's something wrong with my key. I was trying to press the button."

Speaker Redmond: "What to vote?"

Conti: "I want to vote. I can't vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we...the Clerk has taken the record. Representative Conti wants to vote..."

Conti: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "No." On this question, 112 'aye' and 37... 38 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1031.

(Continued on Page 29)



179  
PAGE  
B 1031

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1031. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in regard to limitations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1031 is an amendment to the Limitations Act. This Bill would provide for an 8-year statute of limitations against construction of improvements to real property by architects, contractors, and engineers. This General Assembly in 1975 passed such a statute of limitation, a 4-year statute of limitation, which was struck down by the courts. Again, in 1972, the Illinois General Assembly, 1973, passed another statute of limitation which again was struck down by the courts. At the present time, anyone who constructs an improvement to real property is liable forever. Request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I couldn't hear that explanation. Either the Sponsor's intentionally mumbling or the sound system is turned down or it's too noisy back here, but I'd like to hear what this Bill is about."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll repeat again. This is a Bill that would provide for a statute of limitations for actions of negligence against are, those who construct improvements to real property. This is a good Bill. This is action that the Illinois General Assembly has taken previously on at least two occasions. There was a statute of limitations of this type passed by the Illinois General Assembly in 1965, which was struck down by the courts on Constitutional grounds because of the way the Bill was drafted. It provided for, according to the court, 'too narrow of a class to protect'. In 1973, the Illinois General Assembly



again passed a statute of limitations which was attacked by the courts. Since that time, we have enacted the Products Liability statute of limitations and a statute of limitations for physicians. In light of that background, this seems like a reasonable thing to do to protect those who construct improvements to real property. At the present time, they have no protection whatsoever from negligence. There is no, no limitation whatsoever. The time limit is two years from discovery. Discovery can take place 75 years after construction. Those who make these improvements for the architects who designed them are liable their entire lives, and their firms and companies are liable beyond their lives, beyond the grave. This is a good Bill, and I request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brummer: "What is the statute of limitations imposed in here or the statute of repose?"

Dunn: "The statute is a two-year statute of limitations with 8-year discovery period, so that there can be a total of 10 years. Any claim of act, any claim which is not discovered within the 8-year period is barred."

Brummer: "Now, if I understand this correctly, it would, would apply to such things as bridges, that may have, may have been built with a 50-year life expectancy, or some major buildings, or large constructions projects. Would it, would it apply to that type of thing?"

Dunn: "This legislation will apply to any improvement to real property and will apply only in the future..."

Brummer: "Would, would that apply to a bridge, for example, then, that may have been constructed for...?"

Dunn: "Not a bridge which has already been constructed. No."

Brummer: "No. But a bridge that would be constructed next year or sometime after the effective date of the law, if



this law were passed?"

Dunn: "That is certainly true. If it is any improvement to real property, would be covered by this legislation."

Brummer: "And it would apply to the architects and engineers only, not to the contractor?"

Dunn: "No. It would apply to the architect, the engineer, the contractor, anyone who is involved in the, in the planning, supervision, operation, or management of construction, or the construction of the improvement to real property."

Brummer: "Well, if I may speak to the Bill briefly? This seems to be an unreasonably short period of a statute of repose. You know many buildings are certainly built to last more than 8 or 10 years. Bridges are certainly meant to last and exist and continue to exist for a longer period of time than, than 8 or 10 years. To allow something to be constructed that has a large, a 25 or 50 year life expectancy and, and then for it to have been designed or constructed in such a manner that some 10 years subsequently it falls and collapses with no liability under this statute as a result of that seems to be an unreasonable restriction. I don't think most of the causes of action, I'm sure most of the causes of action occur in a much shorter period of time. However, those who design or construct a facility that does injury to someone or, or if it is a bridge, it may be a unit of local government that may suffer a severe loss as a result of the collapse, as a result of poor design, it would appear to me that an 8- or 10-year period of time for that type of long-term facility, is too short a period of time, and I would urge a 'No' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Is this, if this is on Short Debate, I would ask 10 Members to join me to take it off."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you go ahead and ask your ques-



tion, Sir, if you want it, if that's what you want?"

Leinenweber: "Representative Dunn, what would the effect of the insurance premiums on an architect be, if we passed your Bill?"

Dunn: "You'd have to ask the insurance industries, and they have chosen not to comment about this particular piece of legislation. The purpose of this Bill is not to protect insurance companies. The purpose of this Bill is to provide some relief for professionals, who are trying to exercise their sound judgment in the design and construction of improvements to real property..."

Leinenweber: "All right, well you're not, you're not trying to tell us..."

Dunn: "...so that they and their families are not liable all their lives and beyond lives and into the graves."

Leinenweber: "You're not, you're not trying to tell us, are you, that the current professional liability policies of architects and so forth, do not cover all of the construction work that they did during the term of the policy, are you?"

Dunn: "I don't understand that question, but what I'm telling you is that, that this Bill is not an insurance company Bill, and the insurance industry has chosen not to comment about what effect this Bill would have on their premiums and, as you very well know, they are very secretive about, about the effect any legislation has upon, upon the risk, which they agree to cover."

Leinenweber: "All right. One final question. Your Bill does not, the statute of repose, does not cover the owner of the structure. Isn't that correct?"

Dunn: "This..."

Leinenweber: "Yes or no?"

Dunn: "I don't think it would."

Leinenweber: "It does not, and Mr. Speaker, briefly to the Bill. First of all, ...point out that it would be abso-



lutely no effect on the insurance premiums of architects, who will continue to have to pay the same premiums that they are. There's absolutely no evidence whatsoever to show that there would be any material effect and there would not be because of the fact that most negligent construction occurs, the, the defects occur almost immediately and all the damage has occurred almost immediately, so that any accident that occurs either 8 years, 6 years, or 20 years after the event, is statistically meaningless. But, secondly, I'd like to point out what you're doing to an owner of a building. An owner of a, owner of a building hires an architect to construct a building for him. The architect, at the end of 8 years through his negligence, is relieved of any responsibility if that building collapses. But, I tell you, the owner is not. Now currently, what happens, if someone hires an architect to design a building for him, and that building, say like up in Michigan Avenue, a sheet of marble falls off of that building, then the owner will be sued for negligence in allowing a sheet of marble to fall off of his building, and for the damage that that would cause. The owner, currently, would have the right to bring a third party action against the architect to show that it was the design defect that caused this particular piece of marble to fall. After 8 years under this Bill, the owner would no longer be able to do that. You are stripping them of any possible indemnity, any possible indemnity action, any possible way that they can go against the person who truly caused the injury, after 8 years if you adopt this Bill, and I tell you, if you are an owner of a, if you have any construction work done, you're gonna be left totally on your own after 8 years when the architect under this Bill is relieved of any responsibility. It won't do any good as far as the insurance premiums are concerned. No one's gonna make out on this



Bill, except you're gonna hurt a few people. Principally the owners of buildings."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Speaker, Members of the House. Having had some experience in the field of construction, having been an architectural superintendent, I, I stand in opposition to this Bill. Based on the necessity of knowing that down the road, 10 years or even further down the road, that the architects have some liability will insure the fact that their engineers will certainly have some responsible actions on their designs, and I speak specifically on those features of construction that happen to be hidden and are not on the surface. We're talking about anchor bolts, we talk about the straining rods, we talk about structural steel that take years, sometimes, to show a defect in design and then collapse. And all we read about then is the injured person, the catastrophe that takes place when a bridge collapsed 10 years after construction. And we're, under this Bill the architects would be relieved of any responsibility of having designed the feature of property in the first place. I, I stand in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will, yeah."

Stearney: "Assuming, Mr. Dunn, that eight years and one day after construction of a building, a water tower place, for instance, a person's walking by and a piece of marble falls off from the top of the building and hits the pedestrian. Puts, makes him a vegetable for the rest of his life. Under, under your Bill his only cause of action would be against the building owner. Am I right?"

Dunn: "The situation with regard to the instance that you cite is exactly the same as if the instance happened four years and one day after construction. The, in order



to have a cause of action in the first place, there must be negligence. If those who designed a building, or those who constructed it followed the accepted professional standards, followed the building codes, used the proper guidelines, there would be no cause of action for such an instance as you say whether it happened one day after construction..."

Stearney: "Yeah, but true..."

Dunn: "...whether it happened 100 years after construction..."

Stearney: "Yeah, yeah but..."

Dunn: "The purpose of this legislation is to put an end to frivolous law suits against these professionals, who are trying their best to exercise..."

Stearney: "Well, well let me..."

Dunn: "...their sound judgment and we have statistics which show that 98.7% of all claims, including the nuisance claims, take place inside of the first eight years."

Stearney: "Okay, but you've failed to answer my question. My question is eight years and one day after the construction of a building, a person is injured by a piece of falling marble. His only cause of action now, am I not right, would be against the building owner?"

Dunn: "That is not so. In the event there had been a fraudulent representation..."

Stearney: "Assuming no fraudulent misrepresentation."

Dunn: "...the owner, the, the injured party would have a cause of action. In the event the building was constructed today, this legislation is prospective in application. The injured party would have a cause of action, so the answer is 'No'."

Stearney: "No. And the cause of action that a, injured party would have against the building owner would be under the negligence theory. Am I right, Mr. Dunn?"

Dunn: "There are many theories of, of causes of action as you well know. This Bill leaves open the possibility of



the suit for fraud or fraudulent misrepresentations, fraudulent concealment..."

Stearney: "Well, can you tell me where there might be fraud in a situation where you have a piece of falling marble and a person is injured? Where is the fraud in that situation?"

Dunn: "Well, it's your example, not mine. I prefer to know all the facts before I reach a judgment on...on any particular case."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me address the question, because it's very hard to get an answer. But, let me pose certain questions to the Members of the Assembly, and that is, assuming eight years and one day after construction of a building, a man and a boy...man and his son are walking passed that building, and a piece of falling marble comes down and injures the boy. Makes him a vegetable for the rest of his life. Under the terms of his Bill now, I ask you to be very careful, in reading, is that the architects and everybody in construction and management would be completely freed of all liability. The only person now that the injured party could go after would be the building owner. And, mind you now, the only way he could do that is under the IPI Jury Instructions in the State of Illinois. These would be the only Instructions that could be submitted to the Jury. And that injured party now, that injured child, let's say, would have to show that the building owner knew or should've known of the dangerous condition. But, you tell me now, which building owner knows of the condition of his building on the outside of his building eight years and one day thereafter. There's no building owner that would know. Well, let me submit to you that what would happen in going to a jury under the IPI Jury Instructions which are in effect in this State and which bind the plaintiff. He could not sustain his



burden of showing that the building owner knew or should've known of the dangerous condition of the defective design, let's say, of the architectural mishaps. The building owner does not know, therefore, he would be completely exculpated from liability. But, the injured party, the injured child who is a vegetable for the rest of his life, would be completely out. He would receive no award, because he could not prove damages. He could not prove negligence against the building owner. His negligence, his theory of negligence should've rightfully been against the architect who negligently designed that building, and who, perhaps, negligently controlled the construction of that building. But, by the terms of this Bill, what you have done is completely freed, exonerated the architect and all others in control from any liability. And, remember this, if the Internal Revenue Service extends to a building a 40-year useful life and straight-lined depreciation that would never even probably go down to 25 years in straight-lined depreciation, how can you say that you've...a building only has an eight-year useful life. This is...I would urge a 'No' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland. Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Dunn: "Yes."

Friedland: "Mr. Sponsor. I...I didn't hear the percentage or the actions brought for within the time framework of your legislation. Would you...what was that?"

Dunn: "The 98.7% of all claims, including the frivolous or nuisance claims, have been shown to have been brought within the first eight years after construction."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Move to previous question, please."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall the main question be



put?' Those in favor say 'Aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it. Motion carried. Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn: "In cl...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In closing, I would just like to point out that the only opposition to this Bill in Committee that were surfaced were the Trial Lawyers, and we tried to work something out with them. They were uncompromising. I think that this is a good Bill. It should pass, and I request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor, vote 'Aye'. Opposed, vote 'No'. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'Yes' vote here, I think that we have here...the opposition to this Bill is purely the Trial Lawyers. Now they like to sue everybody and their dog. Now a lot of things can happen in eight years, which make a piece of marble, as the...example is used, fall off a building. And what we're doing by having unlimited liability, is upping the cost of our homes and all the buildings we put together. Just this morning I heard on the radio where the cost of living had jumped 1% in this State in the last month, and they said one of the major reasons was cost of building and the gasoline problem. Those are two of the major things, cost of building new homes and construction and gasoline. Now we can continue to feed that by leaving unlimited liability, and you know that if in eight years all manner of things can happen to cause that piece of marble to fall. This is a good Bill. I think it's a good consumer Bill, and one we ought to pass out of here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As my good friend and Mentor,



the Gentleman from Cook says, I have a conflict of interest, but I shall vote my conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't wish to get into any personal argument with my colleague, but I suggest that if he looks at the Board, he will find that unlike the other professions, fields, and areas that the lawyers are divided in this area, including the Trial Lawyers, and I hope that in the future he'll refrain from such comments."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'Aye' and 58 'No'. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "...poned Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration."

Dunn: "Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Let's poll the absentees with this close. Let's...yeah, let's poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "He...the Gentleman asked for Postponed Consideration and he got it. The case is...the Bill is on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is not on post...I didn't move it there." He has asked for a request for the poll of the absentees. Is Leinenweber absent? Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees: Bluthardt, Daniels, Dawson, Ebbesen, Farley, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley, Flinn, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Flinn?"

Flinn: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Flinn, 'Aye'. Representative Sam Wolf,



'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines, Garmisa, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "If it should go to 89, I would request a verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Goodwin, Harris, Hoffman, Jaffe, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Slape: "Please record me as 'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jaffe, Kane, Keane, Kent, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Leon, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon, 'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom, Meyer, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "...ive Meyer, 'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy, Pierce, Pouncey, Robbins, Schisler, Schneider, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Schneider, 'Aye'. Representative Flinn... verified. Pro...proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schraeder, Stanley, Taylor, Telcser, Vinson, no further."

Speaker Redmond: "How many? 89 'Aye'. Representative Leinenweber wants a verification. Representative Kosinski, 'No'. Representative Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kosinski, 'Aye' to 'No'."

Schuneman: "Would you change my vote to 'Aye', please Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman, 'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman, 'No' to 'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber, do you want to come up here? Eighty-nine. Proceed with the verification. Please be in your seats. Representative Donovan, will you please sit down? Donovan and Breslin. Representative Macdonald."



Macdonald: "I'm sorry. I had an emergency telephone call, and I wasn't really listening to the debate, and I would like to change my vote to 'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady's vote from 'No' to 'Aye'. Representative Pierce."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Pierce: "Please vote me 'Aye' for this fine Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'Aye'. Now proceed. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Please be in your seats, and raise your hand when your name is called."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman, Anderson, E. M. Barnes, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Birkinbine, Borchers, Boucek, Bradley, Bullock, Campbell, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Collins, Currie, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Donovan, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Change me from 'No' to 'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'No' to 'Aye'. Why don't we wait till we get through...finished with the Verified Roll Call?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewing, Flinn, Friedland, Dwight Friedrich, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Hannig, Hoxsey, Hudson, Johnson, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Kempiners, Klosak, Kuchar-ski, Lechowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Macdonald, Mahar, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, Meyer, Mulcahey, Murphy, Kulas, Oblinger, O'Brien, Patrick, Peters, Piel, Pierce, Polk, Pullen, Rea, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Ropp, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schneider, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Repre..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman, Skinner, Slape, Steczo, E. G."



Steele, Stuffle, Sumner, Terzich, Totten, Van Duyne, Vitek, VonBoeckman, Waddell, Watson, White, Wikoff, Williams, Winchester, J. J. Wolf, Sam Wolf, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan, 'Aye'; Representative Vitek, Representative Conti, 'Aye'; Hallstrom, 'Aye'; Tuerk, 'Aye'. Request for the verification's been withdrawn. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Harris has asked to be recorded as 'No'. Representative Huskey, 'Aye'; Representative Swanstrom, 'Aye'; Representative Alexander, 'Aye'; Representative Taylor, 'Aye'. What's the count? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'No' to 'Aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'No' to 'Aye'. 101 'Ayes'. Representative Daniels, how do you want to be recorded? 'Aye'. 102 'Ayes'. Daniels. ...know...this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McGrew. McGrew."

McGrew: "Now that it has sufficient number of votes, Mr. Speaker, could I be switched to 'present' because of a very open conflict of interest?"

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't hear you."

McGrew: "Could I be switched to 'present'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, record the Gentleman as 'present'. 114. Yeah, I declared it passed. It having received the Constitutional majority is here...hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 114. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that was quite thoroughly discussed and presented yesterday, taken out of the record momentarily. House Bill 114 is the Bill that will



guarantee the rights of the public with respect to the location of landfills by guaranteeing a public hearing notice to property owners and making sure that EPA would consider local zoning and land use criteria. The Bill was presented and discussed yesterday and I present it again to you and ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster. Deuster. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Deuster: "I'd be happy to."

Mahar: "Yes, thank you. As I stated yesterday and prior to the time that this Bill was taken out of the record, that I am a Cosponsor of your Bill and I believe that we've been fighting for some kind of local control over landfills for the last...about the last three years. I'm a little disappointed I think in turn of events on this Bill. And my question...the first question is, as we started to talk about yesterday, just exactly what control does the local government have in the right to reject a decision made by the EPA after a public hearing?"

Deuster: "As a result of...of a past court decision and the law also, the EPA makes the determination with respect to the location of a landfill. And in this Bill the consideration would be given...the highest criteria in the legislation is consideration of local zoning and land use plans. The ultimate decision, of course, is made by EPA and this Bill provides that that's the way it would be all over the state."

Mahar: "How will the recent Supreme Court decision which in effect opt it out gave home rule units the power to develop their own procedures be affected by this Bill?"



Deuster: "Representative Mahar, for landfills that are located entirely within a...a municipality they would have control."

Mahar: "Or in the county if the county is home rule? In other words, it is your opinion then that this has... this does nothing to the Supreme Court decision, is that correct? This is not effected by the Supreme Court decision?"

Deuster: "Well there were two Supreme Court decisions of... I don't know what one you're...you're talking about."

Mahar: "I'm talking about the recent one which ruled that the...the rights of home rule units of government to consider the site of their landfills prevailed. As you very well now we could go back to the history of this thing, the Carlson decision, a few years ago that said that the local government had no right to intervene in siting of the landfills. Now that was overturned in the recent decision which affects home rule units only. Now...I'm told that your Bill will take the right away from Cook County and the home rule units. Is this correct?"

Deuster: "Well...if a...if a landfill only serves a municipality or a local unit of government, that local unit of government has control. But if it extends beyond and is what we would call a regional facility, then it is true that this...this legislation provides that the ultimate decision would be in EPA."

Mahar: "Is this Bill supported by the EPA?"

Deuster: "Yes."

Mahar: "Is this Bill supported by the landfill operators?"

Deuster: "I...I don't think so."

Mahar: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the question? Leinenweber says I can. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."



Mahar: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there...there have been a number of us on this floor who have been fighting for local control over landfills for a number of years. There has been a number of Bills introduced in this House by various numbers of Legislators to solve this problem. In this Session there were six or seven Bills that went to Subcommittee and this is the only Bill that came out. I think it's most unfortunate this Bill is on the floor for passage, supported by the EPA and supported by the landfill operators. And you very well know that when the landfill operators support a Bill like this, it does nothing for local control, absolutely nothing for local control. And it's my opinion that the recent Supreme Court decision which ruled in favor of home rule units of government, municipal and county, have been negated in this particular Bill. As so we're right back to the same old thing we had several years ago in which all the EPA does is to hold a public hearing and go ahead and do what they want to. Now I don't think that solves the problem. And I say that we should defeat this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Would...would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Yourell: "Representative Deuster, you indicated in a letter posed to you by Representative Mahar...and the question was, does this completely preempt units of local government to exercise zoning control for sanitary landfills within their corporate boundaries? Now I think the answer that you gave him was rather a...an evasive answer. And I would ask you once again to tell me if a village had any authority for zoning for sanitary landfills within their corporate boundaries should 114 become law?"



Deuster: "To give you a...a precise answer. If a sanitary landfill was serving one municipality or one unit of local government, whether it be home rule or not home rule, that...that local unit of government would continue to have power...concurrent power over landfills. What this Bill provides is with respect to landfills that are serving beyond the limits of one local unit of government...and what we would call regional services of...of the landfill. What this Bill does...and this matter I might say was fully debated on Second Reading when you offered an Amendment on this subject and every Member had an opportunity to vote 'yes' or 'no' on whether this Bill ought to apply all over the State of Illinois where there were regional landfill services involved. And also in the Subcommittee and the full Committee this was considered."

Yourell: "To continue, Sir. You approached me yesterday and asked me if I would be willing to cooperate with you with the passage of House Bill 114 if you would put an Amendment on to exempt Cook County and home rule units, did you not?"

Deuster: "At the time the Bill was taken out of the record, I didn't know what questions what Members had and I said I would be willing to cooperate with anybody in order to improve the law and to move this subject forward so that the citizens are protected and we can have public hearings. And it is true I said I'd be willing to do whatever the House wanted to do. I would cooperate fully."

Yourell: "Are you still willing to do that?"

Deuster: "Well I think that we're at a point, we're in the last day that...that it's kind of difficult for any Member to...to do those sort of things. The House has spoken. You did have a full opportunity on Second Reading to present your Amendment once. And maybe if...



if you have friends in the Senate, if the Bill gets over there, why the Senate can consider that subject too. We have a Bicameral legislature. But at this point, Representative Yourell, we've got the Bill, it was fully considered on Second Reading, here it is...I'm amendable to anything that the House...the Senate wants to do to make sure that this has the full support of the people of Illinois and is in the public interest."

Yourell: "Thank you. May I speak to the Bill, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Yourell: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a direct violation of the principle that most of us believe in that a fundamental authority that should be left to units of home rule...units of local government in Illinois is the power to zone. The power to zone within the corporate municipal boundaries of a unit of local government is just as important as police and fire protection and just as fundamental. If you destroy or take away the authority for local units of government to zone the...the territory, the properties within their corporate boundaries, then you might as well throw the Municipal Code right out the window. This Bill is designed for one purpose only, to give sanitary landfill operators throughout the State of Illinois carte blanche to do whatever they want and place landfills in whatever community they want. Now in the Bill they mentioned to you that there is a difference in terminology. They're talking about sanitary disposal sites and they're really sanitary landfills. And they're trying to soothe your feelings and your reasoning that if a landfill or a sanitary disposal site is within one or more municipal... authorities, then the EPA will take authority and precedence and preempt local zoning. And now they're telling you that if a landfill is in the...entirely within the corporate boundaries of units of local



government...that is not so. But I would remind you that if that sanitary landfill is served, that's the words they're using, served, served by more than one unit of local government...in other words, if they take your garbage from one or more units of local government and dump it in to your town, then this Bill will not...will apply. And it's no different. This is a destruction of zoning powers by units of local government. The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois just a month or so ago ruled that what they did in the Worth-Carlson decision was wrong. And in fact they reversed that decision and said yes, home rule units of government in Illinois should have and do have the power to zone the boundaries within their corporate limits. Now if you really believe, if you really believe in local government in Illinois, you'll vote a 'no' vote on House Bill 114. Because what it does is give the sanitary landfill people in Illinois and the EPA exclusive control of the corporate property within the boundaries of a unit of local government. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane. Representative Kelly, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker...yes, Mr. Speaker, I was under the opinion that we were going to be on noncontroversial items. And it seems to me like we have been on this for quite a while and I don't...I think we ought to get on with the business of the House and go to priority of calls or some other area. I move quickly on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried. Representative



Getty."

Getty: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry. We have heard in debate quite a bit of discussion concerning preemption. I would like the Chair to rule if this is preemption, how many votes would be required to pass this? Two questions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian says that it is not preempted and it is not...it does not specifically mention home rule, so therefore, 89 votes. Representative Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, everybody that knows me knows that for the last year, for the last two years, I've been fighting a landfill. And I've been fighting for the rights of the public. And what this Bill does is guarantee that every citizen in the State of Illinois will have a public hearing. That's not in the law right now. This Bill also guarantees that every land owner anywhere near his proposed site will be notified in writing, that's not in the law. Also what's not in the law is the requirement in this Bill that they absolutely must consider local zoning and land use criteria. I've been working cooperatively with all of the parties involved. We know that we've got solid waste and it's got to go somewhere. I'm not...and this Bill is not designed to absolutely stop landfills everywhere because if we did that we would stop civilization and you would have to move to some other state. But what this Bill is designed to do is to guarantee the rights of the public to participate, to know and to make...and to participate in that decision. So if there is a necessity for a landfill, that landfill is put in the right place and in a place that is harmonious with local zoning and local land use plans. And I would urge your favorable support for this legislation. I think it truly represents



the public interest and is a step forward. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I just want to call attention of the House a couple of things that honestly I don't know what to say about this Bill. We do own on our land and lease a landfill. Now I want you to understand certain points. We're running out of space, we may be interfering with a free enterprise system. Now the local citizens should have control to a reasonable degree, but they're all going to be against the formation of new landfill in their area, that's obvious. Under the present laws, if properly carried out, there is no danger because you have to cover and keep it right. The local...the local areas that have a...the local...legal areas should have a certain amount of control without any question in my mind. And...but EPA may have to be the final decider because you have so much heat generated in local communities against the local...new landfill, that it's hard to say what is for the best...best interest of the community. I'm going to vote 'no', but I'm not advising anybody to vote at all. Because certainly this is sort of a peculiar situation that we're going to have to meet for the future. And I think when the local need means that you have to have a landfill, the local area is going to see that it's there because they have to."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. I just wanted to read from the Democratic staff analysis here. It says that, 'solid waste management calls for planning into the future.' Under the Bill, although the future need is proven as part as solid waste management plan, a site would be rejected because the present need may be unwarranted. Also the



schedule for developing a site to make it suitable to begin to accept solid waste should be considered for it takes approximately three years to start operations. That's why I stand in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "If this Bill receives the necessary votes I want a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk, take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 50 'no'. Representative Yourell has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Deuster has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Ewell from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. Bluthardt. Bradley. Brummer. Campbell. Daniel. Doyle. Gaines. Hudson. Huff. Dave Jones. Kent. Kozubowski. Laurino. Leverenz. Oblinger. Piel. Rea."

Speaker Redmond: "Piel desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rea. Rich..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea, 'aye'. Representative White, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'. Richmond. Sandquist. Simms. Slape. Sam Wolf and Younge."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Reilly: "Switch me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'no'. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Simms, 'aye'. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to switch my vote from 'aye'



to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Neff as 'no'. Representative Beatty. Representative Beatty, 'no'. Representative Barnes from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Gaines, did we get your vote? 'Aye', Gaines, 'aye'. Now proceed with the verification. Poll the...we'll be back to you, Mr. Ewell. Verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Anderson. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkenbine. Boucek. Bower. Bullock. Capuzi. Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Deuster. DiPrima. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Woodyard. Ewing. Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell desires to change from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Brummer...'no'. Slape, 'aye'. Leverenz, 'aye'. Sam Wolf, 'aye'. Richmond, 'aye'. Did you give up? Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson desires to be recorded as 'no'. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bullock. Capuzi. Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Deuster. DiPrima. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Woodyard. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Georgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Harris. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huskey. Keane. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kucharski. Leverenz. Madigan. Margulas. Marovitz. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Meyer. Malloy. Mugalian. Kulas. Patrick. Peters. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Richmond. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Sharp. Henry. Simms. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Taylor. Telcser. Totten. Vinson. Von Boeckman. Waddell. Walsh. Willer. Winchester."



J.J. Wolf and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I've had my objections responded to  
and I'd like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "From what?"

Bowman: "From 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'..."

Representative Bowman. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "What are we starting with?"

Speaker Redmond: "99 'ayes'."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Kane recorded?"

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

Kane: "Change my vote to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Proceed. That's 100.

Representative Yourell. Yourell."

Yourell: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "How's she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Yourell: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Willer has  
returned. Put her back on the Roll Call."

Yourell: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell.: "Representative Margulas."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. McMaster, raise your hand."

Yourell: "Representative Malloy."



Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Is that Patrick?"

Speaker Redmond: "Patrick. He's here, way in the back."

Yourell: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman is here."

Yourell: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew here? Here here, he's in Farley's seat."

Yourell: "Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Pierce here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the aisle."

Yourell: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Yourell: "Rea."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Representative Rea recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "He's there."

Yourell: "Representative Schisler."

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

Yourell: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Yourell: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Down in front."

Yourell: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Farley here? How is he recorded? The Gentleman has returned, put him back on."



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Stearney here? Remove him."

Yourell: "Representative Ewell. Representative Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Friedland is here."

Yourell: "Representative Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the aisle."

Yourell: "I have no further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock desires to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Campbell. How is Campbell recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Campbell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Grandfather as 'aye'. New Grandfather. Representative O'Brien, 'aye'. Representative Braun, 'aye'. Representative Hudson, 'no'. What's the count? No. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I think I will switch over to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "You were just voted 'aye'."

Borchers: "Yes, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Borchers from 'no' to 'aye'.

Representative Dunn, 'aye'. Representative Hannig, 'aye'. Huff...Hannig, 'aye'. Representative Catania has baked cake for the entire Membership. Will you please pass through the aisle and give every Member a piece of cake. Representative Reilly, 'aye'. Garshy has been at work. What's the count? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Collins...change Collins to 'no'. 106 'aye', 51 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2735, Representative White. 2735."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2735."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative White."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amends Sections of the Retailer Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2735 amends the Retailer Occupation Tax Act ...exempt any person participating in the food stamp program from paying the 5% sales tax on all eligible items. Prior to January 1, 1979, anyone participating in a food stamp program would receive a card from the Illinois Public Aid Department. On that card would be an amount that they were to pay in order to receive X number of stamps. Effective January 1 of this year, the person is now eligible to receive only the bonus stamps. He would...he would then have...have to pay a tax on any dollars that were to be spent over and above those food stamps that were given to them as...as a bonus."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative...question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 25 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 900. Representative Cullerton."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 900. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to forceable entry and detainer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Forcefull Entry and Detainer Act. In an action for nonpayment of rent, the Bill provides that the tenant shall have the burden of proof to show that his implied warranty of habitability has been breached."



The Bill does not authorize a tenant to withhold rent but only to raise a defense that the building is not habitable. No one appeared in opposition to this Bill. The Bill passed the Judiciary I Committee 10 to 0. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 133 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2284. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, would you do the Membership the courtesy that you did yesterday. It would just be helpful to us out here if you would give the Cubs line up again...who's ...who's in the hole, who's on deck so they have some idea..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, I will do that."

Polk: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "As soon as I figure out my list."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2284. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Domico. Domico. Representative Domico...Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Domico did not have..."

Speaker Redmond: "Birkenbine on deck."

Getty: "His glasses on and he asked if I would handle it... this Bill for him. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2284 is a Bill which amends the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District Act. It provides for modest graduated increases in the salaries of board members, President, Vice-President and Chairman of the Committee on Finance. The total would be 5 thousand dollars per annum in three stages, 15 hundred in 1981, 15 hundred in 1983 and 2 thousand dollars in 1985. I



would suggest that this is in accord with the prevalent guide lines and I would ask for favorable support on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. We've got one more and then we'll be over here, Mr. Birkenbine. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 24 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1780."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 17..."

Speaker Redmond: "...1542 over here next."

Clerk O'Brien: "...1780. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Chicago Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would if we could correct the board. I think it's 1780."

Speaker Redmond: "1780."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in like manner, this is a Bill which would amend the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District Act. This is a Bill which would permit the district to obtain thousands of dollars in prompt payment discounts every year because the requirement that the bills be individually approved by the Board of Commissioners...they are unable to make the prompt payment. This would allow the Director of Finance, who is the Clerk, to make the payments. The bills having been approved by the Board, it would require that first the...they be properly vouchered and audited. And I would ask for favorable support on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Griesheimer: "Representative Getty, understanding the need for these prompt payments...rebates...or however they're stated, can you just tell me why the board doesn't and can't take action to authorize these payments immediately?"

Getty: "Because...because of the volume that's involved in the processing of them."

Griesheimer: "Well, I would just call to your attention that we just voted through a Bill that gives board members 32 thousand dollar a year salaries. It would seem to me for salaries at 32 thousand dollars, they could be on hand on an hourly basis to vote through these things."

Getty: "Okay. The...what this does, the contracts over 5 thousand have already been approved by the Board of Commissioners and it would permit those Bills as they come in in installments to be paid promptly without having to again consider the expenditure. They would have to be vouchered and they would have to be audited first. So that they've already approved it...contract has been approved by this Board of Commissioners. And this would just permit the Clerk to then do a ministerial act of paying them after they've been vouchered and audited."

Getty: "Well if they've already approved and this is just a ministerial provision, why is this Bill even needed?"

Griesheimer: "Because the statute provides that every expense must be approved. So this would permit...you know, it would permit them to operate the way any business would operate after the Board of Directors had approved an...a contract, expenditure, so forth to pay in installments."

Getty: "From the point of time that the auditors go through the process, how long does it presently take to have the expenditure approved by the board?"

Griesheimer: "Approximately 30 days."



Getty: "Why is that?"

Griesheimer: "They have board meetings once per month."

Getty: "Well I would suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that if we're going to pay board members 32 thousand dollars a year to be...to sit on the Sanitary District Board in Chicago that they sure as heck can meet more than once a month. And if they can't meet more than once a month, then I want to move to Chicago and get one of those appointments. This is the most ludicrous things I've ever seen...having these two Bills come up together. I don't begrudge these Gentlemen a reasonable salary, even though I voted 'present' on the last one, but even so, if they're going to get 32 thousand dollars then I think they can get their little butts over to the office more than once a month."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? The synopsis indicates 5 million dollars. That's in error, is that correct?"

Griesheimer: "That's in error, it's 5 thousand."

Schlickman: "And the synopsis also refers to 'broad'. That should be 'board', isn't that correct?"

Griesheimer: "Yes."

Schlickman: "So it's not the broad...the broad's approval, it's the board's approval?"

Griesheimer: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Okay. Now our synopsis...excuse me, our analysis says it authorizes payment on purchase order or contract of 25 hundred dollars or less. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Griesheimer: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Well that's what the analysis says. But I don't see any dollar figure or limitation in the Bill itself. Has there been an Amendment or is this by reference..."



Griesheimer: "It's in reference to the Act."

Schlickman: "It's reference to what?"

Griesheimer: "Other provisions of the Act, I believe."

Schlickman: "Okay. So is it 25 hundred or less where the Director of Finance can voucher without approval of the board and not the broad?"

Griesheimer: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 47 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1542, Representative Birkenbine."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1542. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning township organization."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli on deck. Capparelli on deck."

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

Birkenbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1542 would authorize the trustees to declare unincorporated areas of a township receiving fire protection a special fire district for tax purposes. I think I can best explain its purpose by describing a problem that exists in Newterier Township in which the unincorporated areas are presently receiving fire protection from the Village of Winnetka. To do that the Village has to write two hundred and forty eight separate contracts with the homeowners who are receiving that fire protection. This would allow the township to contract with the Village of Winnetka for the fire protection. The cost of this, after a referendum of those homeowners, would then appear in



their tax bill. It makes it a whole lot easier. It also gives an additional benefit to those homeowners of then being able to deduct that tax on their federal tax return as they can the normal taxes. The Bill passed the Counties and Townships Committee on a 13 to 0 to 2 vote. The two people who passed expressed concern that the homeowners might end up being taxed twice for the same protection if the property was to be annexed into a...a village or a city at a later date. Amendment #3 took care of that problem. And if there are any questions I'd be glad to try and answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedland: "Is the Bill as written, Mr. Sponsor, does it provide for taxation with or without referendum?"

Birkenbine: "With referendum."

Friedland: "What...what avenue do those residents, not in the area that you're addressing in the township, if they do not want the...the area to join on to the district, what avenue do they have?"

Birkenbine: "They're already being taxed for the fire protection and are not involved in this transaction."

Friedland: "The portion of the district that you're trying to get into the district, they're already being taxed, is that...?"

Birkenbine: "Yes, for the normal fire protection."

Friedland: "I see and this addresses a problem in your local area I guess, right?"

Birkenbine: "My local area and I've been contacted by one or two other townships who are interested in this problem who have unincorporated areas within their township...and also have to write numerous individual contracts to provide the fire protection."

Friedland: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Will the...Sponsor will yield? I'd just like to know if it makes it mandatory that in these unincorporated areas, if the adjoining fire district must go to a fire and take care of it? Is is mandatory? Will they do this or does it...they can collect the money and not go to the fires? Is this possible?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkenbine."

Birkenbine: "It would not force them to go into any area that they are presently not already going to. And it would ...the only areas they would be providing fire protection to are those areas that are paying for it. This simply provides another way of paying."

Borchers: "Then this increase in taxes does give fire protection to the unincorporated areas involved that you're trying to get into this tax levy?"

Birkenbine: "Right. It provides the same protection at the same cost but it provides a different way of doing it so you eliminate the hundreds of individual contracts. You...instead of that you put the cost of that fire protection on their tax bill thereby making it deductible."

Borchers: "I just wanted to be sure that I would not be, for example, taxed and no fire department...no fire protection."

Birkenbine: "No, that wouldn't happen."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Birkenbine: "Yes."

Hudson: "John, you've indicated that the citizens are protected by referendum in your proposal, is that correct?"

Birkenbine: "Yes, Amendment #3 is...I'm sorry, Amendment #2 provides for that."

Hudson: "Now how would the referendum be presented? Would it take a special...a special vote or would this have to



wait until the general election or...?"

Birkenbine: "It would be a vote of the homeowners. The actual timing of it I'm not exactly sure, but it would be a frontdoor referendum..."

Hudson: "Yes."

Birkenbine: "...to the homeowners who would be involved in this."

Hudson: "Would that be...would that come..."

Birkenbine: "It does not call for a special election."

Hudson: "...action of the county board. That is, who would direct the calling of the referendum?"

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Satterthwaite."

Hudson: "I don't have...Mr. Speaker, I don't have an answer to my question."

Birkenbine: "Mr. Hudson, I'm...I'm not all that familiar with the procedure for calling referendums. The... Amendment #2 says, 'With approval of the majority of the voters in an unincorporated area of a township the trustees may declare.' So it does not provide for a special election to do this."

Hudson: "Okay."

Birkenbine: "I just..."

Hudson: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "In the referendum procedure as it's set up in your Amendment, does it require that the rate of taxation be on the ballot for the referendum?"

Birkenbine: "Yes it would because in the..in the Bill itself it says, 'To extend a tax upon the special fire district in the amount specified in the annual town tax levy.' So the amount is upfront."

Satterthwaite: "But that...no, that does not answer my



question. That is the amount in the levy. But I'm asking whether the limitation...I see by the synopsis that the limitation is at .4%. But what I want to know is if when this issue goes to a referendum, the referendum will have to state on the ballot that the people see when they go in for that referendum, what the new rate of taxation will be? Or does it leave it completely flexible for the taxing district then to tax up to .4%?"

Birkenbine: "No, Ma'am. It would be on there because any ballot that didn't would be unconstitutional."

Satterthwaite: "The rate of the tax extension would be on the ballot?"

Birkenbine: "Yes. And I remind that this would apply in this one particular township to roughly two hundred and fifty homeowners who are well aware of exactly the amount they're paying and exactly the amount that they would be paying under this...and the benefits derived from it."

Satterthwaite: "Well I guess I'm satisfied if it has to be on that referendum ballot. Thank you."

Birkenbine: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1873, Representative Capparelli."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1873. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm having difficulty following the ...I know you're not on an order of call and we didn't ...but we did not suspend the rule to go to a discretionary call today. It seems to me that there's been a preponderance of Democratic Bills called. I'm not



objecting to..."

Speaker Redmond: "This is McAuliffe's Bill."

Collins: "I'm not objecting to this Bill, Mr. Speaker. But I know that a number of people were here at nine-thirty this morning and got on a list that seems to have been forgotten. And I...I have no objection to Mr. McAuliffe's Bill. I...is that the Roll Call I asked you for the other day?"

Speaker Redmond: "Collins, absent."

Collins: "I have no Bills. I have no Bills. I am not asking you to call a Bill of mine. All of my Bills are out of here."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative McAuliffe requests Representative Collins to talk a little bit later on. 187...Representative McAuliffe asked me to call this Bill. And I said, 'Roger, I'll be very happy to.'"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1873. A Bill for an Act to amend the Cook County Employees Retirement Fund Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "This Bill will merely do for the Sheriff's police what the City of Chicago policeman already have. Give them the chance to retire at age 53 with 23 years of service. I move for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...on Representative McAuliffe's Bill, on this question there's 136 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2164. McAuliffe is on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2164. A Bill for an Act to amend the Police Retirement...Retirement Article of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "This Bill increases a widow's pension for a policeman...policeman's widows...25 dollars a month."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. McAuliffe on deck. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 162."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 162. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "This Bill was requested by the trucking industry and also by some of the agriculture interests. It would allow trucks on Illinois highways to be five foot longer. It would not allow the trailers to be any longer. It would merely mean that truckers could use cabs where the motor is mounted in front instead of only the type where the driver sits over the motor." I'm sure there will be a lot of questions asked."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak in favor of the Bill. And I would like to present a few of the facts. At the present time, the limit on a tractor trailer..."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a question. Are we on Short Debate?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Piel: "Then he can't speak in favor of the Bill, can he?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's kind of a relaxed Short Debate."

Piel: "Oh, okay. Just thought I'd ask."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed Rep..."



Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as a hyphenated Sponsor I ...I'd like to really speak a little bit on the Bill. This Bill was a product of the Motor Vehicles Law Commission? We studied the issue and had hearings all over the state. At the present time, the limit on the 55 mile...55 feet truck trailer with a maximum of 45 feet for the trailer unit alone. The unit alone isn't ...the trailer is not going to be extended. It will still stay at 45 feet. The request of the Teamsters Union and many other organizations like the National Safety Council, the Department of Transportation, the State Police, the Illinois Police Association, the Illinois Truckers Association and of course it's a product of the Motor Vehicles Law Commission. We had an indepth...indepth study on this issue and what it does it makes a safer cab to have the engine in front cab rather than the engine...cab over engine operated vehicle. We are the only state in our surrounding states that require a trailor...a tractor when it comes into the state to go to an over cab trailer. I think it's a good...it's a good Bill for the safety...for the safety...the National Safety Council recommend it, the Teamsters would like to have it, especially those who are driving trucks. It's much safer and I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 25 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2357."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2357. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2357 amends the Act concerning state finance. It excludes from the definition of 'commodity' permanent improvements, electronic data processing and telecommunications. It raises the units value for an item to be included as a commodity from 25 dollars to 50 dollars. And it adds the definition of 'printing' which includes the purchase of materials and services for the purpose of dissemination of information. It places a value...a minimum value of 50 dollars for an item to include...be included as equipment. This is the current practice and has been the practice of the Comptroller's Act as I understand for some years now. And we're really bringing the Finance Act into the conformity of what is in fact the practice that is being followed. I would solicit the support of the House on 2357."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2358. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 2358 again is serious Bill that has been offered by the Comptroller. This Bill amends the State Comptroller's Act and authorize the Comptroller to specify the format and contents of certain contracts required to be filed with him within the office. The is again clarifying language that has been suggested by



the Auditor General to the State Comptroller and we're trying to make the statute comply to those recommendations of the Auditor General. I would solicit...would solicit the support of the House on 2358 (SIC)."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2360."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2360. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is last in that series. This is House Bill 2360. It amends the State Comptroller's Act. It changed the requirement from each state agency to file fiscal reports from monthly to quarterly. Again, this is the procedure that is being followed and has been for some time and is the recommendation of the Auditor General to the Comptroller. And I would solicit the support of the House on House Bill 2360."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 159 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2419, Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2419. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you. I yield to Representative Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."



Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2419 is a Bill that will award academic scholarships to the four thousand top scholars in the State of Illinois. It will be renewable and they can be used at any state institution. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill for the reason that the cost would be in the neighborhood of four million dollars. That amounts to about six or seven percent of the appropriation to the State Scholarship Commission. The Scholarship Commission, as you know, awards scholarships...scholarships on the basis of need. This means then that there will be six or seven percent of the people who are now getting awards for scholarship... for scholarships because they need the funds and probably could not go to school without them, they will be denied scholarships. That's all there is to it. The pie is only so large. This cuts out a certain number of people who have a need. Now I call your attention to the fact that there is absolutely no need requirement in this Bill. The Bill is based strictly on academic accomplishments. Now these people with these academic accomplishments are going to go to school anyway. Those who do not have quite those academic accomplishments and need a scholarship in order to go to college are going to be deprived because of this. I urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr....Mr. Speaker, I think I'd have to move to take it off Short Debate if we're going to...so I would move to take it off of Short Debate. I have nine other people to support me and...."

Speaker Redmond: "Joined by nine....off of Short Debate."

Bradley: "Well thank you, I appreciate that very much. I



rise to support the Gentleman's motion. It's a...I realize it's a 4 million dollar cost to the State of Illinois, but in terms of the percentage of the amount of dollars that go to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, I don't think that's a bad...too large of an amount of money. After all, I think it's about time that we recognize excellence in our students and if this would at all...in any way at all be an incentive to the students to do better in high school, knowing that if they are in the top four thousand that they are going to receive a thousand dollars to continue their education, I certainly think it would be very well worthwhile. I know I get many calls from parents and from students who are receiving...are a merit scholarship winner and were notified with the IBM printout that we... the students in our district that have become merit winners and merit scholarship winners. And they say to us, 'Well I'm glad that I am, but you know, what's it worth to me.' And it's just strictly the honor. This way I think we would be helping to continue allowing them...and to continue their education and that I think is very important. As I say, if...if this were to be any incentive at all to the boys and girls in high school, it would be worth every dime that we're putting into it. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we reward mediocrity, we reward poverty. Here is a chance to reward excellence and provide an incentive for students to do better. I encourage your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well I have to echo the sentiments of Representative Walsh. I happen to believe that those on the high academic range are given many scholarships that are not available to the low income or those that have a



lower grade average. We seem to be missing the point that those in the middle brackets don't get anything. And it seems to me that it's about time we do that. I would be in favor of giving the 4 million dollars to put in a scholarship fund and giving to those who need it, not those who already get scholarships. Four million dollars for scholarships is good but let's place it where it needs...and not with those who are already getting them."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd rise also to echo the sentiments of Representative Walsh....is that this is a Bill which is putting money into scholarships, into an area where it is not particularly needed. We are trying to get as many scholarships to as many people as we can. What this does is put an added scholarship on top of all of the other scholarships, not measured by any kind of need and not limited to tuition and fees as our regular scholarship program is. If we only have a certain amount of tax dollars, we ought to put those tax dollars where they're most needed, give as much opportunity to as many people as we can. And I would urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 2419."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am absolutely amazed at my good friend from Cham...from Sangamon County. He is a man that also checks the books and does a very good job of it. Obviously this morning he's shooting from the lip. If he will look at that...at that line item, you will find that there's almost 4 million dollars left over from last year. We are meeting the need of those people who have normally applied for those scholarships, Representative. There is money left over. There is 4 million dollars left over."



And what we're doing today is saying to these young people who irrespectively whether they come from the white collar, the blue collar or whatever collar, if you work hard in school and if you want to go out on your own when you become 18 and 19 and you decide to go to one of our universities, if you have worked hard and you've maintained a grade average high enough to maintain that you're a merit scholar, you can do it on your own. You can be independent. We're glad to support you. I think it's a very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Katz: "As I understand, the Bill is designed to reward excellence, is that correct, Sir?"

Anderson: "That's right."

Katz: "Why is the...there a provision in the Bill that in addition to the student's demonstrated superior academic ability that it will also be awarded on the basis of high school rank. Doesn't that discriminate against an individual on the happenstance of where he happens to go to high school?"

Anderson: "I think not. This program is set up...the mechanism is already in this Scholarship Commission to do this and..."

Katz: "Well high school rank ... a student may have a good deal higher high school rank. His aptitude may be very high but if he is in a high school that has a lot of students who are already...with high aptitude rank, then he may have a lower class rank than another student who in another school has the highest...higher rank but actually has less excellence in terms in of learning. Isn't that right?"

Anderson: "Representative Katz, this year I think there were 94 hundred and 62 state scholars and we designed this



Bill around the top 4 thousand. This we thought was affordable because this is the money that...approximately this much is going lapse in the merit scholarship program."

Katz: "But my question is, if you just want to reward superior academic ability, why do you get into the question of what high school they happen to go to in terms of adding high school rank as one of the other basis from which you awarded? Why should you have high school rank if you're trying to reward excellence, why isn't it just on the basis of excellence in..."

Anderson: "It's just one factor in the formula used to set up this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "If the Gentleman's question is answered, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Anderson to close."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we give scholar... we give college scholarships to exceptional athletes without consideration for their financial need ...the schools do. And this Bill was really designed because of a principal of...in my area said, you know, 'We're doing everything for the student that doesn't have any brains. We're bringing our standards down and it's time that we reward excellence.' One-third of the brightest students in our state are leaving to go to other states to attend college. If our state is to survive we have to start rewarding people that will have the knowledge to carry our traditions out. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted



who wish? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just simply like to add my support to this Bill. We've had...we've tried to settle many, many things in the past. We have programs for those that are poor, obviously those that are rich can go where they want. We have programs set up for those who don't have the ability to have English as the native language. We have all sorts of programs and I think this is one that goes a long way. And I'd just like to answer that the only objection on my side of the aisle as to why we have class rank, let me tell you, Sir, you are very well aware neither class rank nor the ability on this test is an absolute...it is not a wholly accurate measure. They're both a good indication and that's the best we have. So that's the reason that we included both of those in the Bill. I think it's an excellent piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote. 123 to 33."

Marovitz: "Yeah, I just...briefly if Representative Anderson would get up in his explanation and just answer something that I...a question that I had and would have liked to ask before was that are we...it's fine to...to reward excellence, but are we penalizing those in need or is there going to be additional scholarships without sacrificing any scholarships at all that presently are awarded on the basis of need? In other words, will there be an additional appropriation as a result of this legislation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there's a 3½ million dollar lapse in this years appropriation. This is what our staff tells us. All the merit scholars have been taken care of. So there will be 4 million dollars added to the



bud...the Appropriation Bill 542 when it comes over."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', 32 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 829, Representative McClain."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 829. A Bill for an Act relating to capital improvements for private colleges and universities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for those of you who were here last Session this is a similar piece of legislation that passed the House and in the wanning moments in the Senate failed. It sets up a grant program for private universities in the State of Illinois. It...this is the substantive language. We had a little problem with the language as pointed out to us in Executive Committee wherein we had included all private universities so we restricted it to minimum of an organized four year program of collegiate grade receiving a baccalaureate degree. So we've restricted it to about 47 private colleges in the State of Illinois. The independent universities in the State of Illinois are in support of the piece of legislation. And it passed out of Executive 19 to 1. The Sponsors are Representative Jane Barnes and Mr. Madigan, Mr. Georgi and myself. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative McClain, how much money are we talking about in this particular Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you. Mr. Stuffle, there's no money figure on this, this is the substantive language setting up the grant program on the Capital Development Board



appropriation and authorization Bills. We have a 10 million dollar line item but that's not locked and granted. This is just the substantive language setting up the grant program."

Stuffle: "In other words, it might go up or it might go down?"

McClain: "Oh yeah, that's negotiable on the other two Bills. This just sets up the substantive language, the authority."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Stuffle: "I realize this is will probably be a futile effort so I will keep it short...noting the Sponsorship of the Bill. I would point out that we have a situation in Illinois where the private schools continue to keep up their enrollment and the public school enrollment continues to drop. There are many Bills on this floor that will pump more and more money into the private system when we in Illinois happen to be one of the best funders of the private school system in this United States. One of the three, I might add, who use at least 10% of their money for higher ed sources to go to the private verses the public universities. I believe in support. I think we've gone too far, however, in support of the private schools in this state. We're hurting the public schools to help the private. I reiterate that because I think this Bill, along with others, will go a long way if they're all passed to pump an additional 35 million dollars into the private schools this year and next when we're in grave need of funding the number one source, where the Constitution says we should be putting money, and that's the public universities. And for those reasons, I would urge a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane."



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

McClain: "Yes, yes, of course."

Kane: "Are there the same requirements in this Bill for the Capital Development Board to choose the architect and own the project and things like that as there are with the public universities?"

McClain: "Yes, and the Board of Higher Education sets up the priority list on which programs are to be accepted and then they will make their recommendations to the Capital Development Board. So the Board of Higher Education sets the priorities for the programs."

Kane: "And will the Capital Development Board own the project?"

McClain: "No, these are...the projects are not new constructions, it's reconstruction, rehabilitation and improvements."

Kane: "Who chooses the architect?"

McClain: "Whatever the same procedure is now. I'm sure it's ...has nothing to do...the Bill does not address architects. So I would imagine whatever the procedure now is it would continue."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the same procedures are followed as are presently followed under the Capital Development Board Act, I'm surprised that the private colleges if they want to maintain their...their private structure would go along with this kind of a grant. All that I've heard from the privates is that they want to stay private. They don't want to have public control. And if the same requirements are in this Section for the grants and the programs as are under the public schools, which I think are good, I'm very, very surprised that the privates would want this kind of a program. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain to close."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House, the Federation of Independent Colleges is in support of this Bill. I'd like to point out one thing for Mr. Stuffle, the private school enrollment in the last ten years has gone up, not down. Ten years ago there was 117 thousand students in private universities in the State of Illinois and this year it's 119 thousand, so the enrollment has gone up. As we face declining enrollments everywhere, the private colleges are going up. Secondly I'd like to point out to the Membership that this...this substantive language addresses only rehabilitation, improvement and reconstruction, not new construction. And the point is that we require many things of our private universities, health and safety codes, building codes, handicap. And all we're trying to do in this kind of program is to set some sort of grant programs, 75% to 25% local match, so that the privates can have some additional money. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 58 'no'. The Bill having...Representative Borchers is not in his seat but he desires to be recorded as 'aye'...having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Griesheimer, do you want 552 called? 552."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 552. A Bill for an Act concerning mobile home parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 552 is a comprehensive Bill that went through Judiciary this year...comes out on the House floor for consideration. I have worked with a



number of legislators that are interested in this Bill. Representative Yourell, I think, has been most helpful in his comments and insights on this Bill. What we did with this Bill this time, contrary to prior years, is sat down with the mobile home industry. The people that previously opposed this Bill have gone through it, taken out all of those items which they felt were objectionable. They now do not oppose the Bill. The Manufactured Housing Association endorses the Bill as it is now written and needless to say, the mobile home owners do. As I say it is comprehensive. Although, the most important thing it does do is require a lease for rental of mobile homes, the terms to be negotiated by the park owners and the mobile home owners. It does not invade any right to contract along those lines. I think it's a good Bill. It's a progressive Bill. It's in line with a number of other states that have similar Bills. I would urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2377."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2377. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Game Code of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to take House Bills 2377 and 2378 as a single vote. They both deal with the same subject matter in exactly the same ex..."

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

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2378. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Fish Code of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These two Bills are Bills to clarify language concerning the Fish and Game Code and also the Game Act that resulted because of a Bill that I had passed through this House last term increasing fishing and hunting license fees. At that time I was chief Sponsor of that Bill. It did not come out of the Department of Conservation. And in all earnestness, I dealt with the problem of individual licenses but did not deal with the subject of commercial licenses. The Department felt that in order to be in parallel that we should increase the commercial licenses for hunting and fishing and that is exactly what these Bills do. There was some difficulty with some language in there which I believe I've clarified for Representative Vinson and Representative Getty. I believe they're in good order now and I would urge their adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any dis...question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 1372. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 13 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1372. These Bills.. having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 1372."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1372. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1372 amends the Insurance Code by providing that the Director should not employ



an examination for the licensing of agents and brokers which has an...I mean, adverse impact on certain classes or groups. This Bill will be amended in the Senate. The Department of Insurance, I've talked with them as well as the Senate Sponsor and the Minority Spokesman on the Insurance Committee. And it will be amended in the Senate by agreement so I move for the passage of House Bill 1372."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'aye' and 22 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 450, is Representative Steczko... Representative Neff is on deck."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 450. A Bill for an Act to provide for the administration of aid to medically indigent of the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczko."

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

House Bill 450 was introduced by Representative Hoxsey, Yourell and myself and would require the Illinois Department of Public Aid to assume responsibility of the aid to the medically indigent program which is currently administered by the townships in this state. There were four reasons for the introduction of House Bill 450. Number one, to alleviate the property tax burden from local residents. But also, more importantly, to provide uniform administration of the medic...the aid to the medically indigent program. In addition to that, we know that local hospitals, if they have received federal assistance under the 'Hill-Burton Act' should have some program available to reimburse indigent patients. They don't do it. They simply find it easier



to submit those bills to the township and have the township pay for those bills. One other problem that we see with the administration of the A.M.I. program as it currently is, is that the townships where the accident occurred if a person is in an accident or where that person is hospitalized is required to pay for the cost of the hospital billing, not necessary the township where the person resides. We feel it is important, based especially on uniform administration, the fact that the Public Aid Department has the resources available to check out the 'Hill-Burton Act' provision, to provide uniform administration and also to receive federal reimbursement that they assume the responsibility for the program. I would answer any questions but would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "I have one question. I understand the transient indigent do have a medical problem but now our township offices...if you are...have a problem it probably takes you two or three weeks to get public aid and you may need the help now. In our area the township is the only one that can help you right now. And I wondered how you handled that? That's the only problem I have with your Bill."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, if I could answer the question. Right now the aid to the medically indigent program and the general assistance programs for the township are held ...are paid from the same levy. By alleviating the townships from this particular responsibility, they would have the money available to provide that general assistance as I believe you're speaking of, Dwight. In addition to that, there are some townships which do receive state reimbursement. And in order for them to



do that they have to wipe out their entire general assistance A.M.I. levies to do that."

Friedrich: "All right, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye' and 10 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Brummer, 'aye'. 1573, Representative Neff."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1573. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies..."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty is on deck."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1573 is legislation sponsored by Representative Stuffle and myself. And we've put this Bill in and...by request of the State University Annuity Association. House Bill 1573 amends the State University Retirement System to provide that the minimum survive annuities shall be applicable to each survivor of participant or annuity who passes away after the effective date of this Act regardless of whether his status as an employee terminates before or after that date. It would become effective July the 1st, 1979."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2310, Representative Keane."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2310. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane. Keane."

Keane: "Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2310 amends the School Code. It increases the Illinois State Scholarship Commission by two, from seven to nine. One of the new positions is to be filled by a student. At the present time there are seven members appointed by the government...Governor. The two new members would be appointed by the Governor. And this would result in the Illinois State Scholarship having one student member. I would ask for your favorable consideration of House Bill 2310."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is...Representative Polk."

Polk: "Just a question, Sir. Did you indicate the Governor would appoint a student?"

Keane: "The Govenor...the Governor would appoint a student as...upon the recommendation of a number of different students."

Polk: "And is there an age limit, a minimum of that...of what the age of that student would be?"

Keane: "I would...the student would be a...enrolled in a higher...higher education institution in the State of Illinois."

Polk: "They must be at least in college, is that what you're telling me?"

Keane: "Correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor...Representative Walsh. Pardon me."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill which seems to be the wave of the future. In the Higher Education Committee this year bills have passed out which would put voting members on all of the various boards dealing



higher education, including the elected University of Illinois Board. Now bear in mind that these are voting members, not observers as we've had in the past. This is just absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's no justification for it at all. And if every there was a case of putting the fox in charge of the chicken house, this is it. Why on earth we should pick out a student to serve on these boards, boards that consist of people who have worked hard throughout their lifetime to be members, why we should put a voting member to cancel out someone who is worthy of serving on this board just beats me. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we make a mockery of the system. We make...we insult the members of the board. We insult the people that we represent by putting a student member on these boards. And I urge your opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. Dyer is on deck."

Vinson: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I would agree with Representative Walsh on the governing boards of the state institutions. However, on the State Scholarship Commission, after listening to the testimony before the Joint Subcommittee of Appropriations and Higher Education last year where we discussed the performance and listened to the board members testify, I don't think I can agree with him. I think the Bill is a good one because the quality of the members is evidence by the mumbo-jumbo we heard on their management ability and on their ability to run that State Scholarship Commission...was incredible. They just have not done a good job and we need somebody, like a student perhaps, who might bring a little common sense to it because those current board members are not. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative J.J. Wolf."



Wolf: "Is this Short Debate or can I ask one question?"

Speaker Redmond: Ask one question."

Wolf: "All right. I would just like to ask a question of the Sponsor. If it were a student who was holding a scholarship to serve on the board, I would believe that would probably constitute a conflict of interest. Am I correct?"

Keane: "If you're asking me that question, I'm not an attorney and I don't know whether that would result in a conflict of interest. Maybe someone else could help you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to speak in support of House Bill 2310 and may alleviate some of the fears that some of the Members have. First of all, there's been an inquiry into whether or not this is a salary position. It is not a salary position for the people who are on the Scholarship Commission. Most importantly you must understand that the problems that have occurred in the last two years with the availability and the granting of scholarships to students at universities have been two to three months behind. I think they have a great concern because those students didn't know where they were, how they were going to pay for their education or if in fact they were going to get paid. I think it's important, as it is on every board or commission we have in the state, that someone who is in that field, possibly a recipient, maybe not a recipient, to have some input into this scholarship program. And in fact, translate back to the students why something is or is not happening. I think this is a good piece of legislation and ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the



House, just in answer to the query to Representative Keane relative to the conflict, that appointment would constitute no more conflict than it is that lawyers serve on the State Bar Board that look into questions relative to the Bar. The same situation exists, no more conflict would be involved than what is currently in law."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1706, Representative Dyer. 1706. Representative Katz on deck. On deck, that's a base ball term. That means you're next."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1...1706. A Bill for an Act in relation to equalization of state assistance to Illinois students attending nonpublic institutions of higher learning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your calling this Bill in a series while we're talking about the importance of keeping a well rounded balance of choice and access for every student in Illinois to either a private or a public institution. We all know that every student who chooses to go to the University of Illinois or Eastern or Western or Northern or Southern, is subsidized heavily by the taxpayers. The capital development that went into these campuses and so on was paid for by taxpayers. Therefore, those institutions are able to charge, oh, from say, 6 hundred and 2 dollars to 6 hundred and ninety-nine dollars per year tuition ...average tuition to the student. The student who might choose to go to Roosevelt or DePaul or Loyola or Knox or any of the excellent private institutions in the



State must pay at least 2 thousand dollars because that is actually the price that has to be charged. The cost is the same but the taxpayers are picking up the basis... the basic cost at the public institutions. House Bill 1706 proposes a formula for rectifying this injustice. It proposes that not just next year, because there's no funding yet in the Governor's budget, but the year... beginning year after next, the Board of Higher Education grant in a form of a voucher to each Illinois student who chooses a private college or university a... a voucher for 30% of the difference between the tuition at a public university and at the private college or university of his choice. It's eminently fair. It is affordable as we look to the future because if we had to replace the facilities at any of our private colleges, if we let them go out of business, it would cost hundreds of times more. I urge your favorable vote. I'll be glad to answer questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and...I think this should not be on the Short Debate Calendar. I'd like to ask, about nine others join with me, to see if...it looks like we've got them..and I would like to ask a Sponsor a question if I may? Representative Dyer, what...I see no...there is no fiscal impact statement on here. And you said this does not affect anything this year, but we've got to look down the road a little bit. Do you have any idea of what kind of money we're talking about?"

Dyer: "Yes. The estimate is...the request of the first year which would be 81 or 82 would be 4 hundred and 22 dollars per Illinois undergraduate in the nonpublic colleges which would be about 24.7 million dollars the first year that it's funded."

Wikoff: "24.7 million the first year?"

Dyer: "That's right."



Wikoff: "How much the second year? That's kind of an open ended check book isn't it because I would assume that the first year we've got 24.7, the second year those same people are still going to be attending that school and we're going to add another 25, 26 million on to there?"

Dyer: "That is not true. The enrollment with the birth rate declining, the enrollment in colleges is going down. The...the projection is that the amount request would go down rather than up unless the birth rate takes a sudden turn upward."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Wikoff: "I think we're giving...they're giving them somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 million dollars right now. This is going to increase it by another...a little bit more than 25%. I think the idea of the public colleges in the State of Illinois was that the taxpayers could and would subsidize the students to a certain extent. And I believe that we have been doing so, in fact, maybe even a little bit more than we should. I was one of those who did and still favor a tuition increase on the ...on the public colleges, but I cannot see us getting into the business of providing tuition funds or subsidization of tuition funds for the private universities. The private universities are private universities simply because that was their choice. And if we start subsidizing them by the way of tuition increases such as this, I can see them losing their privacy because they're going to come under a little bit more control of...of people in this Body. And I don't like to see that happen. I think this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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

Dyer: "Certainly."



Kane: "You indicated earlier that somehow or other it was not fair that the state was not putting as much money or proportionately as much money into the privates as into the publics."

Dyer: "That's correct."

Kane: "That's correct. Would you also then answer the question of whether or not it would be fair to give all of this money to the privates without requiring them to come in and justify their budgets and their salaries and their expenditures to the Legislature in order to get their appropriation as all of the public universities have to do to come in and justify their expenditure and salaries and those kinds of things? Are you envisioning that each private college will have to come in to the Legislature and answer the kinds of questions that presidents of the public universities have to answer in order to get their money?"

Dyer: "There are two points in answering that, Representative Kane. In the first place, this program would be administered by the Board of Higher Education which is the body that screens all these requests for funding that goes directly to institutions. Now the second point is, that the beautiful part of this proposal is that the aid does not go directly to the college. It is in a voucher form and it goes to the student. Therefore, there is not the meddling of the state, you know, in the private sector. This also answers Representative Wikoff's point."

Kane: "Why...why if it's going to the student, why don't you just increase the existing grant program. We are ...we are already giving money to students that are going to the private universities. Why not just increase that?"

Dyer: "Just because of the point I had just mentioned. Illinois does very well in a direct grant to a private institution.



We have recognized that to fill the need of Illinois students we need both the private and the public sector. But, as Representative Wikoff pointed out, if you get beyond a certain point in direct assistance from the state to a private institution that institution is no longer private. And it uses...loses some of its unique contribution. I don't think Knox College or Roosevelt University or Loyola or DePaul would want to be run by the State of Illinois. By this voucher system we avoid that problem."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. What 1706 does is establish a whole new program of aid to private colleges and universities. We already have three major programs of state aid to private higher education and we already give 80 million dollars through these three programs to the private colleges and universities. If we think that aid should be increased, we ought to increase some of the existing programs and not put together a whole new program which in first year of operation is going to require 25 million dollars. If we ask the question, is more money needed for the private colleges and universities? I think that the answer is a resounding no. The privates in the last couple of years have been able to compete very, very well with the public universities. Their enrollments have been growing at a much faster rate than the publics. In fact, in the last three years, the enrollments at the public universities have declined by 3% and in the last five years the enrollment in the private colleges have gone up over 7%. If you look at faculty salaries, facility salaries in the private colleges and universities in this state are above the national means. The salaries at the public universities of this state are below the national means. If we are going to continue in this



area, we're going to blur the whole distinction between public and private. We're going to deprive the public sector of kinds of support that it needs. If you look at this period of time in which we're going into now of tight taxes and declining enrollments. And the public universities have tremendous needs that we are not meeting. The private universities are competing very, very well. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Representative Kane is absolutely right. You may come from a private school, you may believe there is a need for more money. There may be a need for some, but in deed, this Bill for 24.7 million dollars added to the 10 million Mr. McClain just got would increase the funding of private schools by nearly 50% in this state. About two weeks ago, Representative Dyer told me this was a good program. They had it in North Carolina. I would submit to you, Representative Dyer that North Carolina only spends 1% of its higher ed budget on private schools. We already spend 10%. I would point out too in your reference to the Board of Higher Education that they have refuted every argument made for this Bill. They indicate there is no evidence at all for the need for the program. They indicate that the tuition gap Representative Dyer talks about is not growing, but in fact, is dwindling. They indicate that Illinois ranks third in the country in funding private schools and 42nd in funding public schools. The figures are clear. You can argue this money is going to students, not to private schools. And you know what will happen as well as I do. You put it in the student's hands, tuitions will go up, it will go to the private school. Representative Kane indicated ...he's absolutely right. Salaries have been on the rise in private schools much faster than public. Salaries



in fact were above the national average for privates and well below in the publics. Eastern Illinois University is an example on that, ranked in the 83rd percentile at the top in salaries five fiscal years ago. From 83rd percentile salary average in similar institutions nationally they've dropped to the 17 percentile area, while the privates have been rising. This Bill is not good. It cost too much money. The real issue about access is access in terms not of the tuition gap because it's not there but where we're going to put the money. You may be for the private schools, but I think it's unconscionable given the facts about the salaries and the enrollments because they're up on the privates, they're down in the publics. There's no incentive here for enrollment increases. They're already there. This Bill should be soundly defeated whether you're for or against the private schools, whether you're from one or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous three Speakers have done a good job of stating why we should vote 'no' on this Bill. And I won't take long. But I will say that my past voting record in this General Assembly will tell you that I am not against support for private schools. But I am against this Bill. Where do we stop supporting the private schools? Do we go so long that we wind up with two sets of schools, one called the state universities or the public schools and one called private, both supported by tax money? There's ...there has to be an end. I don't mind supporting them and even increasing it to the extent to take care of inflation. But sooner or later, they'll be completely supported if we keep on by state funds. And I'm very much opposed to this Bill and I think it should be defeated."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I wonder if my Cosponsor, Representative McClain, would like to close? Would you like me to close? All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as usual the same opponents of the previous Bill raised their heads and now they're raising their heads again. All this is is a tuition equalization program...I didn't say ugly...program for private universities in the State of Illinois. It's a fair system. What we're interested in is dual education system in the State of Illinois, Got just necessarily taking care of the public sector. Our philosophy in the State of Illinois has always been through the Illinois State Scholarship Commission or loan programs or grant programs is that we want a strong dual educational system in the State of Illinois. Now I'm a strong advocate for public schools. But I also believe that the private schools have much to offer our students in the State of Illinois. We deserve to help them out. I think that we continually pass laws, workman's compensation, unemployment insurance, Health and Safety Code, handicap provisions that mandate things on the private sector. We don't exclude them. All this Bill does is help to equalize somewhat those vast differences between our public monies going to public schools...to equalize that a little bit to our private sector. And because of that, I hope that you will support Mrs. Dyer's Bill which I am a Cosponsor of and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. My only comment, and I'm not going to get into debate, but I think that there might be a credibility problem here. I thought it was Mrs. Dyer's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "No, we closed. Representative McClain closed."

Barnes: "Well you can take the Roll Call but I want to raise a question in my explanation of vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "The question that I wanted to raise in my explanation of vote just a few moments ago on the Representative... on the Gentleman from Adams' Bill. He indicated that the enrollment at the private institutions was going up. And Representative...the Lady from DuPage, on this Bill which is again private schools, indicated that the enrollment was going down. I just wanted to point that out. I'm not sure, it might be vice versa. But apparently they can't quite get together on whether or not it is going up or going down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 58 'aye' and 89 'no'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1944. Representative Polk, for what reason do you rise?"

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, for those of you who read your newspaper synopsis and have...and enjoy a good political cartoon now and then, I'm sure you will all remember the name of Bill Campbell. Bill Campbell originally came from Galesburg, started his cartoon...cartooning at Galesburg Registered Mail and then...originally was born in Henderson County I was just



informed and then moved to the Quad City Times. And he's character pictures of the Speaker, Mr. Ryan, the Governor and many of us know him...known him personally. Unfortunately, Bill was involved in a car accident Tuesday night and was in very serious condition...was then moved to Moline Public Hospital. He has now been flown by helicopter to Chicago Weslin Pavilion of Northwestern University Hospital in Chicago late Thursday night after his condition became even worse. He...a team of neurosurgeons have examined him in Chicago and they now have him on a mechanical assist for both breathing and digestion. There are indications however that there...that they are happy about one thing in regard to his spine. It is indicated that the crushed spine is now incomplete instead of complete. So there is a possibility that he will not be paralyzed, but there's still some question. It's our understanding that Bill is going to be in the Intensive Care section at the hospital for at least two to three weeks that his condition is stable. I know all of you know him, you may agree with some of his cartoons sometimes and sometimes you may disagree. But he's certainly a Gentleman who has got a tremendous sense of humor. He's a real human being and if anyone would be interested in sending him a get well card at the...at the Northwestern University Hospital, those of us who are personal friends of his would certainly appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1944, Representative Katz."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1944. A Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "House Bill 1944 responds to the citizens, perhaps number 1 complaint, about government that we create agencies and they go on and on and that we never systematically review whether or not they still have a



purpose to be served. House Bill 1944 would establish a sunset law for Illinois under which the business and regulatory agencies would be reviewed periodically so that over a period of ten years all of those agencies would be reviewed. This House has several times previously indicated its belief that this is the only approach that we know really to try to do something about making sure that all of the government that we have is still needed and still necessary. I urge the adoption of House Bill 1944."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "I understand this sets up a Commission to abolish Commissions. Why don't you just abolish the Commissions?"

Katz: "No, it doesn't do that, Mr. Friedrich. What it does is to...to study the...every ten years the various license and regulatory agencies that we have established to see if they are still serving a public need. The Governor, under the Bill, would report every year to the Legislature in connection with his budget message whether or not they felt that agencies were continuing to serve a public function. But it would be up to the Committees of the House and the Senate to reach the final decision as to whether or not to continue the agency. It does not establish a Commission. It does set up a Committee in the House, but it is within the House and the Senate...the regular structure of the Senate and the House."

Friedrich: "Well we..."

Katz: "It does...excuse me. Mr. Friedrich, you do make one point and I do want to mention that...that it does establish...in addition...in the Amendment that was adopted, it follows a proposal that I think was in Mr. McBroom's Bill...one of the Bills last year. It does set up a group to study the question of the Commissions."



It does include public appointments made by the Governor, that is perhaps what you mean.

Katz: "No. As I understand it now, it doesn't set up a Commission, it sets up a Committee to study the Commissions then? Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Katz, would you yield for a question, please?"

Katz: "Yes."

Conti: "I like the concept of the Bill. I also was for sunset Acts but I'm a little...I mean Commissions, I'm a little concerned. You're saying you're going to renew the...the...repeal the Land Survey's Act, the Real Estate Broker's Act, the Illinois Land Sales Act, the Architectural Act. Are you repealing any Acts or are you doing away with Commissions?"

Katz: "No. Excuse me. Mr. Conti, the Bill follows the same form of Sunset Legislation that is found in a number of states beginning in Colorado. It provides that the agencies will expire every ten years periodically at different periods. The Legislature then decides whether they're still needed and then they recreate the same board if they believe that it does. That...it is the expiring of the various agencies that...from which the term 'Sunsetting' comes that they have their sunset every ten years. The Legislature then studies it and if it feels that it ought to be continued, it simply continues in affect...the same Commission or makes any changes that it wants to with regard to any of the regulatory or licensee agencies."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'...Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Katz, I don't even have the Bill in front of me, I just have the synopsis. It refers to the Commerce Commission and



Department of Insurance. Were these two agencies... agency and department rather, would they be terminated if in ten years we did not vote to reestablish them?"

Katz: "The answer to that question is yes. But what is set up is that eighteen months before they expire, the appropriate Committee starts to study what they have been doing and then makes a recommendation as to whether they ought to be continued or which functions in those agencies ought to be continued. If...they are sunseted like other groups but a mechanism is set up under which they are continued if they are still doing a job that needs to be done."

Mugalian: "Is it not possible under a certain kind of atmosphere in the General Assembly, for us in perhaps a moment of peak to not vote to establish the Commerce Commission? And if we did so, wouldn't that be absolutely chaotic?"

Katz: "I don't believe the...the Legislature could do the same thing now I assume by not voting an appropriation. I'm sure the Legislature would act responsibly. They would start eighteen months before and I'm very sure that that would not take place."

Mugalian: "May I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker? The Sponsor has indicated we can do the same thing now. So I would ask, why do we need this Bill? I think that all agencies should be reviewed. The...the existence...continued existence of any department of...of our state government ought to be reviewed by the General Assembly. But it ought to do it not under the kind of circumstances and conditions that this...this Bill would set. It's sort of an easy way out but in certain situations it could mean absolute disaster to the protection of consumers and...and others and everyone else in this state...and as a consumer. I just think this is sort of a gimmick and I suggest that it ought to be defeated."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, to close. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we don't systematically review agencies. That's the reason why many states have adopted sunset legislation. It makes us review the agency. It makes us do what I believe the citizens want us to do which is to systematically review whether or not the agencies that we have created are still serving a function. It has been found useful in a number of other states. It is in fact the only way that I know to insure a systematic review of the agencies we have set up to see if we still need them. I would urge the enactment of a sunset law here in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 11 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1271. Representative Totten on deck."

Katz: "House Bill 1271 recreates and continues the Commission on the organization of the General Assembly. The Commission was organized in 1965 to make recommendations regarding the running of the Legislature. In addition to the appropriation that was made then, a good of...some money was given by private foundations. This Bill would continue the Commission. The Commission during the past year has published the 'Goody Book' pursuant to its statutory mandate that lists all of the openings in state government so that Legislators and citizens know in fact the agencies that we have for which public appointments are made, who appoints them and the other terms. In addition to that, the Commission does review the recommendations that were made in the original report and monitors them. In addition to that, the Leadership can make requests that the Commission make...



do special studies. One such study is under...undertaking ...being undertaken now which has to do with the study of legislative investigation. This Bill would simply commend...continue the work of the Commission. It does not involve the expenditure of even a nickel of state money. And I would urge the passage of House Bill 1271."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1271. A Bill for an Act creating a Commission on the organization of the General Assembly and defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 'aye' and 37 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1225."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1225. A Bill for an Act in relation to the state agencies and to the termination, continuation or reorganization. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1225 is jointly Cosponsored by Representative Harris and I to the Illinois Sunset Act of 1979. It goes a little farther than the recommendations of Representative Katz which we passed previously in that it does provide organized review for all state agencies and programs. I'd like to point out to the Members of the House that now that we are probably going to adopt statutory limits it's important that we have a review process to review programs whose mandates may long have expired. And this would provide for an orderly review of all state agencies and programs and



is much needed at this time and I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative Totten, I think you said that this is a rather far reaching Bill, or did I hear you wrong?"

Totten: "You heard me correctly."

Leinenweber: "Can you tell us what happens on July 1, 1981 if the Legislature doesn't act?"

Totten: "Well, it's the same provisions as was in Representative..."

Leinenweber: "No, just tell us what happens."

Totten: "If the Legislature doesn't act, certain agencies would expire."

Leinenweber: "Why don't you tell us which ones."

Totten: "If you've got the list in front of you, you could do it faster than I can."

Leinenweber: "All right. The following agencies will terminate on July 1, 1981 if we don't do anything; The Department of Revenue, the Department of Business and Economic Development, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Conservation, the State Fair, the Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board, the Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education Commission, all five major retirement systems, the State Board of Investment and the Illinois Commerce Commission and, last but not least, the Illinois Art Council."

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

Collins: "My Seatmate convinced me, Mr. Speaker, it's an excellent Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this... Representative Currie."

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



can't support this Bill. I didn't support the smaller Bill that we just did pass out of the House. My concern is that when we're looking...the concern that Representative Leinenweber expressed by reading us all the agencies that by an action, we might in fact, destroy under this provision. But I think, more importantly, the kinds of functions that we're likely to be leaving to the wolves in the agencies in state government that are important, the kinds of programs that, for example, in the enactment of the Environmental Protection Act, changes in the Department of Insurance mandates. Those are the kinds of things that don't happen readily in state government. They take a good deal of citizen action...a long period of time to pull themselves together and to create some real activities for the consumer at the state governmental level. I think what this Bill is is an open invitation to the regulatees, to the insurance companies who enjoy some protection from the Department of Insurance, from polluters who might on occasion develop close relationships with the Environmental Protection Agency. Those kinds of functions in this kind of Bill will go on being protected, but will not be protected by a Legislature that is looking quickly at...at the issue, shall this agency and its function survive, are precisely the programs that are the most difficult to develop are the most important for us to be watchful about. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. As Alfred Conn would put it, 'I can see no better way to unconstipate the bureaucracy in the State of Illinois than to provide for the infusion of some accountability by...by the bureaucracy to this Legislature. And it seems to me the



Sunset, such as...Representative Totten's Bill and even Representative Katz's Bill, it's the only way to go. I voted for Representative Katz's Bill even though it ...it sets up a different kind of structure for the Sunset concept. However, I would say to you that...that Representative Totten's Bill from my worth is...the way to go with this because unless we say to the bureaucracy loud and clear that we expect you to be accountable to this Body, we expect you to be accountable to the people of the State of Illinois, we will continue to be faced with...with spending that we have no control over, with...with arteriosclerosis and the bureaucratic organs of this state that we have no control over and unaccountability by those agencies. I believe this is the best way to go in the interests of the people of the State of Illinois and in the interests of legislative prerogative and in the interest of making this state work. The agencies have to execute the laws, we have...we have the responsibility to see to it that they are accountable to us. And for that reason I rise in support of this Bill and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried. Representative Totten to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to point out that when we talk about Sunset all sort of red herrings about what may be abolished and so on comes before us. The importance of Sunset is that you need a trigger mechanism to provide the means for the Legislature to do the review. This Legislature, in the long run, always operates responsibly and those agencies and programs that are needed



to be continued are continued. What Sunset provides us with is a mechanism to review programs, some of which we have funded and conceived twenty-five and thirty years ago, to review whether they are still necessary and needed and Sunset provides the mechanism to do it. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'aye' and 27 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "I'm sorry, I had my light on. I guess you didn't see it. I did...I know it's short debate but there is one Constitutional problem here. And that is that it involves the abolition possibly of the Governor's office...and the Executive Branch. Regardless of how we, in the Legislative Branch, may feel there is a Constitutional separation of the Executive and the Legislative Branches and I have some problems with this. Therefore, I am voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz, 'aye'. On this question there are 131 'ayes', 27 'no'. The Bill having...Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe, 'no'. 130 'aye' and 27 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2614, Representative Beatty."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2614. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill does...does just what the synopsis indicates. It provides that pension benefits for the surviving spouse of a Member of the General Assembly may be



based on the retirement annuity to which the Member would have been eligible under the alternate formula in the reciprocal Article. What this means is that if ...if a Member of the General Assembly is eligible for a pension and he passes away before he can apply for it that his widow will stand in his shoes. She will pay in whatever he had to pay, whatever benefits would have accrued to him had he survived, she may obtain. This is approved by the Pension Law Commission. There are...it indicates there is no cost. We now pay for a widow or a widower's pension of a Member. This gives them the same rights that a Member would have would the Members survive. I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1891."

Clerk Leone: "House bill 1891. A Bill for an Act to designate depressed areas and relax government controls to allow for economic development therein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1891 is a unique proposal in that it runs counter to some of the things that have been happening in this country and the world. What it does is create enterprise zones. It allows municipalities at their initiative to petition the Department of Business and Economic Development or its successor that they would like to have an area in their city declared an enterprise zone. In effect, what the declaration would do was remove some of the



local state controls that have been controls that have been, maybe, harming economic growth and residential growth in the area. It would also allow the local depressed area or enterprise zone to petition the federal government for relaxation of federal measures that may restrict the redevelopment of that area. The measure has...has brought forth concern from many areas of the state that they are interested in this proposal. I think it is unique and it is one that in our time would help the economy and the...many of the depressed areas in our state. And I would solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, may I ask a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "You may."

Willer: "Would the Sponsor tell me if under this provision, the provision of this Bill, that in certain areas declared whatever that you could do away with the minimum wage."

Totten: "It would...there was an Amendment attached in the...in the Committee that would remove the union...there was a provision that would allow an open shop there. That Amendment removed that. But it would allow the area to operate without a state minimum wage, but the federal minimum wage would still be in effect."

Willer: "And you could do away with property taxes on these businesses?"

Totten: "No, property taxes would come in under the schedule that's in the Bill. They would be lessened...they come in at a 5%, I think the Bill says, the first year and then they would gradually go up over a five year period to the full...it would be to encourage business. The schedule is in the first year no property taxes would be levied on enterprises



locating in there, second year 20%, third year 40, fourth year 60, fifth year 80 and in subsequent years 100 in order to encourage businesses and residential to locate there."

Willer: "And what would be the criteria to declare an area depressed? Who would do it and on what basis?"

Totten: "The local municipality or city would first initiate the request. And then that...if they decided that they would like to have an area in their city or community declared an enterprise zone, they would then bring their request to the Department of Business and Economic Development. Who would then either approve it, recommend it or make changes in it and then they would supervise."

Willer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Don, House Amendment #1 says that building codes and zoning shall not be effected in the enterprise zone. How do you visualize that working?"

Totten: "Well if the local community so chose to declare that their area would be a enterprise zone, then they would suspend local zoning codes and local housing codes."

Mahar: "Well, I don't quite understand a municipality setting aside a zone...enterprise zone and then allowing any kind of building in that zone, within the municipality, that might be contrary to their building codes...with no supervision apparently. I don't understand how that would work."

Totten: "Well if they...first of all, it's local initiative that starts it. If they decided they didn't want to do it, they didn't want to allow this to happen, then they wouldn't initiate it. But if they decided, 'Hey,



this might not be a bad idea and let's do it. But we understand that in order to do it we must suspend local zoning codes and building codes to do it'. Then they start it off."

Mahar: "I think it's...I think the idea is a very good idea. It would seem to me that this...by them giving up their right for building...building codes and zoning codes, they would be...find very few municipalities that would want to do this because they would lose total control over the most important part and that's how the buildings are constructed and how the area is zoned and whatever. It would be...it could be an albatross around their neck down the road sometime.

Totton: "Well, maybe that might be true and maybe it won't work because of it. But I'd like to point out to the attention of the Gentleman from Cook and to others that in a recently issued copy of a report by the National Commission on Neighborhoods the one most debilitating affect on local development in areas of decayed...was sited as being building codes...that building codes were prohibiting areas from being redeveloped and, of course, they were to restrictive. And the report concluded that probably in a lot of our major cities, if we want to improve neighborhoods, we ought to suspend building codes. It's a rather interesting report that was just published by the President's Commission on Neighborhoods and I draw your attention to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think everyone in this House should take a very, very careful look at this Bill. Under this Bill, an enterprise zone could be established. Within that zone there would be a suspension of state laws with respect to wages. Within this zone there would be a



suspension of building and zoning. Under this Bill... under these zones, in the first year, no property taxes. And then you ought to determine, from reading the Bill, by what standards a zone such as described would be established. The standards are set by bureaucrats. Because the department is given the authority to established criteria for determining what areas qualify as enterprise zones. There is nothing, absolutely nothing in this Bill, setting forth standards or criteria as a matter of legislative policy. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this is probably one of the worst Bills that has come before us this Session and I would urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried. Representative Totten to close."

Totten: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just be brief. The idea is not...is a new one for this county but interestingly enough, the socialist party and labor party in England and the conservative party and both have found that this measure is...bares such merit that it is seriously being debated in the English Parliament as a cure for some of their decaying neighborhood problems. Those people who bring the herrings about what would happen if we let everything...the red herrings, what would happen if we let everything go and the market decide what should be developed with few restrictions from state, local and federal government of bring the very red herrings that are causing the decay in some of our



major cities today. I think we ought to let local communities try this, see if it would work. If it does work it could spread and be a bonanza for rehabilitating many of our neighborhoods throughout the state. And I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bowman. One minute to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, reading from the Bill here I want to point out that it's a unit of government, either state or local, owns any property within one of these free enterprise zones they must sell that property at a public auction. There's no discretion in this. It's mandatory that that property go up for public auction. Well bingo, there go your parks in the depressed areas. Also it says here that no person entering an enterprise zone shall thereafter be eligible for any subsidy, grant or other form of government assistance whatsoever. So if I walked through an enterprise zone, that's it, no more scholarships, no more nothing else. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, my explanation vote is sort of a question. It would look to me that since there are no defined boundaries of this zone, metro-government might be snuck in against the people's wishes without an open referendum. And therefore, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Simms to explain his vote."

Simms: "Oh, I'm sorry, I thought the board was locked. I wanted to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I would just like to say something in behalf of the Bill as I'm one of the Cosponsors of it."



There has been, as the Sponsor pointed out, a lot of red herrings. People say, 'Look what might happen if you do this.' But look what happens if you don't do it. I...I would suggest that you go through many of the older cities of the United States in the State of Illinois and look at what kind of slums we have. Now I'm not suggest...or anybody would suggest that those slums that we currently have, these terrible conditions, are good. And I can't imagine how this Bill could make them any worse. It does offer some hope for areas like East St. Louis and Chicago and some of the down trodden areas that we've heard so much about during this term of Legislature and the last few terms."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birkenbine."

Birkenbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in support of this Bill I would refer your mind to Operation Bootstrap that took place in Puerto Rico in which tax incentives were used to attract industry to the island and provisions were made to encourage more people to be put to work, more companies to go in. And I would think this is an ideal type of situation for an area such as East St. Louis, such as any depressed area anywhere in the state which could petition to become a free zone thereby attracting industry and in bringing more jobs."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mugalian to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "No, I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

It would seem to me that this would be in derogation of home rule. I'm not sure, I wonder if there's a ruling as to how many votes it takes for the option."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? You weren't finished."

Mugalian: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Well I'm trying to watch this up here. I



apologize to you, Rich. But what is your...state your inquiry."

Mugalian: "The inquiry is whether or not this vot...this Bill takes 107 votes because it seems on the surface of it that it's in derogation of home rule powers."

Speaker Flinn: "I'll look it up for you. The Parliamentarian advises me that the answer is...that is permissive... it contains no preemption whatsoever. Representative Birchler, would you punch Flinn 'aye' back there? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2283. Is Representative Madigan on the floor or within hearing... Representative Madigan is up."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2283. A Bill for an Act to provide for state grants to certain public television stations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, there is an appropriation for this Bill. I would believe it would be 2284, 2282, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear the two Bills together? Leave. Have no objection, leave is granted. Read 2282."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 22....BLANK IN TAPE....making appropriations to certain public television stations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, that was an error. 2282 is a different Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "He corrected it. He made the correction up



here...the Clerk did."

Madigan: "I'm sorry, that is the correct Bill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, these two Bills together would provide for annual state assistance grants to all public television stations based in Illinois. The amounts to be in proportion to each station's comparative actual operating cost in the prior fiscal year. There are six public television stations currently operating in Illinois, WSIU TV in Carbondale, WUIS TV in Olney, WTTW in Chicago, WCME in Chicago, WTVP in Peoria, WIRL in Urbana, Champaign. The Bill contains a two part formula. One part of the formula would provide for an annual flat grant in the first year of operation, 50% would be dispersed equally to all of the stations. In the second year that percentage would decrease to 40% and in the third year to 30%. And it would remain at 30% thereafter. The second part is a formula which would provide 50% of the money on a prorated basis predicated upon the size of the operating budget in the first year. That percentage to increase to 60% of the second year and 70% in the third year. There's a provision that no station can get more than 50% of its budget out of either of these aspects of the formula. And there's a further provision that none of the money can be used for the acquisition of real estate or improvements to real estate. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure that all of us are familiar with public television. And certainly those of us who reside in the Chicago metropolitan area are familiar with the programs offered by WTTW in Chicago. These are programs that are not normally found on commercial television stations. They are high quality. They are good for our populous. And it is my view that that type of programing ought to be subsidized by the state because if it is, then we can



have a dependable, liable supply of programming and these stations will be in a good financial position to continue to provide good, quality TV programming for the viewers all throughout the state."

Speaker Flinn: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, is recognized."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, it's with reluctance that I rise to oppose this Bill. And I'd like to point out, and I hope everybody is paying attention, what a really grotesque threat to freedom of speech and the press that this Bill poses. Now we have in the past, against what I consider our good judgment, given capital assistance to the state public television stations, most of which...whom are...which are located at our universities. But this Bill..these two Bills, House Bill 2282 and 2283, seek to expand that concept of giving capital assistance to get into operational grants to public television stations. Now I happen to be a supporter of Station WTTW in Chicago and I happen to watch it on occasion. I happen to think it's program content is sometimes very good and sometimes very bad. But I suggest to you, if these stations turn to the state government as they have turned to the federal government, they're going to find their freedom, the freedom which they now exercise to attack various agencies in what they call sometimes consumer programming, freedom to attack the political institutions, such as the General Assembly pay raise, various freedoms which they now exercise in their programming contents, they're going to find them threatened. Much the same as they alledged that their...they were threatened by a recent national administration. I suggest to them that they should turn this money down, they should refuse it if we vote it for them, because of the tremendous threat that it will pose to them. I



suggest to you that it is also very unfair, for example, for a funeral director to have his tax money go to a station which finances a program attacking the funeral industry. This is not fair. It should be financed by private individuals so that they...so that the taxpayer will not have to finance his own destruction. This is a terrible Bill, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and I urge it's resounding defeat."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to close. We're on Short Debate. Representative Jake Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf: "Well then I...I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this be taken off Short Debate. It is an appropriation matter."

Speaker Flinn: "Well it has not been requested at this time and I have no choice but to follow the rules. If there's enough help...there's plenty of hands, more than enough. All right. Representative Willer was next. I'll recognize her, then you, Jake."

Willer: "Yes, I would...would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Willer: "Representative Leinenweber has voiced one of my fears. I happen to think your idea is great. I think that we should...all of us watch a lot of programs on Channel 11 in Chicago that come from England. People either praise them to the skies or many times they think they're absolutely awful. But Representative Leinenweber has made a very good point and I would hope that you, Mr. Sponsor, would...for the record, assure us that once these stations get state money that there will be no attempt on the part of anyone to censor what they do. Some of their programs on Channel 11 in Chicago are pretty hair raising and meet with objections from a lot of people. We are not



England. They are very tolerant over there. They make fun of their government. They make fun of everybody. And I think their programs are great and I think we need more of it. But I am concerned over tax dollars once they are being used for these stations, and I agree they should be, that then there will be an attempt to censor them in the area of good taste or morality or what have you. And I would like you to respond to my fears by saying you certainly don't envision anything like this."

Madigan: "Representative Willer, I certainly concur with your fear and the fear of Representative Leinenweber that there might be such an attempt. And for my part, I certainly feel that there should be no governmental censorship or interference with the operation of any of these television stations."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf is recognized."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also rise in opposition to this Bill. It is five million dollars in unbudgeted General Revenue Fund for public television. It's interesting to know, however, that five of the stations that are in here...this is over and above let me say, the WILL which is the U. of I. station, is currently receiving three hundred and forty-one thousand six hundred and thirty-five dollars in state funds. WUSI and WSIU, which are Southern Illinois University stations, receive eighty-three thousand, four forty and six hundred and twenty thousand, nine hundred and six dollars...this five million is in addition to. I would also like to point out that Western Illinois is receiving this year in capital development funds, nine hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars to complete...to get them operative. And also Higher Education budget has, for fiscal 79, given one hundred and seventy-five thousand and has



budgeted one hundred and eighty thousand for fiscal 80 for Western Illinois University. I don't want to repeat the other arguments made which are all valid, it would be redundant, but I would like to point out... of course the subject matter here is of great importance and to take into consideration how much is already being spent for the university stations with state funds and this is in addition to. If we do start this practice to get into additional stations, how much will they be back for next year? I asked the Sponsor in Committee, if we give five million this year, will they be back in for ten million for fifteen million next year? The Sponsor could not answer. And we all know what the answer is of resounding 'yes', everytime we start a program. Many are started but few are ever taken away or phased out. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think everybody ought to pay attention to this Bill. I think it's one of the best Bills that we've had this entire Session. All of us watch television and see a vast majority of junk on television. If you read this Bill...I certainly would be as fearful as anybody else about anybody regulating free speech, freedom of the press or television. But there isn't one word in this Bill of regulatory authority or regulatory power over what goes into these programs. Not one word. It's straight appropriation money. And what better way is there to reach millions of citizens across the State of Illinois with good, positive, intelligent programming than to help out the public television stations across this



this state? I think this is an important piece of legislation and deserves everybody's support."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew, is recognized."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First let me point out as I've been asked several times, this is not my Bill that is the annual appropriation for Western Illinois University television stations. As a matter of fact, we wouldn't get a penny under this Bill. However, I am a hyphenated Cosponsor of this Bill and I think it's one of the best programs that we have come up with. Let me just give you a little bit of background in comparison to show you how much the State of Illinois is in the dark ages in...in this particular endeavor for government. The State of Ohio last year had fifteen million dollars for their statewide educational television system. It is one of the best in the nation and obviously they're extremely proud of it. The State of Illinois gives zero pennies. If we want to compare that to what some of the other states are doing, it borderlines absurdity. The State of Mississippi is over eight million dollars. They have thirteen television stations. As a matter of fact, they have done several studies to substantiate that the level of education in the State of Mississippi has, in comparison to the national norm, risen dramatically as a result of the investment in educational television in that state. That's probably the only thing that they are ahead of Illinois in, but there's absolutely no question whatsoever that it has gone a great long way in terms of educational endeavors of the children of the State of Mississippi. Illinois is, with these two Bills, beginning to embark upon a program that I think is of utmost significance. It is a program that



will begin to contribute a small percent of the money of the operating expenses for those stations that are already on the air. The money is drastically needed. We do not tell them we will not have private funds. As a matter of fact, I think most people will concede that the best duty of educational televisions are not carried out on sole government money. This is a mixture. It is state money, it is private money. It is a program that will bring the educational level to a great number of people that cannot afford cable systems throughout the state, that cannot get the facilities that are otherwise available to those in major metropolitan areas or those that are available only through the educational television system. I suggest this is an excellent Bill and I ask for its support."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson, is recognized."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the most salutary features of public television, as far as I am concerned and many others, has been the fact that it has been privately financed. Being privately financed, these public programs have been free of state control. This has been mentioned before. But I would remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that once, if this Bill is passed and we begin to see the infusion of state money into public television, we are going to begin to see a commensurate decline in private contributions. I don't think this is going to exist both ways. And if we begin to see a massive infusion of public money into public television, we're going to see a commensurate decline in private contributions because the average citizen is going to argue that they are getting the money from the state, that they're getting it from the



taxpayers and why should we, as private citizens, contribute to public television. And I think that salutary aspect of a public television will therefore be lost to that degree. Furthermore, I see this as the nose of the proverbial camel under the tent. And once we start down this road there will be no end to it. God forbid, what we have in this country what they have in England and some other socialist countries, television that is controlled by the state. I think this is a dangerous concept. And I would remind you to, it's been argued that some of these institutions know they're not taking any state money but if this is passed they will be eligible for state money and they'll all be climbing on the band wagon. I see this as a...a dangerous step in the direction of state control, which has been mentioned several times by Representative Leinenweber and others. But I...I don't think that we can equate this step or a step in this direction with freedom in our electronic media in this country. I think it's a step quite to the contrary and I would urge your careful consideration and your careful vote before you are tempted to support this in any way."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, is recognized."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a great believer in cable TV. In fact, I just passed an ordinance last month to allow cable TV to come into Elmwood Park. But the thing that bothers me the most is the two remarks that were made by the colleagues on the other side of the aisle. One wanted assurance from the Sponsor that there wouldn't be any regulatory provisions in this Act. The other says there's...look at the Bill, there's nothing in there about regulations. Well in my thirty-two years of



office, and I've been involved in an awful lot of state assistance programs and federal assistance programs, and I defy them, I defy them to show me any Act that provides assistance where there's any regulations or stipulations in the Act. But once you get that money, and once you receive that money, you will be filing forms out that will be coming out of your ears. This is a real bad Bill. Both of them should be defeated...the appropriation and the Bill itself."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, is recognized."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Hudson is probably right for the wrong reasons and he also knows we don't have any camels in our district. But one of the problems I have with this, there's no way he can establish in language a provision that keeps this interfering General Assembly from interfering. I mean, that's just the way we are. Representative Leinenweber and I would probably like to subsidize the Cub games even though the Sox fans wouldn't like that. He would have different points of view on the kinds of theater perhaps that would be shown on the various public channels and possibly would act out of spitefulness in...toward the appropriation. So as trustworthy...trustworthy as I think we can be on many issues, when we get into the public sector on an issue like this, I think we're just going to have ...find ourselves as a legislative Body competing with our version of what the program ought to be. It's an unfortunate way that we have to look at things but it's the realistic way. I think we're a free culture. We do not like any form of regulatory kinds of language that would direct us toward regulating television programming. I'd like to give them ten million bucks and let them go their own way. But when you realize it



comes from us and when you recognize that in many cases we have thousands of points of view on a given issue, I think this kind of appropriation and this kind of legislation would have a very tough time. I see it as a problem with free speech. I would oppose it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed... the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in closing I would simply like to point out to the...the Assembly that there were remarks to the effect that if this Bill passes, then the private contributions will decrease. Studies in other states which have implemented programs such as this are to the contrary. There are four or five other states where studies have been conducted and they have conclusively demonstrated that where public subsidies have been provided that, in fact, the private contributions have also increased at the same time. Mr. Speaker, I feel that public television is a public service and it ought to be supported by public subsidies. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all...the question is, rather... The question is, shall House Bill 2282 and 2283 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. While we are explaining votes I am going to use the timer but not the shut-off switch. And I will remind you when your time is up. The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, is recognized. One minute to explain his vote."



Robbins: "We might as well establish a state newspaper and restrict it as well as...put this money in public television, you know you're going to control it because there has never been anything that the government put money in they don't control. Now, if...we have some good programs. We have financed the only thing that I can see is they might be able to buy a few little... a few better movies instead of running the 1930's, they might be able to run some of these current, up-to-date ones that you get a brand X on."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkenbine, to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Birkenbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The arguments that have been made in favor of this Bill speak about the excellence of public TV and I fully agree. I contend that by being independent, by having to seek solicitations from people they maintain and continue that excellence. But I question, with 81 votes on the board, whether there are 81 people in this General Assembly who have felt so good about public TV that they have sat down and supported it themselves. We seem very capable of spending other people's money for something that we feel is good, yet how many of those 83 have sat down and sent in money to do it, to support just that public TV?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I supported this measure in the Appropriations Committee because I felt that it is a subsidy which would be of good benefit to all people of the State of Illinois. Someone just said, 'I have seen nothing that we throw money at as government that we don't



control.' This year we're going to spend 2 billion dollars on education. Do we control education? No. We have academic freedom. And for this 5 million dollars we are going to provide a subsidy for public education, for good programming. Many of us say we see a lot of junk on the...the competing commercial televisions and we do. And I know that with this extra money that we will have more good programming in public television and that's what we all want. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Grisheimer, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe this is the singular most irresponsible Bill that we've handled this Session. Go home to your school district and tell your school board and your administrators that not only have we violated any degree of priority in spending down here but we've now entered into a new area of spending when we haven't even faced up to our constitutional responsibility of fulling funding this school. I can't believe we're even voting on a Bill like this. I know the Governor has to veto it. There's no way he can sign it. But to think that even a Leader would consider introducing a Bill like this shows that there is no leadership quality in certain areas of this Legislature. We're all a group of spendthrifts if it passes and we're not doing anybody any good with their money. We might as well fold up shop and go home."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Greiman: "I think I'm voting for House Bill 2282 because I believe that we do not live bread alone. I believe that our lives have to be enriched by some things other than just things that stimulate the senses. This



stimulates the minds of young people, of adults. It has serious continuing education programs. We spend millions of dollars for adult edu...for adult education and we reach thousands with these...with this money we reach millions, millions of people, millions of minds. We bring achievement and we bring fascination in whole new fields to viewers. It is the most essential thing that we do this Session I believe."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle. I am a regular contributor to the public TV station in our area and I plan to continue to be even after we get legislation such as this passed. In response to those concerned about taking money from schools, let me say to you that this, in fact, is a big aid to our schools. Our schools frequently use programs that are developed at the TV stations. We have cassettes that go out to the school districts across the state and, in fact, across the nation. So that we can bring programming into our schools that may not be provided locally. They cannot produce every course locally. And so this, in fact, is a tool for the schools so that they can bring in specialized programming that they could not otherwise afford. Not all of what the state can do..."

speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Satterthwaite: "...is found on what you see on your TV, it's also in our schools on a day-to-day basis."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, if this reaches 89 I want a



verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I've been here a few years too long but I'm getting to the point where I can give speeches of certain Members better than they can. And it seems that they're the ones on appropriations Bills that stand up and say we're not appropriating enough. We haven't got enough money to give a cost of living increase to public aid recipients. We've had problems fully funding the school aid formula. But every time a new spending Bill comes along, they stand up and support that too. And we haven't got enough dollars to go around for the programs we've got so why should we start a new one?"

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 62 'noes'. And Representative Collins has requested a verification. I suppose Representative Madigans requests a poll of the absentees. Is that right, Representative Madigan? Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Ebbesen."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen votes 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Epton. Dave Jones. Kane. Molloy. Oblinger. Peters. Reilly. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney. Telcser."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Balanoff. Jane Barnes."

Speaker Flinn: "The TV lights are on."

Clerk Leone: "Beatty. Bell. Birchler. Bower. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Georgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig.



Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane.  
 Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski.  
 Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan.  
 Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain. McGrew. McMaster.  
 McPike. Mugalian. Murphy. Kulas. Neff. O'Brien.  
 Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Rea.  
 Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Satterthwaite. Schisler.  
 Schraeder. Sharp. Henry. Slape. Steczko. Stuffle.  
 Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek.  
 Von Boeckman. White. Wikoff. Willer. Sam Wolf.  
 Younge. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Challenges to the affirmative vote. Turn Representative Collins...turn Representative Collins' microphone on. And would the Clerk give us a count to begin with? The count is 94 'aye' and 63 'no' to begin with. Questions, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Bradley."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bradley...in the middle aisle."

Collins: "Brummer."

Speaker Flinn: "Brummer. Representative Brummer. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? There he is."

Collins: "Christensen."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Christensen. Representative Christensen is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "I think I saw Dawson come back, did I? I guess not. Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dawson. He's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."



Collins: "John Dunn."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Dunn, the middle aisle."

Collins: "Ewell."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ray Ewell. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? Representative Dawson is back. Put him back on the Roll. How is the ...Representative Ewell recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Farley."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Farley. Is he back there? We can't see up from up here in the dark with the TV lights on. He's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? If not, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Keane."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Keane, he likewise...he's in his seat and I can see him."

Collins: "Kucharski."

Speaker Flinn: "What? Who's that? Kucharski, he's in his seat."

Collins: "Laurino."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Laurino. He's not in his seat. He is on the floor? How is Representative Laurino recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Leverenz."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ted Leverenz is in his seat."

Collins: "Marovitz."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz...over in the Democrat aisle."

Collins: "O'Brien."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative O'Brien is in his seat."



Representative Laurino is back. Put him back on the Roll."

Collins: "Pierce."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dan Pierce...right here in front."

Collins: "Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schisler. Gale Schisler is in his seat."

Collins: "Henry."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bill Henry is in his seat."

Collins: "Stuffle."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Larry Stuffle. He's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Terzich."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Collins: "I see him, never mind. Van Duyne."

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

Collins: "I have no further questions. No further questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh. Would the Clerk give me a count?

There are 90 voting 'aye' and 63 voting 'no'. And this Bill hav...these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which these Bills have passed, I move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which these Bills passed. And Representative Georgi, for what purpose do you arise? Georgi. Turn Georgi on."

Georgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion has been made that that motion



lie on the table. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it, motion tabled. House Bill 2162, Representative McAuliffe."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2162. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "This Bill would give twenty-five dollars extra a month and raise the minimum pension to three hundred and seventy-five dollars a month for retired policemen and two hundred and fifty dollars for his spouse."

Speaker Flinn: "Have you completed your remarks? Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2162 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 137 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 9....1945."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1945. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year we established on a temporary basis a program in the Department of Children and Family Services to provide a homemaker within the home for assistance to the family rather than removing the child from the home. That program is working out well. According to the statute that program would have died April 1, 1979, this Bill simply extends the operation of this program. Would appreciate an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further discussion, the question is shall House Bill 1945 pass? All those in favor vote



'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', 1 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 509, Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 509. A Bill for an Act to exempt ...hearing aids and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 509 exempts from the sales tax the purchase of hearing aids, prosthetic devices and eye glasses for people who are 65 years of age and over. The fiscal impact of House Bill 509 is three hundred and ten thousand dollars in fiscal 1980 to the state, approximately seventy thousand dollars to the...to the decreased sales tax to the municipalities. This Bill was heard in the Revenue Committee. It came out with a 17 to 0 vote. I strongly encourage...I think this will probably...one of the most important pieces of legislation affecting the seniors. They been looking for this sales tax relief for a good number of years. I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote on 509."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Collins, to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Collins: "No, I have an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I notice that this Bill is #1 on the priority of call. Is that where we are now?"

Speaker Flinn: "No we're just skating around trying to pick up something that will keep us out of trouble."



Collins: "Well<sup>o</sup> wouldn't it make more sense to skate to the other end?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well if you want to go home if would. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2769...same Sponsor."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2769. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2769 is a Bill to require the appropriation of federal funds prior to their expenditure by a state agency. This Bill exempts certain emergency uses of federal funds in other categories which have been developed over the last several years to meet various requirements. This Bill exempts from the requirement of appropriation to colleges and universities of this state and our revenue bond agencies such as the Illinois Housing Development Authority. I know that it is difficult to quickly evaluate a Bill of this magnitude. This Bill is not an entirely new Bill. Many of you have voted for this Bill in one of its earlier manifestations. In the Eightieth General Assembly it appears as House Bill 186 and 2344, all of which were passed and were vetoed by the Governor. I believe that in the Seventy-ninth General Assembly a somewhat similar Bill as sponsored by Representative George Ryan. During my term...terms as the Appropriation Spokesman and Committee Chairman, I became sincerely convinced of the necessity of controlling the uses of federal funds by the agencies of



this state. While the abuses have been somewhat reduced, the potential for abuses remains. This Bill will prevent many of them...misuses of tax dollars. This Bill was heard in the Executive Committee, came out with a 17 to 0 recommendation. I strongly encourage your serious consideration on House Bill 2769."

Speaker Flinn: "If there is no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2769 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 251, Representative Polk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 251. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 251 is a change in the Criminal Code Section of aggravated battery, provides that this is known as...commonly known as the halloween Bill. This is in relation to people who knowingly and willingly would put a needle or a razor blade in a candy bar or in a popcorn cone and...and knowingly and willingly give it to children. We've had many instances in the state..unfortunately, many instances in the state and the Code apparently did not cover it. This was a Bill that was introduced last year and got caught in the Senate. We're trying again this year and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 251 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Chapman is on deck. Now I'm going to call the on decks so you can look it up in the book if you care to. Have



all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 158 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 893."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 893. A Bill for an Act in relation to the health planning, amending certain Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Kempiners and I offer House Bill 893 to you. It amends the Health Facilities Planning Act, commonly called the Certificate of Need Act, and puts the state law into confirmative with the National Health Planning Act. Amendment #6 is the Bill. I believe this is noncontroversial so I would ask for your support."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a bad Bill. It expands further regulation of the health care industry. All it can do is raise cost, reduce availability of access to equipment. It's going to decrease the supply of these things and it's going to raise the cost. Another layer of bureaucracy into health care is something we don't need and I urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "I believe Mr. Kempiners is there ready to close."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners is recognized."

Kempiners: "Well after that speech that Representative Vinson gave I'm not sure I want to speak for this Bill. This Bill is a product of both the Department of Public Health and the Illinois Hospital Association in response to recently acted federal requirements. I



will admit that there are...there is one provision in this Bill that Amendments are being prepared for that we will offer in the Senate because it is, in my opinion, not necessarily included in here. But, I think if you take a look at the synopsis that in some...some ways we're trying to make it easier for people to serve on this board. And we are, through the Certificate of Need process, attempting within our own state to limit the expanding costs of health care. I very strongly disagree with Representative Vinson's assertion that this will increase it because there does have to be need proven in order to implement a program in a health facility. I would urge your support of this legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 893 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and all those opposed vote 'no'. The next Bill is 2210. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye' and 37 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2210."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2210. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2210 is a Bill which derives from the Illinois Office of Education's response to a request by the Appropriation Committees of both Houses of the Legislature. They ask for a consolidation of the adult education funding. This is what this simple Bill does. It consolidates the three programs that are in the statutes right now regarding adult ed. There is no fiscal implication at all."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not the question



...Representative Walsh, you've got your light on."

Walsh: "Yeah, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will."

Walsh: "You say there are no fiscal implications in this Bill and I'm..."

Chapman: "That's right."

Walsh: "I recall a year ago you were interested in mandatory adult education."

Chapman: "Still am, but that Bill is in Interim."

Walsh: "That Bill was introduced but is in Interim, is that right?"

Chapman: "Yes."

Walsh: "And now..."

Chapman: "This is...this is not that Bill, Representative Walsh. This Bill comes from the Office of Education."

Walsh: "And this...this Bill combines the adult education dealing with people on public assistance...is that..."

Chapman: "Yes, to help recipients of public aid get off welfare...."

Walsh: "Yeah."

Chapman: "...through appropriate education..."

Walsh: "Through what?"

Chapman: "Through appropriate education."

Walsh: "Oh yes, what's the...what are the other two phases?"

Chapman: "The Federal Adult Education Act provides some dollars which is used to educate under-educated adults. And then there's the GED review and the Americanization programs."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, we had major opposition to this Bill earlier in the year. In fact, we introduced the...the...to knock it off the list. However, we have worked it out with the Sponsor. I think everything is all been...we, at least...some of



us believe that it's been taken care of now and have no objection to the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Chapman, do you desire to close or shall we take a vote? The question is, shall House Bill 2210 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Next one is 2185. Representative Ewing is on deck. Have...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 voting 'aye' and 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2185. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, I wondered, is there an order that they're being taken from...from the list that people were given? There was...as people came up and gave the number...is there any order from that or are you just going...are there people who have given...who gave theirs before Representative Ewing's Bill? What's being taken..."

Speaker Flinn: "We're trying to follow some order that we can keep the House moving..."

Greiman: "Oh I understand but..."

Speaker Flinn: "...the best we can."

Greiman: "isn't there...no I'm not asking for a priority of call. I'm just asking if there are people who have come up to you before Representative Ewing's Bill and put their name on the list? I wondered if that was true. Well you could tell from the list, perhaps, the way the list was layed out maybe."

Speaker Flinn: "No to me, no one has come to me."

Greiman: "Pardon."

Speaker Flinn: "No one has come to me. I'm operating off the list that is up here. It was already here when I got here."

Greiman: "Thanks, Zeke. Well I wonder...somebody ought to be able to know, I suppose."



Speaker Flinn: "Well..."

Greiman: "Well I've heard a few...can't you wait the time."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Read the Bill."

CONTINUED ON PAGE 142



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2185. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "I thought I gave you an answer. I don't have a list. There's one laying up here and I'm trying to do the best job I can. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which was debated considerably on Second Reading. It's been introduced to try and achieve a balance between the present provisions for out-of-state withholding which take into...take nothing into consideration as far as the amount of tax owed to the State of Illinois, gives no regard as to the cost to the State of Illinois in the collection of this tax, the responsibility put on local individuals and citizens of this state to pay the tax. This Bill provides for withholding from personal service contracts...in an effort that we will obtain withholding from those entertainers who come into our state and people with with like proceeds we also provide for withholding from race horsing (sic), auto driving, from lottery, from prizes and awards. The Bill provides for 1099 type information returns, forms to be filed with the State of Illinois wherever such filing is required by the Internal Revenue Code. This would be an effort to obtain for the Department of Revenue information as to rents and royalties from real estate, tangible personal property and patents and copyrights so that the State of Illinois might also collect the income due them from these sources. The Bill provides for cooperation between the Department of Revenue and the Agricultural Stabilization Offices in the State of Illinois to obtain the names of all owners of out-of-state farm land in an effort to obtain the payment of tax if due from those who own real estate in this state but live out-of-state. It would also require additional



information be filed when a deed to transfer real estate is filed in this state so that we might collect tax from those who would be selling real estate and who live out-of-state. A great deal of effort and time has gone into preparation of this return...of this legislation in an effort to get the proper returns for the State of Illinois that we might obtain the income tax which is due to this state without setting off a border war with our surrounding states in retaliation, without making everyone in this state from those who rent apartments, to farms, to everything else who do business with out-of-state residents and to tax collectors. I realize that this Bill is not perfect. The current law is far from perfect. I think this is a real improvement and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, is recognized."

Mugalian: "I would like to have ten people join me in asking for full debate on this very important Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "One, two, three, four, five, six, seven... I don't count ten yet. Oh, okay, you've got some of here. Alright, there's ten, close enough. Representative Mugalian, do you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Mugalian: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. By perhaps no accident, this Bill which was...got out of Committee in the last week that we had to try Committee Bills, has been somehow brought to the top of the bottle and we're going to hear it first...I mean, before a lot of other Bills. This is a Bill that guts the law that's now in effect that would be...go into operation on January 1, 1980 to see that tax cheaters who don't live in this state pay their dues to the State of Illinois. May I have some order, Mr. Speaker? I have a feeling that no matter what we say about this Bill it's going to pass because there are enough special interests...taxpayer's



that are getting away without paying their taxes to the State of Illinois and putting a burden on the rest of us, that this Bill is going to sail out of here. But I would...I would like you to know what you're voting for. The Governor of this state made a pledge, a solemn pledge in his campaign that he would close the gigantic loophole that exists in this state that permits all kinds of persons to get income from Illinois and not pay those taxes. It includes the very powerful real estate interest who buy and sell real estate. It includes the rentiers of Illinois. It includes the rock groups that come into this state and all other matters of income that go to individuals who happen to be out-of-state that our Department of Revenue cannot pick up. On Second Reading we offered a very reasonable compromise. We offered an Amendment that would permit...would require no withholding if the amount was less than four thousand dollars in any one calendar year. That should take care of most people. But of course the big guys didn't want that. So they are in support of this Bill that, in effect, converts it from a withholding Bill to an informational Bill. And it's going to require us to go to the Stabilization Fund or whatever it is...the...it's going to have us look at...at real estate transfer declarations and in effect, put us back where we were before this law was passed. Just remember, you are depriving your constituents a...substantial sum of general revenue. But not only that, you are, in effect, raising their taxes because you're letting the cheaters get away if you vote for this Bill and it becomes law. If it passes this House and if it passes the Senate, Representative Greiman and I are continue to remind Governor Thompson of his solemn pledge to the people of Illinois that he would not let a Bill like this become law."



Flinn: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, is recognized."

Stiehl: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know, Mr. Speaker, if you were not in the Podium...on the Podium, you would rise in support of this Bill. So therefore, I would like not only to substitute for you, I would also like to join in supporting this Bill. This is a good Bill, a fair Bill and a just Bill. The provisions were arrived at after many long hours of negotiations. It is important to all of Illinois, but it is particularly important if this state is to retain its position as an agricultural marketing center. Without this Bill, the cattle business and the stock yards in Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis will no longer be in existence. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', all those...all those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor of stopping the debate at this point, vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman's motion passes and Representative Ewing to close."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to answer any question that some of the opponents of this measure might have that this has been called out of order. For two days we've been taking legislation in an effort to pass it as people have come up to the Podium. Two days ago I came up there and asked to have this Bill called. I think I've waited my time. Several Bills who are beyond me on the order of call have been called in...this afternoon. So there's



nothing I think out of line about the order in which this legislation was called. I am amazed that the opponents of this legislation have refused to sit down and understand the problem that they have created with the legislation that's on the books and that which they support. It is impossible with one small paragraph to collect the tax due to this state from out-of-state residents and have it fair. They would make everyone into a tax collector. Go back and tell your constituents that rent an apartment or home or any piece of property from an out-of-state resident, that they must now withhold from the gross. I can't imagine how they can expect that you need to withhold 2½% from the gross."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 2185 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Greiman to explain his vote. One minute, timer's on."

Greiman: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you will be...we name Acts. We have the mining..Coal Mining Act, the Conservation Act and this Act and that Act, we give them fancy names. But the name of this Act if you vote for it will be the Tax Cheat Relief Act of 1979. And that's what it is, exactly that. We offered to take all agricultural products out of the Act, would have taken any of them, so that Representative Flinn and Representative Stiehl's problems would have been taken care of. But that's a smoke screen. They're not serious about that. That's the front for the...the large economic interests, the trusts in Chicago, the banks in Chicago, the big real estate operators in Chicago who do that, not the 'Ma and Pa' grain elevators, not the small stockyards in East St. Louis. We took them out. We said, 'Take them out and we'll be glad to worry about that income another way.' But no, they didn't want it. They wanted that in there so that could be a



smoke screen. You're not doing a service for your constituents. You are raising their taxes by this. This is a tax increase for them."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin, to explain her vote."

Breslin: "No, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recognized after the Roll Call is taken."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, to explain his vote. One minute, timer's on."

Mautino: "Before I...I can't explain my vote because I got in a little late in the debate. But I have a concern maybe someone can answer in explanation of their votes. Is it...is it the...the digest correct, and I'm not voting now so...this is the reason I'm not voting, because it says, 'Personal contracts...contracts of personal services,' which could be completed with, let's say, an agent of a person rather than the person receiving the money. I would then assume that...and since there's no withholding program, how can you possibly collect that? And I have a reservation if you would have a contract for the personal services with an agent rather than the person themselves since the...the person would be...being paid and not the agent."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't think questions are in order. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin, you requested the floor for some reason."

Breslin: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that we return to the priority of call."

Speaker Flinn: "I think you better recognize Representative Greiman first for another purpose...and then you try your motion afterwards. Representative Greiman."



Greiman: "Representative...Mr. Speaker, a conference for about twenty minutes."

Speaker Flinn: "In twenty minutes from now or a twenty minute con...."

Greiman: "No, for twenty minutes."

Speaker Flinn: "Starting right now for twenty minutes..."

Greiman: "Twenty minutes...right now."

Speaker Flinn: "...room 114."

Greiman: "Room 114, Sir, yes."

Speaker Flinn: "The Clerk...the Clerk would like to have the...the Clerk would like to have the privilege of five minutes perfunct. So...we'll be in recess for the next twenty minutes for a Democratic conference. What about the Republicans? No, Republicans. Go to lunch."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills #95, 161, 317, 318, 355, 356, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 389, 398, 399, 406, 414, 447, 482, 483, 484, 487, 488, 490, 492, 495, 508, 509, 513, 530, 537, 542, 549, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 584, 585, 587, 590, 830, 864, 1272, 202, 228, 235, 244, 250, 296, 301, 312, 313, 350, 366, 367, 375, 1423 and 1425. Passed by the Senate May 24, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 41, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 46, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to require that the pregnancy test period to an abortion procedure be performed only by private medical laboratory independantly licensed from any ambulatory surgical medical facility



or abortion facility. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 48, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 65, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the designation of an emergency telephone number throughout the state. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 625, Bowman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 758, Schuneman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 775, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 970, Schisler. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to plats. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1241, Marovitz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1375, Capparelli. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. First Reading of the Bill. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills #519, 528, 534, 536, 540, 546, 552, 559, 565, 588, 619, 624, 629, 630, 654 and 659. Passed by the Senate May 25, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Flinn: "If the Members will return to the floor we'll get started again. Our twenty minutes are up.

Jones: "Yes. Ladies and Gentlemen, while we are waiting to reconvene I would like to introduce to each and every one you one hundred and thirty students from the John D. 'Shoe' Elementary School. These are the Eighth Grade students from the City of Chicago with their



teachers and their escorts. This is the school that I attended thirty years and I graduated from that school in June of 1949. So I wish each and every one of us would give them a tremendous round of applause."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Also in..."

Speaker Flinn: "Go ahead, Emil, I'm sorry."

Jones: "Also in that class we have the nephew of Representative Eugene Barnes...in that class and...what's his name, Mr. Barry? Bobby Barry is the nephew of Representative Eugene Barnes. The Twenty-eighth District is represented by myself, Jim Keane and Ted Meyer from the Twenty-eighth Legislative District."

Speaker Flinn: "The House is back in Session, reconvened. Representative Breslin, before we left...Representative Breslin, before we left you were wanting to make a motion. I already know what your motion is and everybody heard it. I would suggest to you, and I don't want to editorialize because I know that's not part of my job up here, I would suggest to you that you hold that motion until such time a little later on. We are doing pretty good. We're...we're going to cut the list off where it's at, we're not going to take any more additions to the list, and try to work our way through the list. Get on the no debate Bills and then we'll go to the special order of business and we'll try to get as much done as we can before midnight. If you don't mind. Thank you very much. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I've been here most of the day...I don't recall us taking an Attendance Roll Call. I was here at 9:30. I was on that one."

Speaker Flinn: "It was taken and the Clerk tells me it was in pretty good order. It's got everybody on it



that's here. House will be in order. Members will be in their seat. And the first Bill is House Bill 256. It will be Representative Kosinski's Bill. Would the Clerk read the Bill? 265, I'm sorry about that."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 265. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Thirthing of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 265 is the Bill that's aimed at bail jumpers. It was a Bill designed by Judge Lewis 'Garrippo' of Chicago and Judge Robert 'Staigment' of Champaign. It's intention within Constitutional limitations is to get those people who deliberately jump bail to escape prosecution. It's Constitutional designed to give them every prerogative if they have cause for such bail jumping. But it's intention to get at people such as the people we've experienced in our county who on posting twenty-five hundred dollars in cash on an aggravated rape and armed robbery, then deliberately jump bail and are not heard of because they feel with overwhelming evidence twenty-five hundred dollars is a cheap fee to pay for escaping a jail sentence. This was particularly evident in the 'Herrara' case, an alledged dope smuggler from Mexico in Chicago to whom they say one hundred thousand dollar has no concern to permit him to jump bail and return to Mexico. It is Judge 'Garrippo's' feeling and the feeling of the Judiciary Committee that the Constitutional prerogatives of the defendant are well protected. I think this Bill will fill a gap that we all need in all counties for all people of the state and I ask for your supportive vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman is recognized."



Greiman: "I wonder if we could knock this off of the Short Debate Calendar if ten people would join me?"

Speaker Flinn: "You have enough hands. It's off Short Debate, on Long."

Greiman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm a lawyer in the real world and I'm wondering what lawyer in this House would undertake a criminal defense without his client being there. I'm wondering how the judge would possibly appoint a lawyer and say, 'I want you to undertake the defense. I want you to cross examine witnesses. I want you to defend the...to give this...be part of the charade of due process.' I for one, frankly, if a judge who appointed me would say, 'No, I will go...I will not..Sir, I will not do that because I cannot defend a client that is not there.' Now you know, people do...sometimes don't make it to court, not because they're...not because they're Herraras, because Herrera doesn't matter. He'll put up millions of dollars, he doesn't give a damn. And he doesn't care if he's found guilty or not, it doesn't matter to him. But people who are just little people who get frightened to think their lawyer sold them out maybe, who think that the State's Attorney and...and their lawyer have a deal and so they don't show up. People who get sick and have a heart attack someplace and never tell anybody...nobody knows where they are and suddenly...suddenly they're guilty. But the main reason why this is impossible is because you cannot find a lawyer, no lawyer, no lawyer in this room would defend...would undertake a defense without their client there or without ever talking to their client. How could you undertake a defense if you haven't talked to your client? Impossible. This Bill cannot give due process. This Bill should be defeated. It



also always smacks to me, you know, trial and absentia. It sounds like something they do in Iran. And I just think it's just not part of our...of our great judicial heritage."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, is recognized."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker...Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. Representative Greiman fails to mention that sometimes...by the time these fellows are apprehended later on, if they would wait for the trial, then the witnesses would all be dead or the witness would be all...or had moved away or be gone. These people are jumping bail because they don't want to stand trial. And if they don't want to stand trial, I don't care if they have a lawyer or not, they ought to be tried while the witnesses are available and they ought to get swift justice. And if they are apprehended later on, let them go to jail. They can be in court if they want to. They're choosing of their own free will not to be there. And they're thwarting justice. And the best thing we could do would be to have the trial and I'm sure the lawyer...some lawyer would be found to defend them and if..if it wasn't...they didn't have a good case against them, then it would be thrown out. But these people will not appear in court of their own free will. And I don't see why we should be worried about them. If they don't have enough sense to come to their own trial, I say, 'To hell with them.'"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, is recognized."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address these remarks in opposition to this Bill to the thoughtful Members of...of the General Assembly and to especially all lawyers. I have observed and I think you



have that out of our frustrations, out of difficult situations involving social programs, we come up with solutions that go beyond mark. I've noticed in the Judiciary II Committee in which I've served this last Session that when we have a problem, we have some kind of social behavior of which we disapprove, we propose to solve it by either making it a crime or if it already is a crime by doubling or tripling the penalty. Now I understand the difficult situations we have sometimes and there are tough cases. And I understand the frustration that the courts may feel because some people have jumped bail. But when we enact legislation out of frustration, we sometimes forget that we are making a law that is applicable to all situations and not to the specific case from which our frustration arises. Those of you who are lawyers know the old law school maxim, 'Hard cases make bad law.' For America or a state in Illinois to commense a program to trial people...to try people who aren't there, to try them in absentia just because in some cases we have notorious bail jumpers is...would, I think, be a shameful act of the part of the General Assembly. We don't need this kind of overreaction to a problem that exists once in a while. This case...this law...sorry. This Bill was apparently inspired by the Herrera case. And as Representative Greiman so aptly pointed out, no matter what you did in that kind of a case, no matter how high your bond was and even if you try him in absentia and convict him, Herrera is probably gone. But don't forget that hundreds and hundreds of others will be subject to the same, rather Alice in Wonderland kind of procedure, trying someone who isn't present at his own trial. Just think about it if you were the defendant."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative



Vinson, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Does this Bill deal with criminal justice?"

Kosinski: "Yes, Sam, it does."

Vinson: "I would suggest that with this Sponsor if the Bill deals with criminal justice we ought to pass it. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed... the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. The Sponsor, Representative Kosinski, to close."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct something, a wrong impression that was given here. This Bill was designed on a Constitutional basis. If the defendant not willfully, I repeat, not willfully was not present at his trial, he is entitled to a retrial. He is entitled to an appeal. It was no intention of Judge Garrippo to circumvent Constitutionality. This merely says that if a man deliberately, I repeat, deliberately jumps bail to escape the state's prosecution, the trial can proceed without him. If he comes back and shows cause he can...that is will...that his absence was not willful, he can ask for a retrial. He can voice his appeal right up to the United States Supreme Court. It is not the intention of the Sponsor, Judge Garrippo or Judge Staigmend to in any way violate the Constitution. It...but it is the intention of the Sponsors of this Bill, and there are a number of Co-sponsors, to properly represent the State of Illinois and the people of Illinois. To insure that for a few



paltry dollars, a man does not escape justice. Within Constitutional limitations, this is a good Bill. It is a Bill for the defense of the people of the State of Illinois and I ask you for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 265 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Cullerton, to explain his vote."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I want Representative Johnson and Vinson and Bower to listen. I'm voting in favor of this Bill, this top law and order Bill. I feel that it is Constitutional. We added an Amendment in Committee that would make this apply only to the most severe cases where the state has to have evidence, affirmative evidence, that there is an intention to flee the jurisdiction. If the...the defendant has to had retained a lawyer before this Bill can take place. So he has the same lawyer that he has asked for and there is precedent for this. Right now we have a law that says if a trial begins and the defendant leaves in a criminal case we wait forty-eight hours and then we proceed with the trial without the defendant being present. As a matter of fact, I've tried two cases myself without my client being present. And I...it proved to be an advantage. I pointed to an empty chair and I said, 'Is that the face of a convicted murder?' And of course, they didn't look. He wasn't there so I didn't have that problem. And I told the jury, 'This ...my client has so much confidence in his innocence, he hasn't even shown up for the end of the trial.' I think this Bill is Constitutional. This law is Constitutional and I think it will go a long way toward stopping the bail jumping that is going on throughout the state."



Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute and the timer is on."

Borchers: "All I wanted to say is that this is one way to solve the problem of the bail jumper. And I understand that there is only a few that do it. Okay, let the few be guilty and they will be taken care of properly and this sure will do it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Alexander, One minute to explain her vote."

Alexander: "I rise in opposition to this vote. I heard someone say one the floor a few minutes ago that in the event that a person was convicted for a bail jumping charge he has a right to appeal. Let us assume that that defendant did receive a sentence, I've worked in criminal appeals for the last twenty-nine years, we're talking about taking out of a man's life while the appeal is pending, something like a year to eighteen months or twenty-four months before that appeal can be defected. So I vote in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote. One minute, the timer is on."

Katz: "If the only right involved were the right of the defendant, it would be very easy simply to vote 'no'. The fact is that there is also the right of the victim to the crime. You have the situation where the defendant has an incentive to jump bail. When he jumps bail, then it is a matter of time until all the state's evidence has been lost to the...the witnesses have disappeared, the victim of the crime is no longer there and so that the present law gives an incentive to the bail jumper, an incentive that works contrary to fairness to the victim of the crime. I believe that



we have tried to make this Bill as fairly a balanced Bill as possible to protect the right of the innocent who may not be bail jumper but who may have failed to be there through a misunderstanding. In that situation, he could have a trial, the original finding would be reversed and he would have his day in court. I believe that this is a fair Bill that deals with the realistic problem in a fair way and I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no' and 8 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Speaker asked me to announce that it is the intention of the Speaker to work straight through the dinner and to midnight tonight or until every Bill is called. Also, Mr. Speaker, every Bill that has arrived from the Senate has been assigned to House Committee and in order to facilitate the hearing of some of those Bills in House Committee next week, I would now move to suspend the posting requirements to allow the Committee Chairman to post Bill today for Committee hearing next week. I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "You heard the motion. Do we have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for this motion? Leave is granted. The Attendance Roll Call will be used for this motion, the motion passed. House Bill 272, same Sponsor."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 272."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski. Turn him on."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission, may I have my Cosponsor, Timothy Johnson, lead off on this one?"

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Tim Johnson is the hyphenated Sponsor...will open debate."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, recent studies in the United States and Illinois, I think, is reflective of the nation trend...indicate that 53% or over half of the serious violent crimes in the United States are perpetrated by people who are, under the laws of the respective states, are categorized as quote, unquote, 'juveniles'. This Bill is a...middle ground, moderate approach towards the very serious problem of juvenile violent crime. It reverses the presumption so that individuals who are now classified as quote, unquote, 'juveniles' are presumed to be able to be tried as adults for purposes of prosecution unless there is compelling reasons why they shouldn't be treated as that. We could take the approach of Representative Deuster to completely abolish the Juvenile Court Act or we could go to the other extreme. But I think this approach, as Representative Stuffle indicated two or three weeks ago when we were debated this question on a motion to discharge, is a good, moderate approach. We're not talking about...in this Bill, about incarcerating juveniles at Stateville or Menard or Pontiac. The incarceration rules are the same. What we are saying is that individuals who are charged with armed robbery, rape, deviate sexual assault, armed violence and murder can be sentenced as adults. And by sentencing I mean that there is a minimum sentence, that there are some determinable standards other than the revolving door, pat their little haloed heads philosophy that



we've adopted in the past. The philosophy of this Bill is a very simple one. It says that if you have the capacity, whatever your age, as long as you're ...as long as you're thirteen or above, to commit a rape on a five year old child, if you have the capacity to commit an armed robbery on an old couple or to blow a shop keeper's head...blow his...blow their brains out..that it really doesn't make any difference to that individual who is raped or the old couple who are the victims of an armed robbery or the shop keeper who is the victim of a multiple murder whether you are sixteen or eighteen. You ought to be subject to the same sentencing standards that individuals who are eighteen or above are subject to. Because people of that capacity, people who have the capacity to commit violent crimes, rape, armed robbery, murders and deviate sexual assaults aren't anything but criminals and they shouldn't be treated as anything but criminals. What we're doing now with our philosophy of jurisprudence, in this particular area, is we're saying it's okay if you are fifteen or sixteen and you rape someone or your sixteen...fifteen or sixteen and you murder somebody, but eventually when you get to the place where you are seventeen or more, then you are a full-fledged criminal and then we can treat you as you ought to be. We're really perpetrating and encouraging the system that teaches people that crime is okay until you get to the place where you are a real professional criminal. The abuses of the existing Juvenile Court Act are unbelievable. Typically, gang leaders send out their fifteen and sixteen year old henchmen to perpetrate the armed robbery. This is a very common pattern in most metropolitan areas around the country and here in Illinois. All we are saying with this Bill is, 'Let's



give the state the opportunity, unless there is compelling reasons why we shouldn't, we've set up a due process procedure whereby the court has to make the determination in looking into the background and circumstances of the offense and the individual, let's treat these individuals as what they are, criminals, for purposes of sentencing and prosecution. And I urge your 'aye' vote on House Bill 272 and would be glad to answer what questions you have."

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

Stuffle: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, I am somewhat hesitant since I am not a lawyer, but to indicate to you that at least one of the lawyers here has stood in an affirmative position on this particular Bill. Representative Johnson and I, and particularly he, filed a motion some time ago and helped bring this Bill out on the floor."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle, let me interrupt you. Are you speaking in opposition to the Bill?"

Stuffle: "No."

Speaker Flinn: "We're on Short Debate and unless it's controversial then...okay. Representative Kosinski, do you wish to close?"

Kosinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I indicate that Mr. Stuffle was..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, wait a minute. There is some more here. I didn't see Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer, I didn't see your light on."

Kosinski: "He was speaking in support of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, I...let's back up to Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I heard a lot of rhetoric from the...from the Sponsor who opened, but I never did hear what the Bill did."



Speaker Flinn: "Who are you asking the question? Tim Johnson?"

Brummer: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Turn Johnson on."

Johnson: "Specific...I think I explained that specifically what the Bill does in the procedural sense is this. When an individual who is of age to be able to commit a crime is charged with a Class X felony or murder, and you know what the Class X's are, Rich, I believe. Then we have a probable cause hearing to determine whether in fact the crime was committed by that individual. If a court finds probable cause that that individual did commit a crime, then the next step of the procedure is for the state to file appropriate motions to have the individual tried as an adult. Then, unless there is compelling reasons why the individual shouldn't be treated as an adult, he is...he or she is. We've set up protections in the Bill. The standards for the courts to consider in the second part of the...of the hearing are the circumstances with respect to the individual, the circumstances of the offense and a full blown hearing as to that...as to the offense and the particular individual. And so it's a, I think, a full due process hearing..."

Brummer: "Could I ask a further question? The digest says that it requires that the court grant the state's motion for a criminal trial. If I understand this correctly, then you are removing the discretion..."

Johnson: "No."

Brummer: "...from the court and placing it with the State's Attorney as to whether or not the individual shall be tried as an adult or as a juvenile?"

Johnson: "No, that's not...I don't know what the digest says. What the Bill says is that the court shall



grant the motion unless there are compelling reasons why the motion shouldn't be granted. But the court still has the discretion and has to exercise the discretion as to whether to grant or not grant the motion. There is no removal of discretion from the court."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "This Bill was heard by the Committee this time and has been before the Committee several times. It has never been reported out favorably. What the Sponsor neglects to tell you is that the State's Attorney now has the prerogative to do this. What he is trying to do is to take the prerogative away from the State's Attorney. The people of this state and the people of each county elect their State's Attorney. If the State's Attorney feels that this particular young person, this child, ought to be tried as an adult, the State's Attorney has the right to file proceedings to bring this around. That's a very fair procedure. There are situations where it ought to be done, there are situations where it should not be done. Certainly the State's Attorney, elected by the people of the county, ought to have good enough judgment to do that. We should not take that judgment away from the State's Attorney. It is a regressive step. Taking away law enforcement authority from State's Attorneys in the various counties...to the detriment of the future because a lot of these are kids who can be saved. And I would oppose this Bill."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, through history there has been a magical term, juvenile. We have constantly shied from the word.



1B662

But I remember well, as some of you do too, when a juvenile was a juvenile. When I was fourteen years of age I was a kid, a punk. Today with sophisticated modern television, radio and communication, a juvenile is a much more sophisticated human being. It's on that basis that Ray Ewell knows in his district there are hit men at fourteen, there are deliberate morphine pushers at fourteen. The concern is that the juvenile is no longer a juvenile in many instances. And when it comes to the condition of murder or a Class X felony, I think the people of Illinois must make that delineation. It's on that basis that I am Cosponsoring this Bill. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 272 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 32 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed." House Bill 662."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 662. A Bill for an Act relating to state mandating of local government expenditures. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 662 is a Bill that deals with state mandated programs. Those of you who were here last Session recall that we had several Bills dealing with this important subject matter. And because of the interest generated in state mandated programs, Representative Ryan, Representative Bluthardt, Representative Von Boeckman, Representative Lechowicz and myself each filed...had drafted separate Bills dealing with this subject matter. The Executive Committee



appointed a state mandated Bill Subcommittee and we had three or four meetings. And at those meetings, the Sponsors of the separate Bills agreed to certain Amendments and we drafted Amendment #1 to House Bill 662 which became the consensus Bill. Many of the provisions of the Bluthardt Bill are recommendations of the Municipal Problems Commission and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Lechowicz Bill was a...again, a product of Municipal Problems Commission and we had, as I've indicated, many meetings relative to this subject matter. So House Bill 662 has hyphenated Sponsors of...Yourell, Representative Ryan, Representative Bluthardt, Representative Lechowicz and Representative Von Boeckman. This Bill would create a new Act requiring the state to reimburse local government units for cost incurred as a result of new state initiated programs, for extensions and enlargements of current mandated programs and for loss in local revenue due to these state mandated exemptions of taxable property. Now the Office of Education had a problem with their tax rates so we drafted, I believe, Amendment #3 that took care of their objection. We have a trigger point for reimbursement of one thousand to each unit of local government or a fifty thousand dollar statewide. Under that provision a program is not reimbursable if the costs are less than one thousand dollars or less than fifty thousand across the state. Any Bill which would be imposed as a state mandate must be accompanied by a fiscal note prepared by L.G.A. as well as a statement of policy objectives. This Bill also provides for a companion appropriation Bill in the initial year of the mandate. The process of reimbursement would be as follows: upon passage of the legislation with an accompanying appropriation Bill, which I think is



probably the most important aspect of this entire concept, so that when you vote on a state mandated program you will know exactly what that program is going to cost that unit of local government. And you will then be, in effect, saying to that unit of local government that you will be voting for the state mandated program or you will not. And if you have objections, if you have objections to the program based on the expenditure, then of course, you can vote 'no' and that will take care of that program. Claims would be submitted to the L.G.A. and they are authorized to review the claims, to audit the local records, to adjust for prior...or over or under payments and L.G.A. will then direct the Comptroller to disperse the funds. We've also created with this legislation a new State Board of Appeals of five members. Three of the members would be local government officials appointed by the Governor, one person appointed by the Senate...President of the Senate and one person by the Speaker. Decision of the Board is final. If sufficient funds are not available, the Comptroller notifies a Legislator, the Legislature supplies supplemental appropriation. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call and would try to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone speaking in opposition?"

The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, first I would ask the Sponsor a question.

Representative Yourell, what is an interlocal equity mandate?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the question, Bus?"

Leinenweber: "Never mind, Bus. That's not really..."

Yourell: "Yeah, I didn't think..."

Leinenweber: "...critical. That is a provision in this

Bill for those of you who haven't read the thirteen



page Act which will expand our Illinois statutes, certainly...probably requiring in itself, a fifth volume. We really don't need this Bill. We've already passed a Bill and I think that the Gentleman ...Representative Yourell who sponsored it which requires...will require the fiscal note for the impact on...on local government when we passed the Bill. I think that's a good idea. We ought to know what we're voting on. But this is a thirteen or fourteen page Act which includes all of these terms like interlocal equity mandate, tax exemption mandate, personnel mandate, due process mandate, benefit spillover, service mandate and so on. Now we haven't heard anything...all these things are about. But I can tell you that this Bill is a statute and any... and like any other statute it can be amended by a subsequent legislation. It will have absolutely no effect on us if we want to mandate a program without funding it. All we have to do would be to say that the Yourell Bill does not apply to the foresaid mandate. Representative Schlickman has wailed time and again on whether or not we ought to accede this tremendous power. And that would be a question, I suppose, if this was a Constitutional Amendment. It's one I might even be able to support. I'm not a believer in mandating programs to lower levels of government without paying for them. And I would say this, I think this Session of the General Assembly and previous Sessions of the General Assembly of which I have been a Member, have been quite responsible in that particular area. We have carefully avoided mandating programs. In short, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that this legislation is seriously flawed because it's non-enforceable, it creates a tremendous bureaucracy with



a...even the State Board of Appeals which will channel various objections and appeals from the process of approving or disapproving these different types of interlocal equity mandates and the like. I would suggest to you that this is poor philosophy embodied in this Bill, it is unenforceable, it creates additional bureaucracy. It will cost state government a lot of money, it will probably cost local government a lot of money and it will probably lead us to actually...come up with more mandated programs. For all these reasons I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Barnes: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I hate to break in at this point, but Representative Conti and I were trying to get some very vital information of an occurrence, a very serious occurrence that just happened at O'Hara Airport. Could I have a little quiet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Member of the House, I have Chicago on the phone, Flight 191 of American Airlines has just crashed at O'Hare Airport on takeoff headed for L.A. It crashed in Elk Grove Village. And the word at this point right now that there are no survivors and I thought someone...somebody here maybe would want that information and they would want to call back in that area and get more...additional information on it. It just happened at O'Hare. I have Chicago now, I'm listening. It was Flight 191 headed for...headed for L.A....headed for Los Angeles and it crashed on take-off in the area of Elk Grove Village. And there were ...according to the...the radio that I'm listening to now, there were two hundred and twenty passengers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."



Pullen: "I am told that that occurred around the intersection of Touhy and Elmhurst, if that means anything to anyone...probably from the Fifth District, I think."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Touhy and Elmhurst Road. We'll...we'll see if we can get some additional information to the Membership."

Pullen: "It's a DC-10."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I talked to the police in Chicago at the Sixteenth District. They said it went down around Touhy and Prospect...in whatever...DesPlaines, I think. American Airlines...said it was a bad crash."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 662 pass? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't want to ...to belabor the Members. I do want to correct some things that I think are important. This is not the Yourell Bill, it's the Leadership Bill on both aisle. The Governor had it in his budget addressed to us in the State of the...State address and I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 662."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 662 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'ayes', 12 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1679."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1679. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1679 is a straight forward Bill. It provides that residency within any school district shall not be considered in determining the employment and the compensation of the teacher or whether to retain, promote, assign or transfer that teacher. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill undoes what Representative Pierce did two years ago in passing a similar Bill but providing that residency could be a condition of beginning employment. Now Representative Pierce did that, although he hesitates to give me credit, he did that with our help because we provided the Amendment that required that...or that provided that residency could be a condition of beginning employment. I think that's entirely reasonable. And it was brought out at that time that there were no school districts, except for one of almost eleven hundred, that were making any effort or had made any effort at all to make residency a condition of employment. So it was kind of a nonproblem and it was responding, I think, probably to the conversation in the Chicago School Board where they were thinking of making residency a condition of employment because the City of Chicago government had made a residency a condition of employment. So it was responding to that condition and I thought it was resolved reasonably well and people in Chicago agreed pretty well that for beginning employment it would be all right. But what the Sponsor of this Bill has done is he has removed Chicago from the application of his Bill. That means the School Board in Chicago could make residency a



condition of beginning employment but no other School Board in the state could. Now I submit to you that that's discriminatory and should not be. There's really no difference between Chicago and downstate, or should not be, on this question. So I urge you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to sustain the work that Representative Pierce and I did two years ago on this important question. The Bill is...what the Gentleman proposes to do is not important at all because there is no problem down there. And let's defeat this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just briefly, there are special circumstances in the City of Chicago because of its large geographical area. That's why Chicago was excluded. Downstate there are many areas where it just isn't practical to live within the boundaries of the school district. For those who live in Toby and Langleyville and teach in Kinkaid, this Bill...this kind of Bill would present...there would be a problem if we didn't have this Bill so I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1679 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Gentleman from Macon that the Bill is necessary. There are school districts downstate... Kankakee we found out has some residency requirements last time, others are threatening it. Chicago wasn't talking about it, by the way, Representative Walsh. Chicago Board of Education actually had a Resolution that only failed by one vote on a record vote in their School Board to adopt the



residency requirement. And the Chicago city colleges ...the junior colleges in Chicago did actually adopt a residency requirement that effected teachers that were already working there and living outside the city. But I think this Bill is necessary to discourage school districts, even though it doesn't affect Chicago and I would rather have it affect Chicago, but discourage school districts downstate from imposing a residency requirement on teachers which would cause divorces if two teachers living together are married and work for different school districts. And I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 20 'nos', 0 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having recieved the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2245. Kindly record Mr. Kozubowski as 'aye' on the last Bill...and Collins."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2274. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2274. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania. Mrs. Catania, please."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2274 would do one thing. It would add four public aid recipients to the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. This was suggested by the people who are public aid recipients who point out that there is a definite need for ongoing consultation by the people who suffer the problem and who understand it best with the Legislators who must advise the Public Aid Department on how to cope with the problem. They point out that we are interested in getting rid of fraud and waste in the administration



of the Public Aid Code. And as one person said it, 'Who is better qualified to point out how fraud is perpetrated and how to get rid of waste in administering the Public Aid Code than the people who have received public aid.' She said, 'We are the people who could advise the Legislators. We can help to save millions of dollars. Please put us on a regular consulting arrangement so that we can explain what the needs are.' And this I thought was a logical way to do it. I ask for your support for this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone is opposition? Is there anyone is opposition? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I can sympathize with what the Lady is trying to do here and where she's coming from, what she is attempting to do and if she is successful, will completely reject the reason for the creation for the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. For those who know the history of this Body, it created back in the mid 60's, not to be a vehicle for communication between public aid recipients and the department but to be a vehicle of communication between the Legislature and the Department of Public Aid. At currently, there are no public members on this Commission. It is totally a Legislative Body. And the reason for it is so that there will be communication between the Legislature and the department. Members of this Commission are the Sponsors of the department's appropriation Bill. This Body investigates and looks at the department and makes recommendations as to what changes ought to be made. Now if this Body had been created to establish a communication link with the recipients it served, this type of measure would serve a purpose."



But that was not the reason for the creation of this Body. I think if you have this type of an individual placed on the Commission that a lot of you in this Legislature would feel that the credibility of this Commission would no longer be in existence. And I fear very much that that would be the case. Once you have these people on it you would have somebody else saying, 'Well, I'm not represented on that Body. We ought to put more people on it.' I just think that if you are going to have a communication link between the Legislature and this department, that's what it ought to be and not expand its scope to being something other than what it was intended to be. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just want to make two points. We are told that this is supposed to be a vehicle of communication. That's exactly what I'm talking about here. I think we need a little more communication. The second point is that there certainly couldn't be a credibility problem. Each of these people would be appointed by one of our Leaders. Representative Ryan would appoint one, Representative Redmond would appoint one, Senator Shapiro would appoint one and Senate Rock would appoint one. How could we have a credibility problem with people who are appointed by those Leaders of our Legislative Body. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 2274 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, new problems call for new solutions. The whole point of this Body when its



creation was to improve public aid. It still has a lot of problems and who better to consult with, at least part of the Board, are those people who are recipients themselves. The manufacturers ask the consumer what's wrong with their product if something goes wrong. The opposition to this really rests on the old protestant ethic than says there is something wrong with the poor. That God loves those and therefore gives them money. So if you don't have money, God doesn't love you. Now the recipients of public aid certainly know what is wrong with it, how it can be improved. With the Leaders of the General Assembly making the appointments there's no credibility gap at all. This is an excellent idea and I urge your support."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, this thing has come up before. Now we are responsible for the public money. Now I just want to point to you what I said some years ago, maybe ten years, maybe six. That this is putting the mice in charge of the cheese. Now stop and think, for heavens sake, what you are doing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie. Timer's on."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to explain my vote. I'm a newly appointed Member to the Commission to revise and rewrite the Public Aid Code. The people who have been most useful so far to me in that...on that Commission have been the Members who are appointed who are themselves recipients of public aid. It seems to me that the Legislative Advisory Committee's work would be better work if they were able to have access to those kinds of appointments too. I urge everyone to vote 'yes'.



Thank you."

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

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm voting 'no' on this Bill for the simple reason as this. I understand the problem as far as welfare is concerned but on the Public Aid Advisory Commission, which I am a Member of, if we pass this piece of legislation we are acting as though public aid recipients are a permanent thing. No one is on there on a permanent basis. So, in other words, we would be putting a person on there this month, next month and the month after because a person is on welfare one month and may be off the next. This is bad piece of legislation and we need more red votes on it."

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

Chapman: "A previous Speaker suggested that this was putting the cheese in charge of the mice. I'd like to point out that this is an Advisory Committee. It advises the General Assembly on public aid members...matters. Who is better equipped to be an advisor on public aid matter than public aid recipients themselves? It's a long tradition in our Legislature to call on the experts when we gather information and make recommendations and develop laws. This is in line with a long time legislative tradition and I ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. Timer's on."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had not originally intended to rise on this matter because I thought it would fly out of this House with the approval of every Member in here. Everyone of us knows and it has been the experience of this state that the public aid system is rotten to the core. We



have to begin to do something to change it, to make it responsive, not only to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois but to the people who are... who are forced to rely on public aid as a means of their subsistence, We have established this Commission to address just that problem. How the system may be reformed, how we can straighten it out. I cannot imagine a better approach to the problem than to have people who are actually on public aid, who are actually the recipients, there to respond to and address some of the very real concerns expressed by all of us. The fact of the matter is that no Commission is established on workman's compensation, on replacement of a property tax, on...."

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

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I'm picking up right where the previous Speaker left off. I wanted to remind the Members of this Body that on the largest, still unresolved issue before this House and Senate, the agreed Bill on unemployment compensation, who was asked to sit down together and work out reasonable proposals? The people directly involved. The people in business and representatives from labor. This is applying the same idea to public aid. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "I request Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the record first. On this question there are 82 'ayes' and 70 'nos'. The Lady asked for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. Abramson. Bluthardt. Capparelli. Collins. Ewing. Dave Jones. Katz. Laurino. Leverenz. Macdonald. Malloy. Oblinger. Pierce."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Pierce 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Robbins. Schlickman. Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schlickman 'no'. Skinner 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Slape. Terzich. Winchester and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dave Jones is 'aye'. The Lady asked for a Postponed Consideration? Don't have it. Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2245."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2245. A Bill for an Act to license, tax and regulate the business jai alai Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be a holiday mood around here today. Mr. Speaker, this isn't the first time jai alai has been tried in this House. In fact, I understand, jai alai was played in Chicago in the twenties. Now jai alai, itself, is not illegal. A game of jai alai is not illegal. And all this Bill does is try to license, tax and regulate the business of operating frontons. But for the state to realize they are a privileged tax and...to supply the Ag premium fund you have to have parimutuel machines and that's the reason for the attention of the Bill. Now the Bill creates a Jai Alai Control Board. And to best understand that you might parallel the operations of the Jai Alai Control Board to the Racing Board and the Lottery Control Board. They control the type of applications. They control the racing dates. But Members of the Jai Alai Control Board are appointed by the Governor, bipartisan board. The Members of the Board are confirmed by the Senate. And in the event that this Bill becomes law, I'm sure Governor Thompson would give the scrutiny of the appointments to that Board, as close a scrutiny as he's given any of his Boards, and that



isn't found wanting at this point. Now there are all kinds of procedures for applying for a license. That is entirely up to the Lottery Control...the Jai Alai Control Board. Jai Alai is now played four states. And...it can't be taken lightly because to build a fronton that they play jai alai in...takes an area with about thirty-five acres. You generally have to build an auditorium to seat ten to twenty thousand people...and the outlay is generally in the neighborhood of twenty to twenty-five million dollars. The people who are operating frontons now are some of our highest rated corporations in America and have withstood the scrutiny of many people that scrutinize this type of operation. But anyway, the...there is a licensing and a wagering privilege tax schedule which is a little different than the racing tax schedule and a little different than the lottery tax schedule. But in any event, a fronton can earn...a fronton can earn in one year ten million dollars in privileged taxes besides generating many millions of dollars in economic well-being as to whatever is chosen. There is plenty of help to be hired, plenty of concessions to be made. There's security, there's maintenance, there's all kinds of work for advertising, printers, the general run of the economic mill. And there's personal property tax involved in a fronton. There's sales tax, there's income taxes. And I'm sure that everyone is sensitive to what a fronton has done in Florida and done in many of the other states so maybe a lot of this stuff that I have been saying is a little redundant. But in any event, we feel that the...that the sophisticated population that populates Illinois and the sophisticated area in the Lake Michigan and Chicago and Cook County area is very capable of handling a fronton operation. There are



other populated areas of Illinois that will want to take...avail themselves to this. But do not forget all the applicants are scrutinized by the Jai Alai Control Board, by a series of Department of Law Enforcement, the I.B.I. and whatever...safe guards you want to put into the Jai Alai operation. So that...if there are any questions I would be glad to answer them. I think many of you are more familiar with this game than I am. I've never seen one before."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone is opposition? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill, out of respect to my colleague from Rockford. I know he's put a great deal of time into this effort and strongly believes in it and I know that he has some arguments in red notations and writing regarding arguments for this Bill that he has not yet shared with the House. But I think that the Members of the Legislature should be very careful and make a determination at this time whether Illinois is going to continue to expand in the areas of gambling and gambling operations and the legalization of gambling in the State of Illinois. I am personally opposed to gambling. I am personally opposed to horse racing. I am opposed to the other forms of legalized gambling in Illinois. I think that every Member of the Legislature should be aware that you are now, if the passage of this Bill should become a reality, that you are following the same steps as other states and the continuation of the progress of legalized gambling. And that is allowing...and establish a precedent of continuation of leaving the impression with the young people and the citizens of Illinois that you can get something out of this life for nothing. And



frankly, I feel very strongly that the citizens of Illinois overwhelmingly are opposed to any more additional legalized gambling in Illinois. Illinois does not want to be another Las Vegas. It does not want to be another Nevada. And I believe that this seriously violates the religious ethics of most people of the State of Illinois. And for these reasons, I vigorously object to this Bill and I must urge that this Bill be overwhelmingly defeated."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I know that many of the Members of the General Assembly are very familiar with the jai alai operation, the jai alai game. I know that my colleague has sometimes...he has problems, you know, reaching the mentality a lot of people reach. You know, I don't think he realizes he keeps talking in Winnebago about there's no gambling in Illinois and the races have been with us since the 20's. We've taken over two billion dollars from race track privilege taxes. And I think he used to beg for more race track passes than I ever got. He voted against bingo and the ship left him there. He voted against the lottery and now we've grossed a half of a billion dollars. He voted against raffles and chances yesterday and he knows his own Department of Law Enforcement in Rockford has to...has all the trouble in the world trying to control raffles and chances. So you can't really make a judgment of a guy that's on the Crime Commission, when, you know, all of us know they couldn't track a bleeding elephant through snow. But I think the thing to realize here is, again, the Governor appoints the Jai Alai Control Board. I have a lot of faith in the Governor, Simms doesn't, that the Governor could appoint five Members



that know enough about jai alai control to have a simon-pure operation. I think Rockford...not Rockford, but Chicago and the State of Illinois and its per capita income, which equals a third of the state...third in per capita income could very well support jai alai frontons in Chicago or in Rockford or in Peoria or East St. Louis. And I think that it's time that we indicate that we are interested in pursuing jai alai or indicate that we don't want jai alai because we don't need the money or don't want the money. But I reiterate, that because the complete control is the Governor's appointments, the appointment of the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, because I have a lot of faith in the Governor and I have a lot of faith in the I.B.I. and the scrutinizing agencies, I have no fear about the proper and prompt good controls that that jai alai would...would be governed by. And I would think we could use the money. And I urge support of this ...House Bill 2245."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall...the question is, shall House Bill 2245 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, I'll be right with you....explain his vote. Timer's on."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I had wanted to ask several questions of the Sponsor of this Bill. Some of the question I'd want to ask the Sponsor of the Bill before I vote on it on whether or not this was the result...this Bill, whether or not is was a result of the Commission. I would like to know how many other states in the Union have jai alai legalized and licensed and operating. I would like to know the provisions of the Bill and what the percentage and what the take would be for state



government. And since I haven't had the opportunity to have a thorough discussion of all of the issues in relation to this Bill, I'm going to have to vote 'present'."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've had experience with playing jai alai, that is betting on it, in Florida. I might add that I haven't been too successful, somehow my teams always come in fifth or sixth. But I can assure you that Florida is not state noted for gambling. It has three successful frontons. It's bringing in a tremendous source of revenue to the state, as well as tourism, in addition to the actual value and the interest derived from the operation of the frontons. This is a really successful business venture. I can certainly understand, and I respect those who have religious scruples against gambling. But to the rest of you who do not have any and recognize that gambling is a way of life, I can tell you that jai alai is an extremely enjoyable game. Sometimes you even win when you bet on a successful team. But even when you lose, it's worth an evening. And the revenue that the state would derive is something that none of us should overlook. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn. The timer's on."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this Bill, last year and this year again, try to talk about the gambling aspect of the jai alai Bill. The game of jai alai has much more to offer than just the gambling itself. It's a highly entertaining sport. It requires high skills of the players. There are avid fans. There are people who



come from other states. The tourism is a great thing to say nothing of...at what's already been mentioned about the income for the state. True, the income itself, would be in the neighborhood of some twenty million dollars, which is not a lot of money but it's that much. But the great benefit becomes from the fact that it attracts people from all of the neighboring states and some from...that are not even bordering Illinois, but states far away. If anyone has ever seen the game of jai alai, they..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr.

Matijeveh, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Matijeveh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, you know, we're in the Twentieth Century now and I don't consider this as gambling. I think if somebody was poor and can't afford it, it might be gambling. But we talk about tourism. You know, I live in Lake County and we have Great America. And you just don't know what Marriot's Great America is doing to the economy of Lake County and the State of Illinois and we are right...heart in the middle of...between Milwaukee and Chicago. And I'll tell you, if no other place in the State of Illinois wants jai alai, I'll take it for Lake County. And I know what that can do for tourism, what it can do for the State of Illinois and what it can do to my county. You are taking a very narrow view. Sure, this failed in 1957, but this is now a different time. We're getting into 1980. And I think it can be a great economic benefit to the whole State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. Timer is on."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've passed so many Bills giving tax relief and stripping the State of Illinois of...of revenue



that I think that we could think about sending a Bill to the Governor that would give him an option. He can certainly veto this if he doesn't want the additional revenue. But as it happens, the people who go to jai alai are very much the same people that would go to a theater. They go and they sit there and not everybody gambles. Many of them just watch the game. It's a very fast moving game. It's exciting. For those who have witnessed it, it's one of the most thrilling sports activity that you can imagine. I don't know why we should sit here and say no that we shouldn't consider this. I don't have...my people in my district...my colleague used to be Bingo Bill Murphy. The people in my district play bingo. Gambling to a limited degree is part of our life..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman asks...poll of the absentees. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "And I didn't get to explain my vote, just for a couple of minutes. Mr. O'Brien asked a couple of questions that are very pertinent. Am I on...am I? Mr. O'Brien asked a couple of questions. There are four states now that have jai alai; Rhode Island, Connecticut, Miami and Nevada. There are twelve fron...there are twelve frontons, I think, operating in the states. The privilege tax is comparable to our racing tax, except when I said earlier that it takes almost twenty-five million dollars...initial outlay for the fronton that they had to have a little ...consideration to get some of their money back. Now I would appreciate a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees, please."



Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Bluthardt. Capuzi. Ebbesen.  
Ewing. Getty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Getty 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Margalus. Mugalian. Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Peters 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reed. Simms."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Simms 'no'. Reed 'aye'. Conti 'aye'.

If it gets 89 the Gentleman asks for a verification.

You're entitled to do that."

Clerk O'Brien: "Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney. Von Boeckman and Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Mr. Wolf from 'present' to 'aye'.

Jake Wolf. Von Boeckman as 'aye'. What's the

count? On this question there are 85 'ayes'. The

Gentleman from Winnebago asks for Postponed

Consideration. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "And I'm going to scrub the expose' I was going

to write. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed Consideration. House Bill  
1299."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1299. A Bill for an Act to promote competition in banking and to compro... and to promote convenience of banking. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison. Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Well, I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would think that most of you are probably not familiar with this Bill. It deals with the bank holding companies. I doubt if anyone on the House floor has been lobbied on this Bill, and I doubt if you've had any calls from your districts, so maybe we could take a few minutes to explain it. This is the first time that this concept has been voted on on the House floor, or in fact, on the Senate floor, in the State of Illinois. House Bill 1299 would allow banks in this state to affiliate on the common ownership. We have divided, in this Bill we have divided the state into five areas. Cook County is one, the collar counties are area two, northern Illinois is three, central Illinois is four, and southern Illinois is five. Holding companies can be formed in the original area where a bank exists and in one contiguous area. Those in central Illinois would have to choose the contiguous area, either southern or northern. And the same way with northern, would have to choose to expand into central or into the collar counties. As currently amended, this would not allow any denovo bank acquisition. In other words, a holding company could not, of its own, charter a new bank. Furthermore, after the date of enactment of this law, newly chartered banks could not, could not be acquired until they have been in existence for five years. Now because we've run into opposition on this Bill, I have agreed this afternoon to amend this in the Senate to change this provision from five years to ten years. Newly chartered banks could not be acquired for ten years after the chartering. Besides the... besides the holding company aspects, the...the Bill deals



with facilities, limited services facilities that you now are familiar with. Under current law you can have two facilities. One within 1500 feet, one within 3500 yards. This Bill expands that and adds a third facility. But under the present law, each bank has a 600 foot home office protection against these facilities. I have further agreed to amend this Bill in the Senate to provide that the third facility would have a one mile restriction. In other words, instead of a 600 foot home office protection, it would have a one mile home office protection under this. I'd like to address myself, very briefly, to some of the reasons why we think this is necessary. First of all, between 1966 and 1977, the most recent statistics we have indicate that banks have lost nearly 600 million dollars in market share to competing financial institutions. As you know, savings and loans nearly have nearly unlimited banking in this state. The Federal Government not only approves state-wide branching, but they are now suggesting that savings and loan be allowed to branch across state lines and to standard metropolitan statistical areas. We have also had a growth in demand, not only for credit, but for banking services in this state. I have received letters from various constituents all over the state stating that they are in need of additional loan capacity from their local bank. I have one from a general contractor from southern Illinois who says his bank cannot facilitate...cannot meet his loan demands. I have a lot...I have...letters from farmers who say the same thing. I have a letter here from the City of Bloomington, and...and one of the paragraphs in here is absolutely phenomenal. It says that in the past two years a savings and loan association in that town has branched and merged from Decatur on the south, to Streator on the north, Champaign to the east, and Morton to the west. While that activity has gone on, this banker has



tried to compete by finding viable facilities within 3500 yards. Now that, Ladies and Gentlemen, simply is not competition when savings and loans can branch all over the state or are state-chartered within 100 miles, and a bank is limited to 3500 yards. We are also looking for additional services in a complex society, and those may be a trust services or various other services that a small bank can simply not economically offer. We're providing a number of safeguards in this Bill. As soon as you talk about the holding companies and two years ago when we talked about branch banking, immediately the word 'monopoly' flew up and they started waving the red flags. So I would call to your attention a few safeguards that are not only built into the Bill, but currently exist under federal and state law. First of all, we have divided this into five distinct districts, so there's no such thing as, as holding companies state-wide. Second of all, in order to form, in order to acquire a bank, rather, you have to have permission from th...from the Federal Reserve Board, and they have a rule of thumb which says that if you...if you currently have a ten to fifteen percent of the assets within your market area, you simply cannot acquire another bank. So, for all practical purposes, this would eliminate the two large Chicago banks from even acquiring banks. It would eliminate them from th...from the provisions of this Bill completely. A further law which was passed by the Federal Government in 1977 and went into effect last year, says that, which is called the Community Reinvestment Act, says that you must be able to prove that you are servicing your...your own community before you would be able to expand into other facilities. A further protection says that a foreign bank, and that is any out-of-state bank, cannot..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"



McPike: "...own...over five percent of the stock of any Illinois bank. So, I, I think this is a very limited concept. I think it's necessary to meet the demand and unnecessary to meet competition. I would answer any questions you have."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because of the magnitude on the import of this piece of legislation, I'm gonna ask to be joined by nine other Members to take this off Short Debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has, has the number required to take the matter off of Short Debate. Would you like to proceed now, Mr. Huff?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Huff: "Representative McPike, could you tell me...or give us what the methodology for acquiring the...what is the methodology used by the MBH...MBHC, the Multiple Bank Holding Company procedure for acquiring, controlling stock from the banks that they want to acquire?"

McPike: "Well, first they would have to approach an existing bank and get permission from its stockholders to acquire that particular bank. I think that would be the first step. No bank would become a member of a multi-bank holding company unless the stockholders of that...of...of that bank desire to do so. And then they would make application to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board for permission to make that...that acquisition..." Speaker: "Time." ...McPike: "and I mentioned before that, that the general rule of thumb is that if it would be anti-competitive, it would be denied, and if the bank requesting the merger controls over 10 to 15 percent of the assets in that market region, it would



further be denied."

Huff: "Another question. How, would this allow other, other banks, other mul, multiple holding, multiple bank holding companies in other states to engage in this type of operation in Illinois?"

McPike: "No, it would not. One of the safeguards in the Bill says that no foreign bank may own over five percent of the stock of an Illinois bank holding company."

Huff: "And, finally, what controls, if any state-wide, would we, would we have to regulate this thing?"

McPike: "What...on a state-wide basis the Commissioner of banks would, would have to give state approval along with federal approval, so that the state-chartered bank it's a dual process, not only from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve but also from our State Commissioner of Banks."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, if, if I can address the Bill, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said."

Huff: "I would like to address the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Huff: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I contemplate the import of this Bill, it conjures up the romantic version of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse descending upon Illinois. Only this time there would be a fifth rider and it would be called multiple bank holding companies. In the opening statement of this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, it states as its intent, to promote competition. I submit that that will no more happen than the earth reversing its axis and its orbit from east to west. What it will do, undoubtedly, is create monopoly. It will create the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, a wealthy few. I asked the speaker how...what was the methodology for acquiring the stock from banks that want to sell. He was a little vague on that, but the way it works, the multiple bank holding companies can



offer the...the voting stock owners of the banks they want to purchase as much as two and four times its book value on the stock, and I assure you that in this instance it may be as much as ten times. That, that shows you that it would be very, very difficult for independent bank stock owners, owners to resist this kind of an offer. In 1929...in 1929 eight percent of the multiple bank holding companies were controlling over 2,000 banks and held more than 11 billion dollars of the 58 billion dollars of loan and commercial paper that was out in existence. Between 1927 and the enactment of the first holding bank legislation of 1933, the holding companies were growing into a giant with large financial companies in which they helped their financial club over the State and the Federal Government and which they had very little control to stop this thing. I'd just like to give you a scenario of what might happen. Assume that...that the multiple bank holding companies are legalized in Illinois and the First National Bank of Chicago is the flag bank, the flagship bank of a holding company which controls, say 20 other banks in Illinois, including banks in Peoria, Springfield and Belleville. The majority of the...subsidiary banks are...will probably be in smaller suburban communities throughout the state. And consider further, that possibly the hol...the holding company shareholders receive an offer to sell to the 'Ale Alloram' Bank of Saudi Arabia for a handsome profit. If the sale of...of the bank occurs, all subsidiary banks will then..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close. There's about 40 lights on this Bill."

Huff: "I will, Mr. Speaker. The subsidiary banks would then come under the control of the Saudi Arabian bank, and therefore, it would control the monetary policies and it would deny the local banks the right to set policies for



the areas in which they exist. I just want to conclude by saying this, Ladies and Gentlemen, by asking you, do you know what this really is? This is just another semantic turn around for branch banking. It really should be called the 'Abud' Bank, who is the Chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago. If this Bill goes through, this would make Mr. 'Abud' the king of Farouk of the banking business, and I can tell you this is...this will be no millenium for the banking world, it would be the Apocalypse now. This is a bad Bill, and it should be resoundly defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your inquiry?"

Dunn: "Under Section 8 of Article 13 of the new Illinois Constitution it says that 'branch banking Bills authorized by law approved by three-fifths of the Members' and so on, and while this is called a holding company ba...Bill... multi-bank holding company Bill, I agree with the former speaker, Representative Huff, that this is, indeed, a branch banking Bill, because it allows another facility, I think for 10 miles or into adjoining counties, and I'd like a ruling from the Chair as to whether this will take an extraordinary majority under the Illinois Constitution or not. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Under Article 13, Section 8 of the Constitution, 'Bills authorizing branch banking requires an extraordinary majority. Three-fifths of those voting on the question or a Constitutional majority, whichever is greater'. There are two aspects of House Bill 1299 which raise a question of whether a Bill authorizes branch banking. One, the provision authorizing bank holding companies. Two, the provision expanding bank facilities. For similar reasons, neither aspect of the Bill consti-



tutes branch banking within the meaning of the Constitution, and House Bill 1299 will require the ordinary Constitutional majority for passage. The reason for this ruling should be clearly stated on the record due to the possibility of litigation in the event this Bill becomes law. The 1970 Constitution does not explicitly define branch banking. There are no Illinois courts' decisions providing clear guidance on the interpretation of that Constitutional term. However, the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention established some limitations on what was intended to be the subject to the extraordinary majorities. Beyond the con-con record, the Chair is bound by the statutory definition of branch banking, and that definition is the only Illinois law which defines branch banking. It was the only definition of branch banking at the time the 1970 Constitution was written and adopted."

Dunn: "Mr., Mr. Speaker. Could I address the Bill? I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To answer your question quite specifically, Sir, according to our research we...we thought that the subject would be raised. It's the ordinary Constitutional Majority for passage of this Bill. 89 votes."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I address the Bill for a minute?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not think the ruling is correct. I think that there'll be some objections raised in the courts in days to come, perhaps, if this Bill were to become law. But I would urge you not to support House Bill 1299 unless you are, indeed, in favor of branch banking. If you want the banks all over the state to be controlled by a small monopoly as spoken by the previous speaker, I would urge you to not vote for this Bill. Representative Richmond in our district made a survey of it and shared it with me and Representative



Birchler. In our district the banks are approximately three to one in favor of the unit banking system which has served Illinois and Illinois residents so well for so many years. I'd urge that you join me in defeating of House Bill 1299. Thank you."

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

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill, because I feel that... that at this time, or anytime for that matter, monopoly power in the hands of...of a few banks in the State of Illinois is not in the best interests of the citizens of this state. It offers no advantage to the consumer; it offers no advantage to the small businessman. Illinois' five lar...five largest banks already control over 50 percent of all the banking deposits in the State of Illinois. This Bill would increase this concentration even more. Credit decision making would be removed from the local unit. MBHC's represent the prospect of both higher service charges on the main deposits and reduce rates on savings accounts. The concept will cause a concentration in banking assets and a reduction in the number of independently competing banks, while at the same time, reduce farm lending activity at their rural acquisitions. Without being reactionary, I believe that in time the small, independent banks of this state will disappear with total control being placed in the hands of a few 42nd Street dime store executives, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly think that House Bill 1299 should be opposed. One of the things that we want to think about if this legislation was passed here in Illinois, the General Assembly would actually lose control over the



banking system. The conduct and regulations of multi-bank holding companies are controlled by the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D. C., and I think we in the General Assembly certainly would keep this in mind. The Federal Reserve Board not only...an Illinois agency would approve...an out-of-state Illinois agency would approve applications for multi-holding companies' acquisitions. Illinois citizens would find it difficult to make their views known when they take over in a proposal...in any proposal. The people whom would be most affected in this is a consumer. He would be effectively shut out of the process. There are over 100 and...12 hundred and 70 banks in the State of Illinois, and I think I'm safe in saying that nine hundred of these banks are strongly opposed to this type of legislation. Now the real strong pushers of this legislation are the...is the five largest banks in the state, which control over 40 percent of the total deposits, and let's compare that a little bit with a couple of states similar to Illinois that do have...do have similar legislation as this. In California where they have similar banking laws as this legislation would give Illinois, they control...they have a total of 105 billion dollars, and they have 80 percent, instead of 40 percent they have 80 percent, in the five largest banks. New York, another state similar to this, where they have 105 billion dollars in...in total deposits, and the five largest banks control 65 percent. If we're to liberalize the Illinois banking laws, there's no question that the larger banks in Illinois will control a much larger percent than they now control. The unit banking system has worked very well Illinois...in Illinois. I think it's worked for the benefit of the consumer, and we're not here to represent the banks, but we're to represent the consumer, and I would hope that we all realize that to effective help the consumer we should try to



keep the present system, the unit banking system. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to previous question. You'll all be able to explain your votes. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think everyone knows there are three banking organizations in this state. One is the...it consists mostly of the very small banks in Illinois, and they are opposed to this Bill. There's no doubt about it. They've been opposed to every change in our banking st...banking laws. They were opposed when we...when we opened one facility some years ago, and they were opposed when we opened two facilities a few years back. They would oppose any...any...any and every change, and there's no...there's no doubt as to why they would. We have 400 towns in Illinois. Four hundred towns, and in those towns there's only one bank. If you own the only grocery store in town or the only filling station in town, there's no doubt that you wouldn't want any competition, and I guess I can't blame them for...for reacting the same way. If you have a monopoly, why...why give it up? Or why even take a chance on giving it up? They holler about monopoly here, but we really know who has the monopoly. Four hundred banks in Illinois have monopolies in their town, and they don't want any competition. In...in Committee this year we...we only allowed that two people to speak for this and two to speak against it, and I got a kind of a kick out of one of the people that testified against it, because that particular individual owns five banks in



Illinois. President of three and Chairman of the Board of two others. Now those banks don't have a lot of competition. One of the banks offers a three and a half percent on passports and...and about four percent on another bank, and there is no competition in those fields, and this Bill maybe would apply a little pressure and make those people compete. I think one telling factor between these different banking organizations is that the small community banks have a loan to deposit ratio of .53. The banks represented by AMB, the Association for Modern Banking, who are in favor of structural changes in Illinois, those banks have a loan to deposit ratio of .83. The small banks are simply not making loans in their communities. There's no way of getting around it. They invest in government securities. They invest out-of-state. They simply do not loan in their communities, and anybody that likes to pretend that they do, simply has to look at this one very simple ratio and say, 'Well, you're right. They just don't make loans.' I think that we're trying to change the structure of banking in Illinois, so that we can bring Illinois into...into the modern 20th c...20th century. We're the only...as we approach the latter part of this century, we're the only... we're one of two states, West Virginia and ours, one of two states that have not got any branch banking or holding company changes in their law. I think it's about time that we modernize our...our laws and allowed banks to compete, not only with themselves, but with savings and loans and all other financial institutions, and I think that this is a positive step in that direction. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is 'Shall House Bill 1299 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on."



Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since I didn't have a chance to ask the questions, I would point out this does, indeed, go to allow out-of-state banking without question holding companies there. It strikes the words 'banks located in Illinois'. It adds words referring to charters of banks in Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, and everywhere else. It provides in Section 3.08 to bring in Missouri banks that happen to already own a bank in Ziegler and a bank of Benton and will operate out of that base to pick up other companies under the holding company act. This is no compromise, except among Chicago banks. It's no compromise with downstate Illinois. It's a take over Bill. A concentration of wealth, and if you believe that those big banks want to provide services, and that's why they have this Bill, you're kidding yourself. You ought to be putting a 'no' vote up there if you believe in the unit banking system, if you believe in services, and if you oppose the further concentration of wealth. One third of the banking assets in this country are already held by multi-bank holding companies. This is a terrible, terrible Bill. Representative Huff was absolutely right. It should go down to a blazing defeat. It should go down to every 'no' vote possible if you believe in people getting services. It is an unfair and arbitrary effort to take over bank..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis. The timer's on."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill will do two things for unit banks, and some of them are already starting to mitigate their opposition to this Bill as they begin to realize that they have two advantages under the Bill. If they... if they choose, they can use the mechanics of the Bill for their own acquisition activities if they choose to be aggressive. If they choose to sell, they'll have a wide open market sector for that sale, but you must understand



that this is not branching. The opponents would have you believe it's branching. What this Bill does is simply say that if we want to acquire, we're gonna go try to acquire. That does not preclude a unit bank from saying, 'No, I do not want to sell.' You have to have a buy and a sell before an acquisition is made. In our s...in our neighboring state of Missouri, this multi-holding company concept has been in effect for 30 years. At the end of that 30 years this...this year there are 40... four hundred and eighty-nine independent banks still striving very greatly and very well..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of explaining my 'no' vote on this particular Bill. Of all the Bills that I've been lobbied to vote upon, I guess this is probably the one that takes the highest priority, and I want to call your attention to some of the type of lobbying that was done to me and some others in my particular district. I had calls telling me that they were helping me, calling my banks to see their position, and then saying that they had changed to a 'yes' position. I called back to those banks, as did my cohorts, Richmond and his secretary and Mr. Dunn, and we found that our banks were still taking the 'no' position. The banks in District 58 that we contacted still are about three to one opposed to this Bill, and that's the position I ask, and I ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Friedrich, I want to apologize to you. Your light was not working. The electrician just fixed it. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think the interesting part about the Sponsor's explanation is what he didn't tell you, not what he did tell you. He



didn't tell you that the new branch can be 10 miles away from the...the home office, which could be in the next town. He didn't tell you that this holding company can do almost anything. They can be in the real estate business, they can be in the insurance business, they can be in the appraisal business, and they can do anything else. So what you're gonna find in your town, in addition to having an out-of-town banker, you're gonna have an out-of-town real estate man, and insurance man, and so on. I guess you can't have an out-of-town lawyer in this, but you can have about everything else. Now this is the beginning of branch banking, because the big money boys can buy one bank in each one of these districts with a different set of...circumstances, and they can control every bank in the State of Illinois. I saw this in the Dakotas many years ago, and the people that run the banks out there are...have to bow down to the people in Minneapolis and St. Paul because they own 'em all, and the guy that's running the local bank couldn't care less about the town of Watertown, 'cause he's bucking for a job in a bigger town. He doesn't belong to the Chamber of Commerce. When you go to him for a contribution for the United Fund, he said, 'Oh, call St. Paul. I can't do anything about it.' And that's the way this thing works. Now if you want...the banking business in Illinois to get into this kind of a situation, you just go ahead and vote 'aye'."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, as I understand it, will destroy independent banks. This Bill would deprive local community banks from setting banking policies for a given area. This Bill will hamper new community banks, which like in my area, we are trying to bring up ourselves to our boot straps what everybody's



talkin' about and prove your own area. Well, we cannot put a bank in Lawndale, or Garfield, or South Austin with this type of legislation, and let...may I remind you, that I understand that the Labor Bureau and Farm Bureau and labor and Bill Henry oppose this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to ask the Sponsor a question before the debate was closed, and I just want to ask that question now and hope somebody can elucidate me later on, and that is on page 1, line 24. What does the language that refers to the regulation under this Act of banks organized under the laws of Samoa, Guam, and Washington, D. C. do?"

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me just say that many of the remarks that you've heard after Representative McPike's explanation really allude to the fact that most of those persons have either not read the Bill or chose not to accept the results of legislation. The key factor in this legislation is Commitment and profit. There's nothing wrong in the United States with a financial institution making a profit, and that should not be a bad word. The loan deposit ratio in this Bill, the loan deposit ratio of multi-bank holding companies, as Representative McPike has said, is without a doubt in favor of those groups that are a member of AMB. There was a survey taken of the Illinois Bankers' Association, and I guess this is the most telling statistic. The question if multi-bank holding companies were allowed in Illinois, our bank would have to sell out. More than 70 percent of the members of that organization felt that that would not be the case. I submit to you there's federal legislation regarding community reinvest-



ment that more than protects against..."

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

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The proponents of this legislation term it as a compromise. It's a compromise only because they are not asking for quite as much as what they'd like to have. It's the first step in branch banking. They sell it in the name of competition. The effect of this Bill, if passed, would, in fact, freeze al...freeze out competition. There's not been a single bank in my district, and there are many of them, who have contacted me to support this Bill, and there have been dozens who have contacted me to oppose it. But, more importantly, the people of my district want me to oppose this Bill. When I surveyed them, they overwhelmingly, by more than 75 percent, were opposed to this legislation. One of the most important factors is we do away with our community banks, we're gonna be doing away with the opportunity in sitting down with a bank official, who we know and who knows us, to discuss our business. There have been many businesses in this state..."

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

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to talk to you just as a consumer. I arrived at my decision long before anybody lobbied me, and I based my feeling on the fact that there's a federal savings and loan in my community, which I was able to benefit from the fact that, that, that, it is a large bank, but it...that had personal service, and I really feel, excuse me, I really feel that we're not looking at this correctly. People who talk and say that this is against the consumer. I don't believe that. I think if you really check with the people in your district, as



many of you have said you've done, you'll find that most consumers will feel that they'd benefit from this legislation. Every bank in our district is for this legislation, and I urge you to pass some more green lights on there."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really ask you, 'Why does Illinois have to stay in the 19th century? Why do we have to stay now with West Virginia?' Here is a Bill that is...that is going to help us to move ahead. It isn't for the consumer. It...it's...these provisions are to help the consumer, not the individual in...banks from downstate who are in small areas who have the monopolies, and they don't want to change that. Now every...ef...effort's been made to...to give them all the safeguards. It was amended in Committee. It was amended on the floor of the House, and now the principal Sponsor, Mr. McPike, we agreed to put an Amendment on in the Senate that they can't have any opposition to it, and yet they still give you the same old thing, because they want to protect their monopoly. The savings and loan are going to take over, and they'll never have a monopoly. Let's move Illinois ahead. Let's support this legislation; put some more green votes on there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele. Timer's on."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I oppose this measure, because, in effect, what this Bill is is really going to bring about absentee ownership in our banks, and when you've got absentee ownership, believe me it's the bottom line that counts. The individual gets lost in the shuffle. Now when you've got absentee ownership, and you've got tight money, what's gonna happen when the small barber, the small baker wants a loan, and the Federal Foreign Exchange



Rate is three percent higher, and these absentee owners can get three percent more on their loans through the Foreign Exchange Rate, or the Export-Import Bank, or whatever else they can get rather than loaning to the small town barber, or baker, or whatever, or factory worker. Absentee ownership is bad in many fields, but particularly in banks, and I think the big can take care of themselves. The big banks are doing fine. The small customer and the small person's the one we have to protect. That's why we're here, and let's oppose this Bill and protect the small customer..."

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

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've addressed this question any number of times over the passed several sessions of this Legislature, and I want to tell you something right now. This is a timber wolf covered with lamb's wool, and if you don't think so, read the Bill, and it's a sugarcoated version of branch banking, and all of y...all of those of you who want to vote for branch banking, vote for this Bill. Those of you who are against branch banking, vote against it, and I ask for your 'no' vote."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think there's anybody that's been fighting branch banking longer than I have in the State of Illinois. But, the Gentleman that just spoke before me couldn't put it any better, and it's just the opposite as far as the local towns are concerned: as being a monopoly. The monopoly is here. The monopoly has been created by the federal chartered banks allowing savings and loans to open up facilities, and in an area in...in my area one mile by two miles, we have six financial institutions.



Branch banking is here, and there's nothing that we can do about it. This is a branch banking Bill, and I'm not going to let the federal charters take over the state charters. I'm changing my vote for the first time in 20 years, and I'm voting 'aye'."

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

Abramson: "...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this Bill ought to be t...soundly defeated. This is going to contribute to the concentration of banking assets and banking power in Illinois. In other states where they have branching and multi-bank holding companies, when the interest rates were raised in 1974, I took them and averaged the two years to come up to the maximum interest rate. In Illinois where we have a competitive banking industry, within two months a majority of the banks were giving the maximum rate of interest, and continu...and continuously compounding that interest. I don't think this Bill is to the benefit of the Illinois consumer. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I don't think you can be dissuaded by the term 'branch banking' or whatever we might want to call the particular Bill. One of the things you have to look at realistically is whether or not you're gonna allow the banks to compete against the savings and loan interest. The savings and loan interest have expanded at a very rapid rate. They are producing services; taking money out of the banks. Now if you have a downtrodden community, one of the things you have to look at, is you've got to keep your community open and let something in and not try to keep everything out. If you want to really get ahead, you'd better start voting for things that will let some things in. There's no such thing as a monopoly and keeping everything out. It's a



good Bill. If you read it, and if you check what's behind all of these particular situations and quit calling names, I'm sure you'll give it a vote."

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

Robbins: "I would really appreciate it if I had had a good bit of stock in the Franklin Bank of Pennsylvania, which had to be taken over by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, because it had too much of its local capital invested in Europe and got caught in the money exchange and went broke. Now, we have in Missouri branch banking and bank holding companies that's been in operation for a good while. They run between one and a half and two percent higher on the money than what we can borrow it, and in our area the banks loan 60 to 65 percent of the money that goes right back in the community if...all you have to do is read the bank records and reports to find out where your money goes and why your loans is being handled. Now think, if you want to keep any local control, if you want to be able to walk in and call that bankers by the name of Mr. Jones, and say, 'I need to borrow five thousand.' and he hands you a note to sign it instead of taking the mortgage on your house, well you'd better try to keep local banking to where it can operate and vote down this branch banking Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The...the Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "It's the <sup>o</sup>Lady from Lake, Mr. Speaker. Whenever a Bill is controversial, someone hollers land use or branch banking, and scares everyone to death in this House. For a change, why don't we speak to the positives of this legislation? We're talking about controlled progress within a major industry. We're talking controlled competition within that industry. We're even talking controlled access to the consumer market. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is no more than a baby step to modern banking



methods in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sent a questionnaire out of my district, and I...I got a very high return, I feel, and...the question...that I had on the questionnaire... one of the que..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "My fault, I'm sorry."

Watson: "One of the questions dealt with banking facilities and do you feel that a bank should be able to establish a facility at other locations. Over 70 percent of the people that returned the questionnaire felt that banks should be able to do this, and one of the other questions that was one there was if so, should a limit be placed on the number of facilities allowed, and, again, they felt that there should be a limit. This Bill does both of those, and I think that the people want the facilities brought to them, and it's...give them more better service, and I would urge you to support House Bill 2119."

Speaker Lechowicz: "2199."

Watson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on. No? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Record me as 'aye', please. It's too late, I guess. Nice job, Glen. The Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees, and Mr. Abramson wants a verification. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you seek recognition? All right. We'll get to you in a second."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. Bluthardt. Capuzi. Deuster. Domico. Epton. Farley. Hanahan. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record me as 'aye', please. Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "McGrew. Kulas. Oblinger. Peters. Stearney. Vitek. VonBoeckman. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "VonBoeckman is 'no'. Vitek is 'aye'."



Mr. Dan...Vitek is 'aye'. Daniels is 'aye'. Mr. Hoffman is 'aye'. On this question there are 88 'ayes', 62 'nos'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2049."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2049."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2049. A Bill for an Act to permit employees to review personnel records. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2049 will allow employees of any company access to their employee's work record once every six months by written request. Mr. Speaker, may we have a little quiet here, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Dawson: "It will allow them on...twice a year to review their personnel records at their expense."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Any opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2049 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'ayes', 13 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2168."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2168. A Bill for an Act in relation to product liability. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the next three Bills, including this one that you hear, deal with the subject of products liability. The first two Bills have been completely agreed to by the various parties of interest. Taking the first Bill, House Bill 2168, this Bill merely adds a provision to the Statute of Repose section that it shall not be constructed to create a new cause of action. It also clarifies what causes of action the Repose Statute applies to. This Bill has no opposition that I know of and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone to speak in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2168 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Record me as 'aye' back there please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye', 3 'noes', 0 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2362. Could I have a Calendar here, please? 2362, Jack."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2362. A Bill for an Act in relation to product liability. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill, House Bill 2362, is also an agreed Bill. And what it does is provide some additional reporting for the insurance provisions and so we can accumulate additional data on products liability insurance. It also has another provision amending this statute of repose similar to the one that was in 2162. There is no opposition to this Bill that I know of. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone to speak in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2362 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 165 'ayes', 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2658."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2658, a Bill for an Act in relation to liability and any actions for injury, wrongful death, or property damage. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2658 is a Bill that addresses itself to a sellers exclusion on product liability. Under present Illinois law a wholesaler, a distributor, or a retailer can be made a defendant in the Strict Tort Liability Law Suit merely because he passes a product on to the user in its original sealed carton or its original manufactured condition. It is immaterial if the manufacturer is completely free of negligence or fault. Such sleeping application is strict liability to all members of the distributive chain is unjustified for several reasons. First, a nonmanufacturer did not create the defective condition in the product which is the basis of Strict Tort Liability. Secondly, the nonmanufacturer is ill-equipped to defend a product which he neither designed nor manufactured. Third, the nonmanufacturer must incur substantial and unwarranted defense cost. These expenditures are unnecessary and simply fuel increasing litigation costs in product liability cases. The nonmanufacturer is not a necessary party defendant because ultimately the loss will be shifted to the manufacturer of the defective product. We have a piece of legislation now that was written in conjunction with the trial lawyers up until a certain point. I don't wish to indicate that the trial lawyers in any way support this legislation. But in good faith we sat down with them for one afternoon and wrote this language that they agreed to at that time and they on Monday morning, called and said they could not continue to negotiate, could not continue to support the legislation. But it is their language and I'd like to point that out. What this thing, what



this Bill does, in a product liability action, the defendant or in a Strict Liability and Tort Case, the party shall, upon answering or otherwise pleading, file an affidavit certifying the correct identity of the manufacturer of the product allegedly causing the injury, the death, or the damage. Once the plaintiff has filed a complaint against said manufacturer or said manufacturers and the manufacturer or manufacturers have required or have answered or otherwise pleaded, the court shall order the dismissal of a Strict Liability and Tort Claims against the certifying defendant or the defendants providing the certifying...they will dismiss the defendants providing the certifying defendant are not within the categories set forth in Section 3. We do have some exclusions. The plaintiff though, may at any time subsequent to the afore said dismissal by the court, move to vacate the order of dismissal and reinstate the wholesaler, the retailer, or the distributor of certain specific instances. The first one, at the applicable period of the statute of limitations, the statute of repose bars the ascertainment of a Strict Liability and Tort Cause of action against the manufacturer or the manufacturers. Secondly, that the identity of the manufacturer given to the plaintiff by the certifying defendant or defendants was incorrect. Thirdly, that the manufacturer no longer exists, cannot be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of this State or, despite the diligence, the manufacturer is not amicable to the service of process. Fourthly, that the manufacturer is unable to satisfy any judgement as determined by the court. And this might be the case in a situation where he would not have enough insurance coverage to take care of the amount of judgement, then the wholesaler, the distributor, manufacturer would be brought back into the... into the case. Or finally that the court determines that the manufacturer would be unable to satisfy a reasonable settlement or other agreement with the plaintiff.



A court shall not enter a dismissal order relative to any certifying defendant or defendants other than the manufacturer even though full compliance with Section 1 has been made or the plaintiff can show one or more of the following. I think these are important, that the defendant has exercised some significant control over the design of manufacturing....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Bradley. Please proceed."

Bradley: "Yes, Sir. Thank you. If the defendant or if the wholesaler, the distributor, or retail merchant has exercised a significant control over the design of the manufacturer of the product or has provided instructions or warnings to the manufacturer relative to the alleged defect in the product which caused the injury, death, or damage they would be... the court would not remove them from the case. Secondly, that the defendant had actual knowledge. If the defendant had actual knowledge of the defect in the product which caused the injury, death, or damage, he is not removed. Or that the defendant created the defect in the product which caused the injury, death, or damage he certainly is not removed. That is what the Bill says, that's what it does. The attempt is to try to remove some of the liability to people who are not directly involved in the manufacture of that product that causes the damage or the injury or the death. It certainly was not the intent of this legislation to remove somebody who should be liable for such an injury. I think it's a good piece of legislation. I don't see where there could be a case where an injured party would not be able to come back on the manufacturer or if the manufacturer does not exist anymore, if he's out of business, or if he's gone bankrupt, then the distributor, wholesaler, and retailer shall be liable and I urge and ask respectfully an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2658."

Speaker Lechowicz: "In opposition.. Is Mr. Getty from the county of Cook."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition



to this Bill as it was amended. I would like to explain to the Members of the House that this Bill received a very full and fair hearing. Parties on both sides of the issue thought during our Subcommittee hearing that they could reach an accord so that we would have an agreed Bill which would address itself to a very important subject matter..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Getty. Just want to welcome the Governor back to Illinois. Welcome back Governor. Governor it's my understanding we'll be working here until midnight and I hear that hors d'oeuvres and coffee will be served in your office till that time? Unfortunately I believe many of us will be here till tomorrow morning. Please proceed, Mr. Getty. Excuse me. Let's get a little. The Gentleman from Mclean, Mr. Bradley, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, as Sponsor of the legislation I think it only fair to the Members to take this off Short Debate I know there are a lot of Members that would like to speak on it. If nine others would join me, we'll take it off the Short Debate. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, really, I know the importance of the legislation, but if you look at this Calendar I think it'd be more beneficial to the House. You'll probably take the time for 10 Bills. We should have a proponent and an opponent. People still can just...still explain their vote and it moves the House a heck of a lot quicker that way."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's 3 or 4 that would like to talk and I don't think we would have more than that. If you object, I will remove my request, I'm sure others might make it. I'll remove the request to leave it on Short Debate.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's only two lights on this Board. Mr. Getty please proceed in opposition."

Getty: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again to state the



position. This Bill .. this subject matter was fully and fairly heard in Committee. We thought we could reach an accord. Unfortunately, we were unable to arrive at satisfactory language to both sides. It's a very complex issue. It's an issue that affects the rights of every citizen of Illinois if they are a person who is injured and very often a person who is very seriously injured. If you vote on this in an affirmative way, in the manner that it is, you may affect the rights of your constituents and mine to recovery when they have a very serious illness. As this Bill is drawn for example, you would have a very serious question if a distributor of a substance, a chemical for example, were to sell it to you, you would become seriously injured, the manufacturer would in subsequent years either go out of business or be unavailable for process. The person who sold this to you would not be held liable in strict liability in tort. I know for the nonlawyer Members and indeed for some of us who are lawyers, this is a very complicated subject matter. Representative Breslin presented in Committee an Amendment which I think was a very fair, very equitable Amendment which would have been fair to all parties and interests. What that Amendment would have done would have provided that the seller, the distributor, would be able to tender his defense to the ultimate manufacturer. The manufacturer would then have the opportunity to defend the suit. If he failed to do that, he would be liable for the cost, the expenses, and the attorney fee involved in the defense of that suit for the distributor, the distributor who had not modified the product, who had not caused the damage. But that Amendment, unfortunately, was defeated in favor of the Amendment #2, which is presently on the Bill. Unfortunately that Amendment is not clearly drawn. Unfortunately, the person who sued the distributor could be put out of the suit, dismissed only to find years later he'd be subject and back in it because the man-



ufacturer had not been properly insured, because the manufacturer was unable to properly defend, because the manufacturer was not available causing a real difficulty to both the ultimate consumer who was injured, our constituents, and in fact to the distributor who Representative Bradley by this Bill would like to help and rightly so. I suggest to you the proper vote on this issue is a present vote, hoping that either this Bill or some other Bill could be amended..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Getty: "...To put on a reasonable Amendment. At that point we would be able to support it. I would ask for a present vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClean, Mr. Bradley to close. Mr. Daniels to close. That's fine. The Gentleman from DuPage."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me first of all emphasize to you that this Bill has the complete backing of the business groups in the State of Illinois, including your small businessmen throughout the State that have been screaming for at least, at least as a case like this, a minimal, minimal relief in the area of products liability. This relief is what is called the sellers' exclusion and many of you have received letters and support from your wholesalers, and manufacturers throughout the State to put on a sellers' exclusion. To be perfectly candid and perfectly honest with you, I think that there are some additional issues that must be addressed on this Bill in the Senate dealing with the area of sellers' exclusion. Representative Getty and I have discussed the area of the opinion that was recently issued by the Supreme Court just yesterday, as is my understanding. We have just received a copy of it and I'm more than happy to discuss in the Senate some of the additional terms regarding legal



fees and its application. But let me remind you that recently we had some additional Amendments that were defeated by this House in the area of products liability. This is one of three Bills, three Bills that are minimal in nature and three Bills that your manufacturers, your wholesalers, your Chamber of Commerce, have asked this House to act on. This is one of the three Bill packages, we think that the request is certainly reasonable. I would ask you to support the Bill and as one of the Chief Sponsors of the Bill, we are going to work further on this in the Senate to see if we can clean up some of the language of the Bill. We need your support now and we'd appreciate a green vote. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is whether House Bill 2658 shall pass. All in favor vote 'aye' ; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I serve on Judiciary I. I've been very much involved in the subject of product liability for a number of years. And generally my sympathy has lied with the trial attorneys. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, both the sellers and the trial lawyers are in agreement as to an end. Their difference is as to a means. I respectfully suggest that House Bill 2658 is the only show in town and that to be responsible. We should advance this Bill to the Senate for more consideration. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Barnes? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes' 9 'nays', 34 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 690. 690."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 690. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave to return this to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Any Amendments? 690."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Schuneman-Hudson, amends House Bill 690 as amended in the title and in the introductory portion of Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schuneman, on Amendment number... what? 2. Amendment #6, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 690 is the Bill on unemployment compensation. I'm glad that the Sponsor has taken this Bill back to Second Reading because it gives us an opportunity to offer an Amendment which I had hoped to offer and did try to offer one other night on the floor of the House. My Amendment simply says that refusal to cross a picket line shall invalidate any employee's claim for unemployment compensation. I think many of you are familiar with the case in Alton, Illinois which involved the...the 'Olan' Manufacturing Company whereby one labor union had brought a strike against that company and other employees, not members of that particular labor union, refused to cross the picket line. And under Illinois unemployment compensation insurance, those employees who refused to cross the lines were allowed unemployment compensation insurance for an extended period of time. That one case cost the Unemployment Compensation Fund in the State of Illinois a large, large sum of money. Not to mention



the fact that the employers in the state were financing the payment of people who were helping in the strike. And I submit to you that this is wrong. When employers are required to provide unemployment insurance for employees who loose their jobs through no fault of their own, that's one thing. But when the employees refuse to work and join the strikers against that company..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Schuneman: "...and the company is required to pay for the insurance that would fund the union activities, I submit to you that that's wrong and that it's time to bring about this needed change in the unemployment compensation laws. I would urge a favorable vote on Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike.  
Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Well...we'll accept this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman accepts the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye...and opposed...the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, McPike, amends House Bill 690..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am very happy to see Governor Thompson on the floor at this time because Amendment #7 is the agreed Bill adopted by the Committee that he appointed on unemployment insurance. There were three people from organized labor on the Governor's Committee. There were three people from the...the manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce and there were three public members. After a number of weeks and after meeting for hours and hours on this, after



negotiating in good faith across the table, this Committee of nine finally voted nine to nothing... nine to zero to accept this as an agreed Bill. I would now offer number...Amendment #7 to House Bill 690 which...which...and I would only like to say one other thing at this time. This is the only vehicle left in the House and it's my understanding that there are no vehicles left in the Senate for such an Amendment as this. So I would offer Amendment #7 at this time."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. McPike, do I understand that your Amendment #7...I've not had an opportunity to review this so...the reason I'm questioning. Is your Amendment #7 now putting this Bill into the same posture as the so-called agreed Bill that has been submitted to us?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Schuneman: "And in addition...okay, you just accepted my Amendment #6."

McPike: "That is correct."

Schuneman: "And does that remain in the Bill now?"

McPike: "No, Amendment #7..."

Schuneman: "Okay. Thank you very much. So...we appreciate your gesture and at least for a little while you were right. But...so your Amendment now strikes that provision and simply puts the Bill into the posture of the so-called agreed Bill?"

McPike: "Well, if it did not strike your Amendment then it would not be an agreed Bill...of course, would break down the Governor's agreed Bill process. And I certainly wouldn't want to contribute to that."

Schuneman: "That would be too bad. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #7 be



adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The question is, shall Amendment #7 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlmen of the House, I am, indeed, glad to hear that the Sponsor of this Bill is so concerned about the Governor's recommendation. I wish he would have been as concerned..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor."

Ewing: "...on House Bill 2700."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 16. Out of the record. 16, please. Mr. Daniels, it's your Bill. Do you have to bring it bring it back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 16. A Bill for an Act to provide for the regulation of elevators, dumbwaiters, escalators and moving walks and facilities equipment associated there with. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Daniels, amends House Bill 16 by deleting everything after..."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 puts in the exclusion relating to the City of Chicago because they already have an elevator code that is much more restrictive than the one proposed in this Bill. And I'd move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...Amendment #2 is adopted."



Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill considered immediately. Use the Attendance Roll Call. Hearing no objections, House Bill 16. The Bill has been read on Third Reading. Please proceed with the Bill, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 16 provides that there shall be an elevator safety code with the standards adopted by the National Code. It's a minimal standard throughout the State of Illinois and it would be enforced locally by the municipalities or counties whatever the case may be. And I move for the favorable adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is...any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 16 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Record me as 'aye', please. Yes, Ma'am. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Was this Bill brought back from Second a moment ago or was that something strange on the board? This Bill can be heard on Third Reading on the same day only with the affirmative votes of 107 Members."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which we intend to do with the Attendance Roll Call, Ma'am. Have all voted who wish?"

Pullen: "Well I sure didn't hear that rule being..."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, I really didn't plan to say anything until Representative Walsh forced me to. I just wanted to point out that we are licensing, apparently, a new group of people and some people don't like to do that. This...the group now being licensed by this Bill is..."

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



what's your point?"

Daniels: "As I said on Amendment #2, that provision is removed. All we are doing is setting minimal standards now for the safety code. That provision of licensing is out. I don't like the licensing either."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leinenweber,apologizes."

Leinenweber: "No, Representative Walsh wants to apologize."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Both of you apologize. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 6 'noes', 9 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 834, is it in the same category? Mrs. Dyer, I believe that's your Bill. The Lady asks leave of the House to bring the Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Dyer: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Dyer: "I believe that Mr. Collins wants to present the Amendment. Here's your Amendment, Phil."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Collins-Winchester-Lechowicz, amends House Bill 834..."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 834 embodies two other Bills which were left on Second Reading and came out of the Elections Committee with an overwhelming affirmative vote. The first...the first Bill which is embodied in this Amendment was Representative Winchester's Bill which would require an official canvass at least once every two years to remove the names from voter registration lists of persons who have moved or died. Now this is not a Cook County problem but it has been a problem in downstate counties as most of you who were here at the time will remember. Representative Choate at that time tried to do this by a statewide registration. This is an attempt to do the same thing in a little easier way. The second part of the Amendment would...would embody the provisions of Representative McAuliffe's Bill which deals with the required number of signatures on nominating petitions for Members of the General Assembly. And this would double that number required on petitions for candidates for the General Assembly. As I say, both of these Bills in Bill form came out of the Elections Committee



with hardly a descent. And I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for one quick question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Mr. Collins, why?"

Collins: "Why what?"

McClain: "Why double the number of signers?"

Collins: "Well, I...I should defer to Representative McAuliffe whose Bill this was. But I think his rationale was that the number of signatures is so small that it... it is just too easy to put a name on the ballot to run for an office such as the one that we occupy. Let Representative McAuliffe answer for himself."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian, please."

Mugalian: "Apparently Representative McClain hasn't finished. I yield back to him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? Yeah, I thought he did."

McClain: "I don't know why the Members of this Body would want to subject themselves to the criticism that they are...will make it harder for new candidates to run. It certainly...it favors the incumbents in doubling the requirement from three hundred to six hundred. But there's another provision in this Bill...in this Amendment and I'm surprised that Representative Collins would offer it because he's considered to be one who's in favor of election reform, generally. And what that does is require an independent candidate to have not less than 10%, no more than 16%, of the number of people who voted in the previous election. And that is...it really makes us look bad. I think it's...to say it's a



step in the wrong direction is an understatement. I think we should reject this Amendment and proceed with a good Bill that this was before this Amendment was offered."

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

McAuliffe: Well I could...I could answer Representative McClain's question. In some districts in Chicago it only takes about sixty names to get on the ballot for a State Representative or State Senator. I think that's an unusually small amount and I don't think any legitimate candidate would really have any trouble getting one hundred and twenty or a hundred and forty names. If you couldn't get that many names on a petition, I don't think he would really be a serious candidate. And this is meant to weed out some of the people who really aren't serious candidates."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Mr. McAuliffe, I'm just...this is probably meaningless but during our Democratic Conference last night we heard from one of our Chicago brothers that in some districts there aren't but a hundred or a hundred and fifty or two hundred Republicans in the whole district. So, I mean, what you could be doing is having no Republican candidate from those districts, so..."

McAuliffe: "In the..."

McClain: "Which is fine with me, except I hate to see Peters ...I like Peters."

McAuliffe: "But anybody can sign the petitions. I'm sure there are some districts in Chicago where you would have a hard time finding a hundred and twenty Republicans. But anybody can sign the petition."

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

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "...indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Earlier this afternoon we passed out of the



House a Bill that said that any mandates that we put on state or local government would have to be paid for by the state. Do you have any estimate as to the additional cost to the counties to provide for this kind of a canvass?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Collins, please."

Collins: "I have no estimate as to cost on that feature of the Amendment and that is Representative Winchester's... portion of the Amendment. I'll defer to him to answer that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "I didn't hear the question, Mr. Speaker."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Winchester, the first portion of the Bill beginning on page 1 and ending on page 2, the new language that is included there...first of all may I ask, does that apply statewide or to which counties of the state are we talking about?"

Winchester: "Well, I'm...I'm of the opinion, Representative, that it would apply statewide."

Satterthwaite: "Alright. If it...if it's applying statewide, we do not currently, downstate at least, have this kind of a canvass. And my question was in regard to the Bill that we passed out of this House earlier this afternoon that if the state were to mandate any additional programs on local government that we were to provide funding at the state level for that. What do you anticipate the cost to be to county government to provide this kind of canvass?"

Winchester: "Okay, first of all, on your first answer...your first question, if I might go back. It applies statewide except in Cook County where they're already doing this type of thing every two years. So they've got a pretty good canvassing program going now. The second, I am told...the second part of your question is, that it would probably cost statewide about a hundred and



fifty thousand dollars. No. I am told that the Department of Local Government Affairs will make that decision so I...I don't know. That was just a...guess."

Satterthwaite: "The Department of Local Government Affairs would have to estimate the cost, but you don't know what the cost would be."

Winchester: "I don't, no."

Satterthwaite: "I would certainly suggest that this kind of canvass statewide would appear to me to cost far in excess of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I would think that it would be prohibitively expensive for the County Clerk to pick up this kind of...of charge to the...to his office without state assistance. The other question I have is in regard to the language on page 2 starting at about lines 9 through 12, where it requires that a person appear if his registration has been challenged in order that it not be cancelled. And then again in the following paragraph it talks about a person who has not so appeared, then being mailed a card etc. It seems to me that the time limitations given there for response are very limited. And I wonder what happens in a community like Champaign County, for instance, where a large number of the university's faculty people may leave mid May because they only have nine months appointments. They don't come back until August. If the County Clerk there decides to conduct this canvass during that summer period, I fear that a lot of people who are really permanent residents, except that they go somewhere else for a summer job, are going to be left without registration when they come back. How do we avoid that kind of problem?"

Winchester: "Well the only answer I can give, and I hope it's one that's satisfactory, is that this is the... it's identical to the way it's being done in Chicago, in



Cook County right now. It's not going to be any different than the way it's being done in Cook County. Does that answer your question?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again I indicate that I think the expense of this additional mandate on downstate counties is going to be prohibitively expensive and unless there are appropriations that are going to cover this cost to the counties, I do not see that we should be supporting this legislation. I can understand the intent of trying to keep up-to-date roles within our counties and certainly many of our County Clerks have not been very diligent in the past in taking this route of clearing their books. However, with the kind of very limited time, 10 days to appear in person at the Clerk's office, it seems to me that we are going to cause more confusion and knock people off the role who are legitimate residents of a particular county. And I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge the adoption of Amendment #2 which I think is a very good Amendment. The...item #1 which we have just been discussing as to the...canvass every two years, I think this is something that everyone of us would find desirable. One of the...actually, the only objection at the time that former Representative Choate proposed his statewide reregistration, was the fact that it might be costly. This is the way to do the



identical thing or near identical thing at a fraction of the cost. And I think we would all agree that it is desirable. As to...as to the signature requirement on the...for Members of the General Assembly, I think we have seen abuses of the two party system by so-called independents interjecting as a third candidate in some districts where you might...you might see the election of...of three of one party and I'm sure we can all do it...if we can both do it in certain parts of the state. I don't think that...for the privilege of running for this office that twice the number of signatures you may have in some districts which might be sixty out in the...the...some areas of Chicago or on the Democratic ticket in counties like DuPage, is an unreasonable requisite on the potential candidate. I think it's a good Amendment to a very good Bill and I would solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed ...Amendment is adopted. Roll Call has been requested. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Johnny. Have all voted who wish? Give me an 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'ayes', 37 'noes' and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Mrs. Dyer asks to suspend the Rule for immediate consideration...use the Attendance Roll Call. Any objections? Objection. The Lady moves to suspend the Rule. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Alright, now we can. Kindly record me as 'aye', please. The Lady has moved to suspend the Rule for immediate consideration on...on House Bill 834. Yeah. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 117 'ayes', 27 'noes', the Rule is suspended.  
The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, on House Bill 834."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 834 is a good government election Bill that I think can be supported by both parties in any county in the state, whether you're the Majority party or the Minority party. Thanks to excellent staff work, it provides a mechanism by which absentee ballots that have been received too late to be distributed to the individual precinct polling places can be counted faithfully without danger of vote fraud. And if you'll look at your...if you'll look at your analysis you'll see that when the absentee ballot applications are received by the election authority in any county, the name and the address of the...of the person requesting the ballot is posted in a conspicuous place. When the voter returns the ballot the same information is posted. And then in each county, the county board appoints a three judge panel with no more than two from any one party, who have the responsibility on election day of counting the absentee ballots that have come in, that have been post marked before 11:59 the day before the election but because of a delay in the mail have not been able to be delivered to the precincts. They are counted carefully by this three judge panel and every political party or candidate or civic organization may have a poll watcher to be present at the county. It doesn't take place until after the polls have closed but it must be completed by 8 p.m. of election night. It's a tightly drawn, beautiful good government, good election Bill. It will give your constituents the assurance that their absentee ballot can be counted properly and safely. I respectfully request a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 834. A Bill for an Act to amend



the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not a good government election Bill. What this Bill does now after it's been amended is to basically disfranchise voters. It gives the opportunity to... County Clerk to remove people without cause on a very, very short notice. It says that a voter has to appear before the County Clerk within 10 days after a postcard has been mailed. It gives no grounds on which the County Clerk may challenge the...the voter. It says if the County Clerk feels that the voter should be challenged, he can send out the postcard and the voter has to appear within 10 days. Now if you have a County Clerk that mails a card on...say a Thursday, it's not going to get delivered until Monday. There's 4 days gone right there. It means the...the individual has to get to the County Court House, and in some large downstate counties that might be rather inconvenient, have to get there before the following Friday or he is going to be removed. A lot of people are going to be out of town. If he chooses to mail it during a vacation period like the week of July 4th or if in deed I've known of...the mail not to even arrive in the same county within a week or two, but it's not....there's no record that the County Clerk has to keep of when the card was mailed or anything else. I think that this is a Bill that's going to disfranchise voters. And if you look at some of the other provisions in it, I think it's a terrible Bill. It's going to be expensive. It's going to end up disenfranchising voters. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 834 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have



all voted who wish? The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you. I would like an opportunity to close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Dyer: "I would like in response to Representative Kane, I'd like to point out the language that he pointed out is in the Amendment. And it is under present law that it is precisely the procedure in Cook County right now. It is simply a method of cleaning up the roles after an election, the...cleaning up the voting lists. It does not disenfranchise anyone. It is...it is a good government Bill. It is a step forward, a very strong step forward for getting absentee ballots counted in a proper, honest way with good safe guards. I do urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Pullen: "I'm not going to talk about all the expense that this Bill will cost. I'd like to talk about the original idea of this Bill, the absentee ballot part of it. The Lady who is sponsoring this Bill told us all that there will be ballots counted in the County Clerk's office on election night by a three judge panel, that's two of one party and one of another. And we can all have our watchers down there. You tell me how many of us are going to have our watchers in the County Clerk's office from six to eight on election night. It's absolutely ludicrous. It's going to cause more problems in the already difficult situation of absentee balloting. It is not going to solve anything. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'ayes', 45 'noes', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1816.



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1816."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1816, a Bill for an Act to add Article 30 to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brummer: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1816 is an insurance rating Bill. I'd like to say at the out-set that the State of Illinois is the only State in the Union without any insurance rate regulation authority in the vital areas of property and casualty insurance that affects the Home Owners Insurance of everyone, it affects the automobile insurance of everyone, and the State of Illinois in a highly regulated business is the only State in the entire country that has no authority to look at rates that are charged to consumers in the State of Illinois. This Bill would provide an open competition. And I want to emphasize an open competition, use and file system of rating in the State of Illinois. Many states have very restrictive rating systems which require prior approval by the state before rates can be used. This Bill would not do that. It would provide an open competition use and file system by which the companies would use the rates and file them and then if the State of Illinois found those rates to be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory, the state would have authority to order those rates corrected for the protection of the consumers of insurance in the State of Illinois. The second feature of this Bill is a 7 man Insurance Regulatory Board. We have had numerous directors of insurance in Illinois in the last 6 or 7 years. I don't have the exact count, but I think it has been at least 5 or 6 individuals that have served as the Director of the Department of Insurance. Traditionally, in Illinois, those Directors of the Insurance have either come from the insurance industry or gone to work for the insurance industry. We have had almost a revolving



door in that directorship between the Director of the Department of Insurance and in the industry which the Department is supposed to over-see. Most recently, the Director came to work from All-State, his immediate predecessor, who quite as Director, went to work for All-State. We have had a revolving door between industry and the Director's chair with regard to insurance. I do not think that does anything towards lending credibility to the decision that those individuals make with regard to the very sensitive issue of regulating insurance of the consumers of the State of Illinois. This Bill would provide for a 7 man Board appointed by the Governor for a four year term that are staggered. The appointment would be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, the make-up of the Board is carefully structured in the Bill to provide reasonable representatives from all segments of the State of Illinois, both geographically and by business background and consumer background, so that the consumers of insurance in the State of Illinois can have confidence with regard to the decisions that are made by that Board in looking at the rates that are charged for homeowner.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Brummer..Let's give the Gentleman some attention please. Please continue."

Brummer: "I think it is important that the public have confidence with regard to the decisions that are made by the Board in those critical areas of Home Owners and Automobile Insurance so that they know that they are getting a fair dollar for the dollar premium that is paid so that they know that the rate that they are being charged are not excessive, that they are not inadequate, or that they are not unfairly discriminatory. This Bill is the work product of several years of study and work and I would urge a favorable Roll Call on it. I'm sure there will be some questions. There are several Chief hyphenated Sponsors, the second hyphenated Sponsor is Representative Marovitz,



who would also assist in answering any questions concerning this. And I would ask that he be able to close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Before we get into any further discussion on House Bill 1816, the Speaker asked me to convey to the Membership that he will have food in the Speaker's Office and it'll be there at 8:00 and everyone is welcome. The Minority Leader, George Ryan, also asked me to convey the same message that food will be available in his office at 8:00 this evening. The menu from what I understand is chicken in the Speaker's Office, and I don't know what George is having but I'm sure it's as good. Let's get back to House Bill 1816. And I want to commend the Membership, I want to commend the Membership for their attention to today's duties. Now, is there any opposition to House Bill 1816? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1816 is a very significant change in the insurance rating procedures in the State of Illinois and I would like to ask that nine other Members join me so that we could ask questions on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've got the required number. Full debate."

Schuneman: "Representative Brummer, you indicated that this Bill was the so-called file and use. Representative Brummer are you there? Oh, yes. And Mr. Speaker, could we have a little order please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. Would you kindly put Mr. Brummer's mic on? Could have a little order in the chamber please?"

Brummer: "I did not indicate that was a file and use. I indicated it was a use and file. A file and use is a more stringent type of provision."

Schuneman: "Well, these, none of these terms are precise, but..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's not badger the witness."

Schuneman: "I'm going to have to change my methods."



Brummer: "There are apparently significant differences between use and file and file and use..."

Schuneman: "...I'm apparently too forceful."

Brummer: "File and use the company has to file the rate before they can use it..."

Schuneman: "That's not my point..."

Brummer: "...and use and file system..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Brummer. Why don't you let him proceed and maybe we can answer the question..."

Schuneman: "That's really not my question..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you repeat the question please?"

Schuneman: "I'm getting to the question I think. On the Amendment to your Bill where it refers to the pre-filing of rates for certain companies, it seems to me that what your Bill does is permit the Board to decide whether or not a company shall be required to pre-file their rates. So that it seems to me that in certain instances your Bill might become a prior approval type of rating mechanism and I'm curious to know what your response is to my concern."

Brummer: "Well, there are some extreme cases and the reason we put that language in there was the Director's Rating Bill had that language in there. The Director felt, the Director of the Department of Insurance felt that it was advisable that at times under certain circumstances that pre-filing rates would be required. And so we put that in there as a result of the suggestion and the language of the Bill submitted by the Director of the Department of Insurance."

Schuneman: "OK. Now, your Bill provides for the creation of a Board, which would be charged with the responsibility of reviewing insurance rates and determining whether or not they come within the guidelines of the law. The Board is to be established, a 7-Member Board, to be appointed by the Governor, does the Bill now require that those Members be submitted for Senate approval before they're appointed?"



Brummer: "Yes that is correct."

Schuneman: "OK. The Board would consist of 7 Members, two shall be Representatives of the insurance industry, one shall be from the academic community. What does that mean?"

Brummer: "That means an individual who is involved in the academic community acquainted with insurance, such as an instructor of insurance at a university or college."

Schuneman: "Well, it doesn't say that. It just says from the academic community..."

Brummer: "Well, you asked what it meant. I told you what I thought it meant..."

Schuneman: "...Yeah, it could be a member of the school Board, I suppose. It says he has to be knowledgeable in the field of insurance. How knowledgeable does he have to be? Any particular knowledge required?"

Brummer: "I would leave that in the good discretion of the Governor with the advise and consent of the Senate."

Schuneman: "But the Bill then also provides that 4 of those Members may not be affiliated in any way with the insurance industry and shall be appointed from various parts of the State. One other thing I noticed that it says that the Member, one of the four shall be a business man. Is that..."

Brummer: "....."

Schuneman: "Not necessarily, does that mean that he needs to be a man particularly, or could it ...it says businessman."

Brummer: Well, you know, we would submit that to the ..Representative Terzich's Committee and or commission, they may come up with a Bill to call it a business person, or something like that."

Schuneman: "OK. Just one other question. I should have requested a ..request should have been put in for a fiscal note before this Bill was moved to Third Reading. Did you file a fiscal note on this Bill?"

Brummer: "Yes."



Schuneman: "And was that fiscal note prepared by the Department of Insurance?"

Brummer: "Well, the fiscal note was prepared by me with an attachment that was prepared by the Department of Insurance which was the fiscal note that I think you had received as well as the other Members of the Insurance Commission, the Insurance Committee, regarding the fiscal impact of the various Bills."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker can I speak to the Bill please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've got four minutes."

Schuneman: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the principle problem with this Bill is not that it creates a rating law for the State of Illinois, I have no particular objection to that, in fact I offered what I thought was a much better rating law as an Amendment to this Bill, the problem with the Bill is that it creates a Board that to a great extent will have no knowledge of the problem that they are supposed to be solving. The Director of Insurance is not even a Member of this Board. The person that is charged with the responsibility for looking at the consumer interest in the State of Illinois is not even a voting Member of the Board that would be established by this particular Bill. The Department of Insurance has Commission studies in the last few years to determine whether or not insurance rates for automobile insurance and home owners in particular, are competitive in the State of Illinois. And those studies have consistently shown that Illinois is indeed very fortunate under our present rating system in that we have very competitive rates. And I would quote from the Department's statement in which they said that while it may provide little solace to Illinois consumers who believe their insurance premiums are too costly, this study shows that on balance the auto insurance rates being charged in Illinois are not out of line with rates charged by these same companies



in other States. In fact, in several rate evaluations the Illinois rates compare favorably with rates being charged in non-Illinois localities. Many of you have received mail on this Bill and I think you'll find that the people back home, who are engaged in providing service to your consumer in the area of insurance are universally opposed to this Bill. And you also would find upon checking with the Department of Insurance that the Department is opposed to this Bill. Now, contrary to what ever fiscal note the Representative may have filed, the Department indicated in testimony that the fiscal impact of this Bill would be somewhere between 2 and 3 million dollars. Now I submit to you that we may not only be screwing up the insurance ratings for our consumers back home, but that we're also going to be spending a lot more of State money that we need to. And I would urge a 'no' vote on what I consider to be a bad Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

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

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

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer to close."

Brummer: "Yes, I would like Representative Marovitz to close please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Brummer: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: " I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I would just reiterate what Representative Brummer has said about this legislation. This legislation is the product of well over a year of work by groups across the State of Illinois who are somewhat disenchanted with the fact that Illinois is the only State without a regulated insurance industry. There is evidence that a tougher system



of regulation, or any system of regulation, would generally reduce all insurance rates. While Home Owners Insurance in other States with tougher systems of regulation have a 60% ratio, Illinois only has a 50% ratio. Much of the mail that you have received have been on other Bills that have been Amended. A Bill which you will hear subsequently, which had a prior approval system, file and use system, this Bill does not have either of those. It has the use and file system. Very few people even object to the forearm of rate regulation that it is this legislation. Consumers are uniformly in favor of this legislation and the industry letters that you've received have been as a result of Bills prior to the Amendatory process, either in Committee, or on the floor of this House. This Bill would allow the rates to be reviewed. It would not set rates. Nothing in this Bill sets rates. But it would allow review of rates on the basis of excessive, discriminatory, or inadequate to the company charging those rates. I must say that in suburbs around this State, for the very same policy, some consumers, some citizens are charged \$250, while others are charged \$150 for the very same policy. Rates on an average are higher in Illinois than in other Northern industrial States with forms of regulation, states such as Pennsylvania, and Michigan. If you are interested in the citizens of the State of Illinois and in bringing the insurance industry into some form of regulation and by no means is this a tough regulatory Bill. It doesn't set rates at all. If you want some form..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Marovitz: "...for the State of Illinois, so that we're not the only State without a regulated insurance industry. I would seriously solicit your 'aye' vote on this excellent compromise piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 1816 pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The



Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan to explain his vote.  
Timer's on."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill and I wish to explain my vote. All of us, especially those of us from the Chicago metropolitan region, are aware of the need for regulation of insurance rates charged in this State. Whether it's your home, whether it's your car, or whatever the item may be, we all know, that in many areas of this State either insurance is not available, or if it is available, the cost is prohibitive. It's prohibitive to the extent that many of the citizens of this State do not have insurance, cannot obtain insurance, or cannot pay the cost of the premiums. This Bill is the product of a very dedicated group of Members of this House. They worked long and hard, many hours during this Session, to develop a Bill which is designed to bring some sanity back to the question of insurance rates. The Bill would create a 7-Member Board, appointed by the Governor, with the advise and consent of the Senate. There would be provision for consumer representation on the Board and the influence of the insurance industry would be severely restrictive. It would provide for open competition. It would provide a use and file system; it would provide that if the Board did find that the rates were excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory the Board would have the authority and the power to suspend those rates, roll back, or provide a rebate to the consumer. This is a good Bill. It ought to be supported."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine.  
Timer's on."

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill seems to being sold on the fact that some people worked hard to put it together. They say there's a need for insurance rating in Illinois. I draw



your attention to the Illinois Insurance Department study of May 1977, The United States Department of Justice Study of January of 1977, their Task Group on Anti-Trust Communities, the February of 1977 report of the New York Insurance Department, and the National Commission of review of Anti-Trust Laws and Procedures of just a few months ago. Report after report indicates that Illinois, without a rating law, is as competitive as all the other States with rating laws and indeed, in many cases, we are better. Indeed, quoting from a New York report that has had rating and had some bad experience with it, they say, 'The public interest would best be served by .....' " (Timer)

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

Bradley: "Thank you Sir. I rise to explain my 'no' vote. Just the opposite of what the Majority Leader said, that you're going to have fair competition, or ..he is restricting for this Bill, he's suggesting the Bill would restrict the competition of the insurance companies and we., on my opinion we want to have open competition in the insurance industry as in any other industry. Why not let competition decide what the rates will be and what we will ask our people to pay in insurance rates? Nothing is fairer than having open competition. Small insurance companies, and I have large and small, probably would like to have the rates set by the Department of Insurance to put the small companies on an equal basis with the large companies. It's very unfair to the consumer, this is an anti-consumer Bill if I've ever seen one offered on the floor of the House because it takes away competition...." (Timer)

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Timer's on."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to remind the Members that the Director of the Department of Insurance had his own rating Bill, which unfortunately was not reported out of the Insurance Committee. I'm supporting



particular Bill simply because I still have hopes that should it pass and go to the Senate side, there'd be an opportunity to incorporate some of those ideas which the Director of the Department of Insurance had in his rating Bill. This is the only one that still remains alive and it is for that reason that I am supporting it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf. Timer's on."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 1816. This Bill is not something that just developed overnight. It took a lot of hard work by a lot of people. I would certainly hope that the Regulatory Board as set-up by this Bill, would have one of the effects of reviewing excessive rate filings by insurance companies for the sole purpose in many cases of furthering their red-lining process. We have had many cases in Southern Illinois where excessive rates have been filed just for that very purpose, to get an insurance company out of a particular area and to circumvent contracts which were made primarily to guarantee a 12 month renewal for home owners throughout the territory. I think this is a good Bill. I heartily support it and I urge your support."

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

Slape: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. As a Member of the Insurance Committee I could tell you that there are several people voting for this Bill today who gave a lot so that the State of Illinois could have this rating Bill. It's very important for the General Assembly to go on record today as supporting a rating Bill that will help; it will support the consumers of the State of Illinois. And I'd like to see more green lights up there."

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



Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, as one who worked hard and contributed as much as I could to the Resolution of this issue, I must say that in the beginning, the issue of insurance confuses all. How was it possible that an insurance company could say that that was competition in areas such as areas that I represent where you can never find an office representing any of the insurance from the voluntary market? The reason for that Ladies and Gentlemen, we found to be quite simple. It's simply that the State does not provide any supervision for one of the largest monopolies in this country. And it's for this very reason that the Congress of the United States is debating right now whether or not to repeal the McHerrin-Ferguson Act, which in event, if we do not pass this measure...." (Timer)

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis. Timer's on."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Rating laws destroy open competition. There's no question of that. And there are some areas in the State where the market precludes low rates because of the risk involved. Now, if all of you want to go back home, you down-staters are voting for this particularly, you want to go back home and tell your consumers because of a rating law that you passed that their insurance rates are going to go higher to pay for the lower rates of those areas in high risk places in the State, then you go right ahead and do it because of this is not an anti-consumer Bill, there never has been one. And this probable rates as the worst Bill of the Session."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in other States would...some form of regulation, they pay out 10% more than does Illinois. In Pennsylvania in addition, one out of every six applications for rate increases in 1978 were turned down. In Illinois, insurance



companies get every rate increase they want because there's no one to tell them no. Now, if you want to go back to your constituents, if you want to go back to your constituents and tell them you did something about the high insurance rates in Illinois you should be voting green on this Bill. If you don't care about insurance rates in Illinois, if you don't care at all about your constituents and what they pay for insurance, then vote 'no' or present."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Brummer: "Yes, it's amazing all the .. some of the comments that are made here. Number one, there was a statement made that there was no need for rating in the State of Illinois. The Director of the Department of Insurance appointed under Governor Thompson submitted a rating Bill and said there was a need for rating in the State of Illinois. The comment was made that this is anti-consumer. If it's anti-consumer I'd like to know why many of the insurance lobbyists have been working hard to kill this Bill. Because they know that it is for the consumer; that it will help protect the consumer, and they do not want anyone looking over their shoulder to see if rates are excessive, if the rates are inadequate, or if the rates are unfairly discriminatory. One final comment, one additional comment, the comment was made about destroying open competition. In my introductory remarks I stated very emphatically this is an open competition system of rating, no one who is on the Insurance Committee has denied that. They know. Everyone who has looked at this, that this is an open competition system of rating. It is the best system..." (Timer)

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

Friedrich: "It finally boils down to this, that you're not as apt to have an accident in Wayne County as you are in Cook



County. Now, if you really think it ought to be even then you ought to make life insurance available, the same price for a 75 year-old that you do at a 15 year-old because then we'd all have the same rates. You have different risks, and you're entitled to different prices for it. It's as simple as that."

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

Leon: "I thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is very seldom that I do get up and say a word. However, this Bill brings me to tell you that I had House, Home Owners Insurance on the building I live in, it came time for renewal, the company that had it was one of our great companies in Illinois. They declined to renew. I was able to get the same policy through another company for \$250 a year more. That is one incident. I had my car insured with one of the greatest companies in the United States for 25 years. It came up for renewal; there was no accident and no loss, they refused to write without giving me an explanation. I believe this Bill will overcome those deficiencies that the insurance companies are putting upon us who work for a living and who honestly want to insure our cars to protect everyone, including ourselves. I would appreciate seeing 5 or 6 more green lights on that Board. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just a couple of brief points, this certainly is consumer legislation. A newspaper that formerly called itself 'the World's Greatest Newspaper' ran a series about a year ago in which they pointed out emphatically that insurance rates are higher in Illinois than they are in our surrounding States for comparable coverage in comparable communities. I'd like to point out that if this Bill passes there still is certainly the possibility and the probability



that insurance rates will differ in geographically different areas in the State of Illinois. So that those of you that have favorable insurance rates can expect that to continue, but you can expect it to continue in an area of open competition. That is healthy; that is in the best interest of everyone in the State of Illinois, and if we could just get a few more green votes up here, we can pass this Bill."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, there are 3 essentials for life in these United States today. And it's water, food, and insurance. You can't travel without it. You can't buy a home without it. You can't build without it. You can't even have , you can't even bring industry into the area without it. There's nothing that you can do without insurance. The insurance companies have a monopoly, a lock on the people of the State of Illinois, and for those of you who say you represent the people and allow the insurance companies to do what they do to to them, on their homes, on their autos, and to all of the industries that we have in the State, it's the insurance companies. Have you ever seen a poor insurance company? Have you ever seen an insurance company go out of business? Have you ever seen one file for bankruptcy? They own the wealth of this country. And they control the country...." (Timer)

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer requests a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. If this reaches the necessary 89 I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's fine. Poll the absentees please."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Capuzi. Oblinger. Schisler. & Stearney."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? Mr. Brummer, the absentees have been polled. And the count is 88 votes. Pardon me? Mr. Brummer? What? The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mrs. Breslin?"

Breslin: " Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen , the major problem that I have with this Bill is the fact that it creates a new Commission. I think that we should have the Department of Insurance, with the Director regulating this procedure and in the hopes that the Commission, part of the Bill will be eliminated and the Bill will be Amended over in the Senate. I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Did I hear you correctly? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Does that make 89 Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll check with the Clerk. Yes, it does Sir."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the House has a lot of work to do and we're all tired and we want to go home, and I hesitate to verify the Roll Call, but I know there are votes up there for people. For example, Representative Laurino and Representative Hanahan, who I know are not here. I don't believe they have been here all day and there are others. And I think...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. Excuse me. What purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "I don't if it's possible to save the time of the House by putting a Bill on Postponed Consideration with 89 votes, but I think we are missing 1 or 2 Members. I'll go through a verification. OK. Let's go. They're here."

Speaker Lechowicz: Mr. Schuneman? Do you persist in verification?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has to call first as far as



the Affirmative Vote. I don't believe we've done that. Proceed to poll..., proceed to verify the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow..."

Speaker Lechowicz: Mr. Brummer? Brummer? "

Brummer: "We'll put it on Postponed Consideration please?"

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

Schuneman: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor is thinking of Postponed Consideration, the Board does show, or your record, I guess, does show 89 votes. Would it be proper for us knock a couple of names off and then have him put it on Postponed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No."

Schuneman: "No? No problem?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's right. It's up to the Sponsor whether it's put on Postponed Consideration or not. Mr. Brummer, may I strongly recommend that you put it on Postponed Consideration? "

Brummer: I will accept your advise, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed Consideration on 1816. Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1694."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1694. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1694 is a product of the Rape Study Commission and has been recommended by many state's attorneys around the state as well as judges. And basically the aim of House Bill 1694 is to get more convictions for the crime of rape. And what House Bill 1694 does is it now creates two classes of rape. Rape is probably the only crime that we have that does not have two classifications. One would be aggravated rape and aggravated rape would be a Class X felony. And that would be committed when the offender was armed with a dangerous weapon or when great bodily harm was inflicted upon the female or in...in the commission of another felony or where the...where the offender wore a hood, robe or mask to conceal his identity or where the offender..after the dwelling or temporary place of lodging by deception or force or where the rape victim was under fourteen years of age. Rape would be a Class II felony..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Would the electrician kindly turn up the power? Please proceed, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I think I just gave you the...where there would be aggravated rape, and aggravated rape would be a Class X felony. Rape would be a Class II felony... this is under the joint sponsorship of Representative Peters, Barnes, Gaines, Chapman and myself. And as I say, it's been advocated by many of the state's attorneys and judges of this state and would produce more convictions for the crime of rape. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1694."

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



The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Jaffe can try to first, mumble his way through the Bill and secondly, to try to make some distinctions. But the fact of the matter is, what this Bill does is to lower the penalty for rape. Rape, according to at least historical precedent and a trend of thought in Illinois today, is a serious crime. All he is doing by this Bill is that he is taking aggravated rape and keeping it at Class X and making a new category of rape and lowering the penalty for it. If you want to go on record, you can call it whatever you want, but if you want to go on record as lowering the penalty for rape, vote for this Bill. But if you think that rape is a serious crime, ought to be a Class X felony, vote against the Bill. And further than that, he says it's going to increase convictions. That's ridiculous. The jury not only doesn't know...that isn't permitted under Illinois law to know what the penalty is. So you're talking about convictions, you have twelve people who simply decide whether somebody is guilty or not. The court imposes the penalty. And to try to purvey this as being something that is going to cause more convictions by lowering the penalty for a serious crime is ridiculous. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. And to try to have anybody purvey this as being something that's going to increase convictions is the most mottled reasoning I've ever heard. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would tell you that the Gentleman from Champaign is a little bit loud and little bit vociferous. It's too bad that he doesn't have the facts on his side. I might



tell you that the Chicago Crime Commission endorses this Bill and most state's attorneys and justices throughout this entire state. Judges have told our Committees repeatedly, that they can not get convictions for the crime of rape because the sentence was just too high and they were hesitant in some instances to give a Class X felony for certain crimes of rape. Therefore, they urge that we divide it into two classifications as you have with burglary and armed robbery and so on and so forth...and have aggravated rape and rape and you have aggravating raping a Class X felony. It is a Class X felony, raping a Class II felony. I think that you would find that this is a good progressive Bill, endorsed by most of the judges, most of the state's attorneys in this state, the Gov...with the Chicago Crime Commission and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1694 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Cullerton: "Mr. Jaffe, was Representative Stearney's Amendment adopted in this Bill as promised in Committee?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe, please."

Jaffe: "Yes, Representative Stearney's Amendment was adopted in Committee. And I know Representative Stearney is not here at the present time but he indicated that he would vote for the Bill and he endorsed the Bill."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think you all know my posture on law enforcement and



law and order Bills. I support this Bill. This Bill is almost identical to House Bill 1185 which passed this House overwhelmingly in the last Session and passed the Senate overwhelmingly, was vetoed by the Governor through a misunderstanding. The veto was overridden in the Fall Session of 1977 by this House and failed by one vote of being overridden in the Senate. It's the same Bill. Representative Jaffe is absolutely right, it is supported by the state's attorneys around the state, by the jurists and by the Chicago Crime Commission. We do hope it will produce more convictions for the heinous crime around. And I urge you to change your vote to 'aye' and support this very good Bill."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I'm sure everyone here recognizes that when you say, 'What should we do with a rapist?', the initial answer is, lock him up and throw away the key. However, what happens is that there are many different situations in which rape is committed. And I will never forget the testimony of Judge Marvin Aspin before the Judiciary II Committee when he pleaded with us to have categories for penalties for rape. He said in his courtroom he has had cases where a man takes a woman and tortures her sexually for forty-eight hours and makes her a psychological disaster for the rest of her life, and that's rape. However, at the other end of the spectrum, there's a case where a young woman breaks off her engagement to a young man. They go out to dinner, they have a bottle of wine, they go back to her apartment and he forces her to have sexual intercourse. If that young man has no previous criminal record, he's thirty



years old, he's the sole support for his sixty-five year old mother and he has two children from a previous marriage. Do you think that any judge or any jury is going to convict him of rape? Even though he was guilty of rape. Now, the answer, when we were adopting Class X to that kind of question, 'What do we do with that young man?', was we don't bring the charge of rape. Well I'm sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen, but that young man is just as guilty of rape under the current statute as the first person, who we might even think was a pervert because of what he did to the young woman. What we are saying here..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Lady kindly bring her remarks to a close."

Catania: "...is that you can convict a rape when it is rape. But no judge, no jury, would convict of rape, even though it was in that second case, unless we pass this Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 34 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2273."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2273. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Abortion Law of 1975. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Yes Sir, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, believe it or not, this is a noncontroversial Bill and it's supported by the pro-life people. Basically what happened when we passed the Illinois Abortion Law of 1975 was, because of the language changes that we had, we made it impossible for the University of Illinois to proceed with their research that they were



doing with regard to miscarriages. Because that particular Act said that we could not use any fetal tissues for any experimental purposes at all. So, basically, what 2273 says...and I'll read it here. It's a very short Bill, about ten lines in its entire thing. It says, 'Nothing in the Act shall prohibit the use of any tissues or cell obtained from a dead fetus or a dead premature infant whose death did not result from an induced abortion, for therapeutic purpose or for scientific research or laboratory experimentation, provided that the written consent for such use is obtained by one of the parents of such fetus or infant.' I might say that that was Representative Pullen's Amendment. We agreed to it. Also Representative Catania had some input in it. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on 2273."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly. Kelly, please."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to concur with the Sponsor. We did sit down and adopt some...several Amendments that has made the Bill acceptable. It does concern a live fetus, or I should say a dying fetus, as it had initially had...was prepared. It's now in what I consider acceptable condition for those favor...to pro-life."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 2273 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish?"

Aaron, will you kindly shut off Mr. Schneider's speak switch? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes', 0 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2165."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2165, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2165 has been completely changed from the Digest. All rating portions and rate regulation portions of the Bill have been removed. They were placed in a previous Bill that you heard, 1816. So there is nothing whatsoever in House Bill 2165 that has to do with rates or rate regulation whatsoever. It applies to Cook County only, has been endorsed by the Chicago Sun-Times. It's a neighborhood re-vitalization and stabilization Bill. What happens is in many communities in Cook County, entire communities are funneled to the Fair Plan where the coverage is often times more expensive and less comprehensive. House Bill 2165 in its present form as Amended by this House, which set-up minimum standards of insurability so that good pieces of property could not automatically be channeled to the Fair Plan where they would have to pay more for less comprehensive insurance. And if you want to re-vitalize your neighborhoods, stabilize your neighborhoods, this is something that is extremely important to many neighborhoods in Cook County. It would also provide that individuals would have access to the information in their files and that if any information was incorrect in their file, they would have an opportunity to correct it and have that correction placed in their files."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Just a question Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor, I know you're not supposed to do it, but I'll be very quick. Representative Marovitz, if this Bill should get out of this House and go to the Senate, and be Amended in the Senate to proceed with



any kind of Rating Differential Law in the State of Illinois, what would be your posture on the Bill when it returned for concurrence?"

Marovitz: "I am only concerned about getting this portion of the Bill regarding the Fair Plan and minimum standards of insurability to the Governor's desk because that's what's concerned with my community, and that's all I'm concerned with in this Bill."

Davis: "Does that mean Sir, you would not concur in the Amendment or would table the Bill...."

Marovitz: "... I would not encourage any Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman... Question is shall House Bill 2165 pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Let's go. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. In quoting from the 1977 Illinois Department of Insurance Report, I quote, 'The subjective evaluation of neighborhoods by inspection companies or agents as changing or deteriorating, frequently results in a blanket refusal to right insurance in those neighborhoods. No company or agent who was interviewed was able to provide an objective standard used to determine that a neighborhood was deteriorating.' This Bill is geared toward those deteriorating neighborhoods that want to revitalize or stabilize themselves. That's all this Bill deals with. We're not rating; we're not regulating it whatsoever. We want to help improve neighborhoods and revitalize them and stabilize them. And we're going along with the Illinois Department of Insurance Report of 1977 and the Midwest Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report. I would hope ..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I



rise to explain my 'aye' vote. This Bill should be supported because it is a simple Bill. It is not complicated, it is not regressive. It simply provides that the consumer will have access to files and that there will be appeal procedures provided in the event of a cancellation or a refusal to renew. I certainly think that these are basic modicum of fairness that ought to be provided to the consumer. I see no reason why the Bill should not pass. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

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

Brummer: "Yes, I would just like to affirm what was said. You know, this Bill may have a problem of having a number that initially many of you heard about. I would like to remind you that Amendment #3 by Sam Wolf, Mike Slape, and myself was adopted which deleted all the rating material in this Bill and it left the material so that the public, the insured, could obtain access to his files to determine what information was received on that individual and to have an opportunity to correct with the company erroneous information that is contained in the file. I think this is a fair item and I think that ought to be allowed. And the other thing deals with the Fair Plan as it affects the city of Chicago in Cook County regarding minimum criteria for standards of insurability. This is also fair and equitable and this Bill ought to be supported."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm voting against this Bill because I think it does some things that we should not be mandating as far as government is concerned. First of all, it requires the Director of Insurance to develop the objective criteria for minimum insurable standards. Then it tells the Director how to do that. And it says that in developing these minimum criteria, he



cannot include the age of the property. You can't consider the age of the property if you're going to consider an insurable risk and you cannot consider the location of the property. Now, I submit to you that age might very well be a reasonable way to classify for insurance. Sometimes age is a measure of a hazard. For example, in older buildings, the heating plants are old, the wiring is old, the plumbing is old, the roof coverings may be old. I submit to you that on..." (Timer)

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill and I think it's just a fair Bill for consumers. Those of you who are looking at some of the earlier information that you got about 2165 this Bill has been changed by the Amendments that have been put on it. No longer is it a rating Bill. It's come out of hearings that we had in our area in Lakeview and other areas in Chicago with the Department of Insurance was participating in. It is for consumers, it's a fair Bill. It no longer has those, the rating things in. And I ask your support."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I draw your attention to the language in the Bill, it says the State Insurance Commission shall be forbidden to use geographical location as a basis of classification of risks. I contend that that is the same as House Bill 1030 that would make one unit rating area across the county of Cook, which would have the suburban Cook County residents subsidising the higher risk areas in the State. I think 1030 is a Bill that many of you are aware of, but this Bill would do the same thing. I bring it to your attention in so far as what that would do to your rates.



I suggest in Representative Boucek's District Home Owners Insurance would go up 24% , in Representative Chapman's District, 24% , in Jaffe's District, 24% . This is a bad idea and it's being snuck in under the guise of a decent, fair, insurance Bill. There's a whole lot more to it than that."

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

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those of you who live in some of the areas of the city of Chicago as I do know as a matter of fact that red-lining is supposed to be illegal by zip code. And what the insurance company, some of them have done as a way to evade that is they just say we just don't write on older buildings period. And that will affect you the same way when they can eliminate certain geographical areas because the houses happen to be old. I will submit to you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Oxford University is over 500 years old, it doesn't make it a bad piece of property. What we would like to see is the insurance companies at least come out and take a look at the piece of property in question, if it has bad house keeping, if there are other things wrong with the home, we can't expect them to write insurance. But just because it happens to be 60 years of age or older, that doesn't give them a good excuse to write off one certain Section of the State. And I would urge a few more green lights."

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

Jones: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the previous speakers mentioned the fact that age should not be a criteria. But, age of a house does not necessarily mean that that particular home is bad. You have many old homes in the city of Chicago that have been well kept and the furniture, in it that may be new. So what this Bill really does is saying the insurance company can not use age as a



criteria for not issuing the insurance to a home owner. It's a very good Bill. I think it's a consumer oriented Bill. It will affect many communitites in the city of Chicago. And we should see more green votes up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I support House Bill 2165 in its Amended form. And I would simply say to Representative Birkinbine that some of the that information he was referring to has been eliminated by the Amendment. I would also like to ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...it's my fault Sam, go on. Mr. Wolf, please. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "I would also like to mention to Representative Davis that if this Bill gets to the Senate and if any kind of Amendment is put on in the Senate, which would bring back the information and the provisions which have been eliminated by my Amendment, I will oppose this Bill just as actively as you will, Sir."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm opposing this Bill for the simple reason that this morning we passed the Katz Bills out here and sunset Bills doing away with Commission and Boards. In the last hour and hour and half, all the Bills that we're presenting here this afternoon are starting and creating new Commissions and new Boards. I can't understand what this House is doing today. The most important thing is there isn't anything in this Bill that says what the salaries of the Members of the Board Members will be. And I still, while I'm on my feet, if this receives the 89 votes I'm going to verify the Roll Call."

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

Schuneman: "Well, I've already spoken Mr. Speaker. I was simply going to ask as Representative Conti did, that if this receives the necessary votes, we'd like to verify."



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

Brummer: "Yes, there is no Board left in this Bill. Amendment #3 eliminated the Board completely, as has been said here 3 or 4 times. There have been more red herrings thrown up on these items of insurance legislation than I can imagine. There is no Board in there and I wish the speakers would speak with accuracy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me.... Does everybody hear that Mr. Brummer? It's still a good Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if what Representative Birkinbine says is true, that geography may not be considered as a rating factor, then this Bill is better for suburban Cook County than House Bill 1030. But it's substantially worse for down-state because that means that down-state has to be included with Chicago and with suburban Cook County in rating Home Owners and other personal lines of insurance. This is truly a bad Bill for down-staters. It's a lot better than 1030 for suburban Cook County people but it's really bad for down-state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 'ayes', 76 'nos' and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Please poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asked to poll the absentees."

Marovitz: "I pushed... Alright, just poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, mu light was on. I wanted to explain my vote while we're waiting for the Roll Call to come out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're ready for you."

Satterthwaite: "I would like to say that at least two speakers



on the other side of the aisle have gone back to the original Bill, have not looked at the Amendment. Anything having to do with the Board or with the city of Chicago rating system is no longer a part of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Capuzi. Oblinger. Peters. Richmond. Stearney. & Vitek."

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

Katz: "To record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Katz as 'aye'. What's the count Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 88 'aye' and 76 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Stuffle seeks recognition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Stuffle as 'aye'. They are not here."

Marovitz: Is that 89 Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the count, it is. They're going to verify. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Huff: "Well, clearly Mr. Speaker, in light of this 89 strong votes, any verification would be dilatory."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to mention any names here or anything else, but I've got 4 people that are voting up there and if they don't want to take this off of Postponed Consideration, I'm going to be here until tomorrow morning and I'll be here until Sunday. We'll verify the Roll Call, that's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz."

Conti: "There are 4 names up there I still see on the Board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Better put it on Postponed Consideration, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Alright, Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2165 is on Postponed Consideration."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2440."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2440. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts and to remove obstructions in the Des Plaines...in Illinois River."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the most important Bill of the Session, this deals with the sanitary districts...and it doesn't include any insurance ratings. What this Bill does, it simply exempts laborers from taking a written examination for the position. This is similar to Bills that were passed excluding CETA employees from taking written examinations. It came out 11 to 0 out of Committee and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2440 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Glen. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 16 'noes', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1030."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, HB 1030, which has been referred to in prior debate, can be called the Cook County anti-red-lining Bill, insurance anti-red-lining Bill. What it does within Cook County it prohibits discriminatory underwriting of auto and fire insurance based on geographical location. Again it applies to auto and fire coverage, it affects only Cook County, contrary to some rumours that are going around, and it simply prohibits companies from classifying risks by geographical location. I'm sure all of you are aware that red-lining is the process whereby lines are drawn around certain geographical areas and either coverage is not given or is pulled away from that area or where for the single coverage you pay a premium. At the present time the statutes already prohibit companies from basing automobile bodily liability rates on geographic districts within the city of Chicago. There's an Amendment on the Bill, presently any person who has filed a complaint with the Director of insurance who alleges that they've been cancelled, nonrenewed, or refused to have been issued a fire or extended coverage policy is entitled to access to the companies files on his application or policy. This Amendment extends the privilege to persons who alleged that their fire and extended coverage insurance rates have been based on the geographical location of the covered risk within Cook County. The Amendment also allows those who have access to the company files to correct any information, erroneous information the file may contain. The statutes presently allow the Director of insurance to request from automobile and fire and extended coverage insurers annually by zip code area the number of policies that they've applied



for, including renewals, the numbers issued and the numbers cancelled. This Amendment allows the Director to request by zip code area and census tract the number of policies applied for, the number issued, the number renewed, the number denied, the number of nonrenewed, and the number cancelled. The Director may also request by zip code area and census tract a company's earned premiums and loss expense disposal and amount paid out for claims. Submission of all of the above information is mandatory for Cook County on at least a semi-annual basis. The Illinois Department of Insurance currently collects cancellations, nonrenewals, and new policy information by zip code area for residential property insurance. This information is required to be submitted on a quarterly basis. The Amendment also allows the Director to require companies that are found to be discriminating against any insured in Cook County on the basis of geographic location to take affirmative marketing action in the previously red-lined area. This Bill has received bi-partisan support. Representative Epton, the Minority Leader, on the Insurance Committee is a Co-Sponsor. The reason that I introduce this Bill is that in my district insurance companies are presently red-lining by use of zip codes. These are postal zip codes; the zip codes were set-up to deliver mail. They have absolutely no rationale for setting insurance rates..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close...."

Keane: "The present red-lining by insurance companies is completely arbitrary as was mentioned by an earlier speaker, addressing an earlier Bill. They can do whatever they want. They can go into any community that they want with red-lined areas in it. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Schuneman "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor, who is a



new Member of our House and a valuable Member here. I happen to think that this Bill is not in the best interest of a number of groups of people in Illinois. First of all it's not in the best interest of citizens of Cook County who live outside the city of Chicago. Because what this Bill says is that insurance companies can no longer use geographic territories as a basis for rating automobile insurance. Now, I submit to you that there are places in the State of Illinois where we have higher volumes of traffic, we have higher accident statistics, than we do in other parts of the State. For example, I would hate to have to pay the same insurance rates out in Whiteside County as people living in Cook County have to pay. If I lived in Cook County, outside of the city of Chicago, I wouldn't want to pay the rates that are required to pay the freight in the city of Chicago. But this Bill says that no insurance company can distinguish in rating, automobile insurance, between the city of Chicago and the rest of the County of Cook. So in effect, what we're doing is passing a subsidy for the city of Chicago at the expense of the people who live in the rest of Cook County. Now, that doesn't affect me and my constituents, except to this extent, that if it's good for the people of Cook County then I suspect that they may decide that it's good for the entire State of Illinois, and the next step is going to be to include the entire State as a rate making territory and I think that this is a fundamental principle that is wrong. And I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane to close."

Keane: "Very briefly, I think that the Kempner Insurance Company



lobbiest David Brown, handed out a memo to the Members of the House of Representatives opposing my Bill. If you read on page two, he quotes from the Actuarial Subcommittee on a Task Force stating that there is a rate, the rate of the metropolitan resident. And if you read that, I don't want to go through it all, if you read that, basically what he's talking about is having a metropolitan rate. That's what my Bill does. Thank you." I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall HB 1030 pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this becomes a very amusing situation to me. If anyone in the State is subsidising the other members of the State it's got to be Chicago. For example, we have 85% of the traffic in the State of Illinois on the Dan Ryan. And did you know that 85% of the accidents that happen on the Dan Ryan are assigned to the zip codes along that way? That's why we are prohibiting the use of geographical zip codes for setting rates in Chicago. If on the shore can not get insured by the preferred companies he's forced to go into the substandard and have to pay 250% more than anybody has to pay in Peoria or other down-state areas. This only affects Chicago and we need this Bill. Give us somemore green votes."

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

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, explaining my 'aye' vote, the point of insurance I thought was to share the risk. I think what this Bill does is to say that the risk shall be shared geographically, which is the way insurance risks generally are. All other kinds of factors can still be taken into account, accident records, the presence of a garage on the property, those kinds of issues



are not affected by this Bill. What this Bill says to the insurance companies is stop using zip codes to decide insurance rates, make insurance work the way it ought, spread the risk, share the risk, across the metropolitan area.

I urge your support."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Currie was right to a certain degree in that insurance does share the risk, but I contend that you must stop somewhere. Cook County is the third largest county in the entire country. You have to stop the geographical area somewhere. For those who think that this only affects Cook County and you're getting off scott-free, the next logical extension of this is to make it state-wide. So you are going to be sharing the higher rates of Cook County if this indeed passes because all of Cook County, including suburban Cook County, is then going to come after you. For those of you who think, for those of you who love to hate the insurance industry and think this is somehow getting them, I contend that this makes it easier for them to do business. The people who it's going to hurt are those people who are going to have to share the high-risk expenses even though they live in a low-risk area. This is not a consumer Bill. If anything, it makes it easier for the insurance companies because they'll then have just...."

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

Jones: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very good Bill because the Bill eliminates the use of zip codes for setting insurance rates. And zip codes were , are used for the purpose of delivery of mail, post office mail. And if we compare cost, then the cost of delivering the mail down-state would cost twice as much than it would be to deliver mail to the city of Chicago



or Cook County because the area is spread out more. And zip codes go right down to the heart of a community. If you happen to live on one side of the West then you pay one rate, you live on the other side you pay a higher rate. This is ridiculous to use zip codes. It is not a natural boundry, it cuts down the heart of communities and we should see more green lights up because this is a very very good consumer Bill."

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

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we need some help here on Chicago. This is strictly a Chicago problem. Many of you get support from us when you have your various projects. This is the time we need your vote. Those of you that are not in the tank with the insurance company I'd appreciate you voting 'yes'."

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

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I opposed the other two insurance Bills but with this Bill it's not a down-state problem, it's not a Bill that is anti-consumer as I thought that the other two Bills were, and I am going to change my vote and vote for the Bill because the people in that particular area that this Bill addresses seems to have had a particular problem that can be resolved if we vote 'aye' on this Bill and so I switch my vote to an 'aye' vote and I urge other Members...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

Bradley: "... to do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "...5 names are on that Board, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Get those 5 names off the Board."



Conti: "OK."

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

Walsh: "To explain my vote Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed..."

Walsh: "... in response to the last Gentleman very briefly, let me tell you this, Jerry, that if this Bill passes and becomes law, there are 89 of us in Cook County and Emil Jones and I are going to be together in getting the whole State rated together. If you feel this way about suburban Cook County people, you want us rated with Chicago, then we'll want all of Cook County rated with you down-state. Think about it. I was here when they put all of Chicago in one rating area. And I realized then that this was not far off. Well, if it happens, and it won't be very long, the entire State will be one rating area. And you'll all have your insurance premiums go up."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the autos that use the highways on the city of Chicago are not owned always by the people of the city. They're owned by people from throughout the State, people passing through the State. The accidents happen and we have to pay the charge for it. That's one of the problems that we face. But we share our gas tax with everybody here. We don't tell you that the gas tax is collected in Chicago and let's keep it there, we don't ask the same thing about the race track revenue, and when it rains on you in Southern Illinois, we sympathize with you, where ever it floods. We help you when your fairs fall down and you say you need some more help, we respond. No matter what you need, we give. The city of Chicago has built the entire State. We have provided the revenues for every good thing that you have anywhere throughout...."

Speaker Lechowicz: Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentle-



man from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Yes, well, I'd like to poll the absentees and I'd like to find who's voting Representative Epton's button. Representative Epton is one of the Co-Sponsors of this Bill. And also... "

Speaker Lechowicz: "The report says the Gentleman isn't here at the present time Sir."

Keane: "That's true. So who pushed his green and then who pushed his present button? I want to explain my vote. It's unfortunate that the Board has been closed. At the University of Illinois two years ago started to use the same funds, the same premium funds that they were paying to commercial insurers and the self-insured. In two years they have amassed reserves of a million and a half dollars. I contend that what's happening in the red-lined areas in the city of Chicago, and in the red-lined areas of suburban Cook County, is an insurance rip-off. There is not necessarily going to be any increase rates because I think the fear of the insurance companies is that this Bill would have collected the premiums, it would have shown reflected the premiums that are collected by insurance companies and what is paid out and it would have become a real scandal as to how much of the insurance companies are over charging in Cook County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Capuzi. Jaffe. Kent. Oblinger. Simms. Stearney. C.M. Stiehl."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The absentees have been polled. Is there anyone want to change their vote to be added or deleted? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asked to have HB 1030 be on Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration."



1979  
Horsdal  
HB 2492

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2492."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2492. A Bill for an Act relating to the salaries of certain state state's attorneys. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2994 (sic) amends the Fees and Salaries Act's Section on state's attorneys salaries and provides for salary increases over a four year period. The first increase would be in December of 1980. The...it creates two classifications by county population of state's attorneys under this Act and counties less than thirty thousand and counties of thirty thousand or more and less than a million. The Governor's office is opposed to this legislation. So, therefore, the figures that we had in the increase are going to be amended downward in the Senate. And I have also agreed with Representative Telcser to place on an Amendment for him that would include the Cook County state's attorney. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call and I would answer any questions anyone might have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2492 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "What kind of an agreement have you made with Representative Telcser...respect to the Cook County state's attorney? Before we vote for this I want to know what it is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "I would say to the distinguished Gentleman, I explained what it was, but obviously he didn't hear me. That it would include the...amend in the Cook County state's attorney which the original Bill did



not have."

Johnson: "Oh, you mean just cover the Cook County into the same provisions as the rest of them."

Schisler: "That's right."

Johnson: "Oh, okay."

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

Borchers: "As usual, I just say, keep on adding to the cost of the people. They will all appreciate all of it just like they did you pay raise. Just remember that one of these days there's a day of accounting and I, for one, am looking forward to that day I can vote against the people that are doing these kinds of things."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 39 'nays'. The Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees. You know you guys are making a...kindly record Mr. Hanahan as 'present', please. One moment. We're going to poll the absentees here in a minute. And the Gentleman from Cook wants to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Huskey from 'no' to 'aye', is that correct, Sir? All right. Mr. Schuneman... Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Could I be recorded as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schuneman as 'no'. Mr. Ebbesen as 'no'. Mr. Johnson as 'no'. Kindly ...poll the absentees, please."

Clerk Leone: "Balanoff. Bluthardt. Brady...Bradley. Braun. Capuzi. Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Bradley as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Davis. Donovan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mrs. Catania



as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Epton. Gaines. Harris. Hoffman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Huff. Kane. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kosinski as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Kozubowski. Laurino. Leverenz. Oblinger.

Richmond. Schoeberlein. Stearney. C.M. Stiehl.

Stuffle. Totten. Van Duyne. Walsh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Walsh as 'no'. The Lady from  
St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stihel: "Vote me 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Stiehl as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Wikoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook,  
Mr. Kozubowski, for what purpose do you seek  
recognition? Kozubowski, please."

Kozubowski: "Record me 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Kozubowski as 'aye'.  
Mr. Schlickman."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're recorded as 'present'."

Schlickman: "Change that to 'aye' will you, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schlickman as 'aye'.  
Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "An 'aye'."

Campbell: "Change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to  
'no'. Mr. Davis. One moment, please. Mr. Davis.  
Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman...Mr. Wikoff...'no'.  
Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Would you please change me from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Anderson as 'no'.  
One at a time it's...Mr. Kornowicz...as 'aye'. Mr.  
Von Boeckman as 'no'. Mr. Pechous."



Pechous: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, please change my 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Pechous as 'aye'. Mr. Stuffle as 'no'. Mr. Donovan, 'present'. Mr. Jones, you're light is on. Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be driving through Macoupin County and everything and I know the state's attorney works very hard, so change me from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Jones as 'aye'. Mr. Winchester as 'no'. Mr. Harris as 'no'. Do we proceed. did we complete the absentees, Sir? All right. Are there any more? What's our count? On this question there are 90 'ayes' and Mr. Johnson wants a verification. Is that correct, Sir?"

Johnson: "That's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Currie: "Would you change me from 'aye' to 'no'...or to 'present' please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Lady recorded, Mrs. Currie."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to be recorded as 'present', Ma'am? Kindly record the Lady as 'present'. What's the count now, 89? Proceed to verify the affirmative vote. The Gentleman from Robbins...the Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins. What purpose do you seek recognition?"

Robbins: " 'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Is there anyone else who wants to change their vote or be recorded...on House Bill 2492? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Change me to 'no'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me. Change Mr. Bowman from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 87 'ayes', 39 'nays'...how many 'nays'? Is that right, John? Pardon me? I'm sorry. On this question there are 87 'ayes', 52 'nays'. The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler, asks leave to be this Bill on Postponed Consideration. Leave. House Bill 249....pardon me. Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't have an opportunity to explain my vote. And by God, we took time with all these other Bills this afternoon, so we'll take time while I explain my vote. The reason I introduced this legislation is because all of us over the years that I've been here, the eleven years that I've been here, have totted the fact that they are law enforcement people. Well you can have the best sheriff in the world, you can have the best state police, you can have the best city police and if you don't have a good state's attorney, then you don't have law enforcement. And if these people don't get a raise this time they will not get one until 1984. They have four-year terms. And spread out over that period of time, this amounts to only 4.6% increase. And I don't think anyone will have to hang their head in shame when they go home and explain that they are for good law enforcement. I'd encourage my colleagues to give me the extra votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. Mr. Totten as 'aye'. Mr. Jack Davis, what purpose do you seek recognition? As 'aye'? I'll tell you...Mr. Von Boeckman as 'aye'. Mrs. Braun as 'aye'. Mr. Matijevich from 'no' to 'aye'. Anyone else? What's our count now, Mr. Clerk? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "As long as we're explaining our votes..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "We're not explaining our votes. He was the Sponsor of the Bill and I didn't recognize him...close the debate and he...I gave him that opportunity and I think I've extended that opportunity to almost every Member. What's the count there? On this question there are 91 'ayes', 49 'noes'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "In following up in...in my previous request. I would want to ask for a verification of the Roll Call in light of the fact that this salary will be more than the Governor of Illinois by 1982 for the Cook County state's attorney. And if that's what you want, then...then you ought to vote 'yes'. But I want a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Schisler: "I explained to the Gentleman that this is going to be amended downward in the Senate to whatever his Governor would sign. I don't think that the man could ask for anymore than that. They have the last word on this. And I would say to the distinguished Representative that it has to come back to the House..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson, he's addressing his remarks particularly to you."

Schisler: "...for final passage."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to poll...no, verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Alexander. Anderson...no, I'm sorry, Anderson changed from 'yes' to 'no'. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bradley. Preston. Braun.



Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman.  
Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Would the Membership kindly be in their own seats. Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. Kindly proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels.  
Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Doyle. John Dunn.  
Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa.  
Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Hannig. Hoffman.  
Huskey. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keane.  
Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski.  
Kucharski. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz.  
Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich.  
McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McPike.  
Molloy. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien.  
Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Reilly.  
Ronan. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman.  
Schneider. Henry. Slape. Stanley. Steczo.  
Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Totten. Vinson.  
Vitek. Von Boeckman. Watson. White. Williams.  
Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. J.J. Wolf from 'no' to 'aye'. He wants to be recorded as...he wants to be verified. Mr. Ted Meyers to 'aye'. Okay. What's our count? What are we starting out with, Mr. Clerk? Meyers wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. McCourt as 'aye'. There's three of them, Wolf, Meyers and McCourt. And Mr. Bruce Richmond as 'aye'. Mr. Bower, what do you...what purpose does the Gentleman seek recognition?"

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, after talking to the Sponsor of this Bill, who has given me his absolute assurances that this will be amended downward in the Senate and we'll have the opportunity to bring it back to the House, I



will vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bower as 'aye'. Schoeberlein as 'aye'. This is when you need a computer. We're starting off with 98 'ayes', Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson. Does the Gentleman have any questions of the affirmative vote? Mr. Johnson, please."

Johnson: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Robbins wants to be recorded as 'aye'. I think you are recorded as 'aye'. How's the Gentleman recorded? They've been switching around here so much. Mr. Robbins. Oh, he went from 'aye' to 'no' and now he wants to go back from 'no' to 'aye'. What a Bill. Please proceed, Mr. Johnson. Now what was the question?"

Johnson: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco. He's back there."

Johnson: "Abramson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Davidson?"

Johnson: "Abramson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, Abramson. He's back there."

Johnson: "Bullock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bullock. He's back there."

Johnson: "Davis. Davis. Jack Davis."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brummer. He's there."

Johnson: "John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Johnson: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ralph Dunn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is back there."

Johnson: "Garmisa."

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

Johnson: "Jaffe."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Johnson: "Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back there."

Johnson: "McAuliffe."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record. What purpose does the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, seek recognition?"

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was in error a while ago. I wanted to be recorded as 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Richmond from 'aye' to 'no'."

Johnson: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schneider. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Ronan."



Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "Where is he."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's sitting in his chair."

Johnson: "Mulcahey."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Pechous."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pechous. Is the Gentleman in the  
Chamber? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Totten."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Totten. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Totten in the Chamber? Take him  
off the record."

Johnson: "Williams."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Rea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sam Wolf is there."

Johnson: "I just have...Oh, Giorgi. Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi is here."



Johnson: "Okay. If I can just have one second, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary list."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Johnson: "Van Duyne, is he here?"

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

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a mistake. Put Mr. Williams back on. Put Mr. Rea back on."

Johnson: "Wat...no, he's here. Preston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Johnson: "Preston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is in his chair. Mr. Piel, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Piel: "I'm very absent minded. May I...I hit the wrong button. Would you change me to 'aye', please?"

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

Johnson: "Huskey."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That was Mr. Piel."

Johnson: "Huskey."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leinenweber is right here."

Johnson: "Keane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Keane is back there."

Johnson: "Doug Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Johnson: "Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, Kane. Mr. Kane. How is the



Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Johnson: "That's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? How many 'noes'?  
On this question there are 90 'ayes'...what's the  
count, Jack? And 51 'noes', 90 'ayes'. House Bill  
2492 having received the Constitutional Majority  
is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1494."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1494. A Bill for an Act  
relating to spouse abuse. Third Reading of the  
Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
there were two indetical Bills, House Bill 1494  
and House Bill 2725, and Representative Anderson  
and myself decided to just go forth with one Bill  
because we were both interested in addressing this  
subject. The intent of the legislation is to assist  
the development of spouse abuse centers. And the  
primary intent is the rehabilitation and treatment  
for the abuser and the abused."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any...is there anyone to speak in  
opposition? The question is, shall House Bill  
1494 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all  
opposed vote 'nay'. Ohler...get me his eye over  
there. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will  
take the record. On this question there are  
146 'ayes', 2 'nays'. This Bill having received  
the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared  
passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1319."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday this Bill was brought out of the record primarily because of perceptions that the timing of it was inappropriate. I, and other Members of the Black Caucus particularly, felt strongly that the priorities of the poor in the State of Illinois, should not be perceived, continue to be perceived as a Black problem only, must not be continued to be given short script by either side of the aisle, and would not be a political football in this House. There are people all over this State, not just in Cook County, and they are hurting. It does not really matter if you are black or white when you're starving. And they are starving. Illinois has the lowest subsidy for Public Aid for the poor of any State in the Midwest. Our energy costs have gone through the roof, housing, food, clothing costs have all risen dramatically. We all know that inflation steals from us all, but it robs the poor with a vengeance that is devastating. This Legislature has given increases to the teachers as it should, to the bureaucrats, as it should, to the State and County fairs. This Legislature even gave itself a substantial pay raise last term. Yet we have given the poor... given the poor only a single 5% increase of this subsidy since 1974."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Would you kindly give the Lady your attention? The Membership kindly give the Lady your attention. Thank you very much. Please proceed Ma'am."

Barnes: "Thank you. Thank you. As all of you know, as all of you know, I worked long and hard talking to just about everyone of the 170 Members of this Assembly, in an effort to address your concerns and solicit your support. I was determined that this Bill be passed or defeated on its merits



and on the basis of the wisdom and compassion of the Members of this Body. That is all I ask now, that you consider this Bill on its merits. This Bill would grant a 7% increase cost of living to the aged, blind, and disabled, families with dependent children, and general assistance. It will cost a total of \$32,000,000. But this Bill will actually save the State money. In fact, it will cut the Public Aid budget over-all by some \$60,000,000. It will shift some of the inflated portions of the budget to provide for a 7% increase for Public Aid. As the Public Aid budget is inflated, the Public Aid budget is inflated as all of us are aware and I will address any concerns you have in that regard. There have been hundreds of millions of dollars left each year and yet the poor in the State go wanting. I urge you to vote your conscience, I urge your favorable consideration and I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone to speak in opposition to this Bill? Anyone to speak in opposition? Question is shall House Bill 1319 pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Yourell: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm in my 13th year down here and long before some of the recent Members arrived many of us in this House voted with Bob Mann on each and every occasion for the cost of living increase to Public Aid recipients. And I can tell you that the last time this Bill was called, Yourell had a green light up there and if you look, you'll see it's up there tonight. But to be victim of a blanket indictment as a closet racist by one of the Members of the Black Caucus didn't set too well with me. And I resent it. And I think that everybody else that was included in that inditement resents it as well. I'm proud to vote for any increase in Public Aid recipients because I think they deserve it, they need it, and I'll be there each time this Bill is called. Thank you."



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

CHapman: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, there were more than 89 votes when he voted on a Legislators pay raise not too long ago. I vote 'aye' for a Legislators' pay raise and I'm voting 'aye' tonight. Like Representative Yourell, I have consistently supported cost of living increases for Public Aid recipients. I hope that we will very quickly see 89 votes or lots more up there. If you voted for a Legislative pay raise, I certainly hope that your green light is on right now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich to explain his vote. Timer's on. Everybody will get a chance to explain their vote to seek recognition."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, in line with Representative Yourell, in my tenure of General Assembly I voted for Public Aid increases and you might as well know, I also voted for General Assembly increases. And I would hope to think that this Bill is presented by a Member of the General Assembly who is concerned with all of the people on Public Aid and this Bill in not being presented by a Black Caucus, but a Member of the Illinois General Assembly and they would show the same respect for all Members of their District in their voting rights as we respect their wishes. And of course I will be proud once again, to vote 'aye' for the people on Public Aid."

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

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, is there something wrong with the electrical system? I noticed that that side of the room doesn't seem to be registering on the Board, so I assume that probably they're all decent people and concerned with the poor, and I assume that that's the reason that obviously there's a short circuit or something across the aisle. So that's why they're not registering. But I've sat here now



for these days and I've seen Bills by the insurance companies, by the banks, by the utilities, by all the special interest, one way or the other. And they didn't quite get caught in politics and the politics of this General Assembly, the same way that the rights of the poor people get caught. The rights of the poor people, they're always for political gain. They're always fair game because they're not represented really here. They're always in the middle of politics. But the others of special interest, they somehow escape it. Come on. We'll have an electrician..." (Timer)

Speaker Lechowicz: "Going to hear from Roy now. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In spite of the fact that the Sponsor of this Bill has failed to come through for one reason or another with an agreement that we happened to make last night, I don't feel that the people that are deserving of this raise should be denied that. And I would now encourage everybody to go green and put the votes on this and pass it out of here."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just a suggestion. My running mate from the other side of the aisle, that he ought to be a little bit more aware of some facts before he gets up on the House floor and starts shooting off his mouth in his usual manner. There's many of us on this side of the aisle that have had more conversations with Mrs. Braun about trying to work this out in a reasonable quiet and dispassionate manner than you may know. And a lot of other Members may know. And I resent totally, absolutely, and completely the implications you have made by your speech and your statements and your insinuations here on the House floor."

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

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



only comments that I want to make are very obvious. This is not a race issue, this is not a political issue, and it saddens me to see that politics was brought into this issue. What it is, it is a people's issue, I represent a District that has very few Black people in it, and I'm not voting for this because the Black people. I've got a District that's got a lot of Latino people in it and I'm not voting for it because of Latinos. I'm voting for this issue because I got a pay raise when I came in here and I didn't have the opportunity to vote for it but I would have. And I got that pay raise. And I can't understand how anyone who is sitting here, benefiting from that pay raise, can't understand that a 7% cost of living, which is going to help the poor people, the old people, the disabled, and the blind, can sit here and accept that 5,000 this year and 8,000 next year. I'm happy to see some Republicans join with us. As I said, it's not a political issue. If somebody tried to make a deal, well, that's their business. But as far as I'm concerned, I'm proud of the people who voted for this issue and that's why I voted for it. Thank you very much."

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

Borchers: "Well, I hate to vote red but I've gone and watched the food stamps, where the food stamps have been cashed in and saw the women going into their Chrysler and their Cadillac cars and all nice. I know that 38% of the people on Welfare shouldn't be there at all. I know that there are some that do need help. But I'm voting 'no' because I think that the proper attitude and proper action is not being taken by the Representatives of the Welfare Department. And if it was so, that you needed a green light, I'd vote it. But I think there should be some opposition to let those people weed-out, to show those



people they must weed-out those that are undesirable. And there's plenty of those folks that are undesirable. They are making money, they're not reporting it, they have trading and food stamps. It's a sad situation. I think we should have a few of the green lights go to red but leave the 89 votes there. As a protest.." (Timer)

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

Johnson: "I realize there are more than enough votes, but I hope among those 122 votes or so, when we have an opportunity in three weeks to vote on Representative Getty's, another Member's Bill, having to do with those people who are recipients of Public Aid and who are not blind or disabled, or mothers of dependent children, have an opportunity to vote on a Bill that will help everybody in requiring..in having a work requirement local government for those individuals. I hope the 122 votes up there will join with Representative Getty and others in pushing that Bill through for passage. "

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For edification of the press and those assembled here this evening, I want to extend a personal debt of gratitude to Representative George Ryan. George, I regret that we're not able to follow through and give you 2700 as you would like, but I can assure you that somewhere along the tenure of the Legislature that Members on this side of the aisle will show you our gratitude. I want to thank the Republican party for giving us the opportunity to make a political statement last evening and I can assure you, George, that in some way, I will help you over the years. Thank you for giving us an 'aye' vote."

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



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just to make one note, first, I don't know what the recent figures are, but I certainly don't consider this a black issue. I think you'd find that more nonblacks are on Public Aid than blacks across this country. And I'd also like to say to the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle who made it appear as though Republicans don't care about people's needs; I'm serving in my 13th year in this Legislature and I'll put my record next to anyone when it comes to issues regarding people who are in need of help. And I mean that literally; I'll prove it anytime, Sir. And I'm a Republican and proud to be one."

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

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. Unlike the previous Speaker, I'm a Democrat and a proud Democrat. I'm a Harry S. Truman type of Democrat. And I'm proud to think that Democrats on this side of the aisle who have continued to support me over the years, and you can rest assure, that Jim Taylor and the delegation will continue to support your issues and we truly appreciate the fact that you found in your heart today, especially those fellows from down-state who thought that they had some problems, to give us the vote that we have tonight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'ayes', 26 nay, 7 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which House Bill 1319 passed, I now move to reconsider that vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski. Kosinski moves that the Motion lies...."

Kosinski: "I move that Motion lie on the Table."



Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', Aye. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'...all opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Motion lies on the Table, House Bill 1319. House Bill 2077. 2077."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2077. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer. Griesheimer, please."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Bill, which was more than adequately described during Second Reading when there were two Amendments put on it, is merely clarifying the State Purchasing Act to make eminently clear that we are in conformance with certain Constitutional directives with regard to the qualifications of individuals who attempt to work for the State of Illinois. It's my understanding that the way the law is right now is actually unconstitutional, does not provide an adequate opportunity for a spouse of an elected official or a sibling of an elected official to apply for a professional job and to go through the qualification process that any other citizen in the state could do. This Bill also had two Amendments added to it which further clarifies the language. It does not allow those siblings or spouses to take part in state contracts, that is still prohibited activity. I believe it's a good Bill and does clarify situations that needs clarified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2077 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Lee Schwartz, give me an 'aye'...'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk



will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 4 'noes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1353."

Clerk D'Brien: "House Bill 1353. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1353 is a Bill that would permit the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District to file liens against real estate...for delinquencies in the payment of user charges. The purpose of this is to provide for a much easier method of collection, similar to that used by material men in filing liens against real estate. This would provide for a means to bring the Metropolitan Sanitary District into conformity with federal legislation and U.S. E.P.A. regulations that require the district to develop a fiscal system based to a great degree on direct charges to users. Thereby, substantially reducing the ability to receive maintenance and operating equipment replacement revenues from ad valorem property tax agents. I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 1353 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122...124 'ayes', 1 'nay', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1354."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1354. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1354 amends the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District leasing statute and would permit review of the fair market value of leased real estate every ten years., it's presently fifteen years, after the initial five-year period. This would permit increases and adjustments in the rental of property and certainly makes it more in keeping with economic growth and inflation. And I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 1354 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'ayes', 8 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1700."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1700. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would, for the Metropolitan Sanitary District, allow the purchasing agent to make a decision, only in a case of a tie bid, to make a decision for that which would be the best in terms of deliveries to the sanitary district. And I would request your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill that I tried adding an Amendment, to when it was on the House floor. I think that the thing that the Sponsor forgot to



mention, that in case of a tie bid, he can award it to who he feels is best qualified, true. But the way the Bill states, if you'll read it, in case of a tie bid whether it is the lowest or the highest bid. So in other words, three of us could bid, one man could be quite a bit lower, I happen to be the purchasing agent's brother-in-law and somebody else happens to be purchasing agent's brother, we end up tying for the high bid and he can award it to whoever he wants to. The way the Bill states, it's whoever is tied for highest or lowest bid. It does not say it's the way the bid comes through. And I would definitely urge ...and please read the Bill....a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Gentleman is correct in part in that in which he says a tied bid. A tie bid is a tie bid is a tie bid and this would merely allow the purchasing agent for the district to make a decision in terms of what is best for the sanitary district. I think we worked all those things out and discussed it in depth...and is the protections and the purchasing rules and regulations for the Metropolitan Sanitary District are extremely tight and there is no room for anything that the...the person that stood objecting to this seemed to indicate. I would solicit your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1700 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 'ayes',



55 'noes'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "We'll put it on Postponed. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please place House Bill 1700 on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2471."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2471. A Bill for an Act providing for additional judges in the circuit of Cook County. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2471 is a Bill that would provide for much needed additional judges to take care of the ever-increasing caseload that we place on them by our force in this General Assembly...stricter law enforcement. That would be six new circuit court judges from Cook County and twelve new associate judges of Cook County Circuit Court. The breakdown of the associate judges would provide that two would be from the county at large, two from the City of Chicago and two from the area outside the City of Chicago, half to be elected in the general election in 1980, one half to be elected in 1982. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 2471 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Brummer: "Well I was just wondering if the increasing burden as a result of the change in laws in the General Assembly on the judges in Cook County, doesn't it impose an increasing burden on the judges in downstate as well?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 29 'nays', 6



recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1443. Mr. Von Boeckman. House Bill 1443, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1443. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is not on the floor. Take it out of the record temporarily. Where are those motions at? Where are the motions? The Clerk will read the motion. We're going to no debate and we've got two motions to take care of just before that. And it's the intent of the Chair while they...well...withdraw Mr. Greiman's motion. Mrs. Breslin, I believe, has a motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to modify the special order of business and no debate order to permit the Sponsor thirty seconds to explain the affect of the Bill, including the statement of the problem to which the Bill is drafted, but not to include argument on the merit of the Bill. Representative Breslin."

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

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, since it already...it takes at least thirty seconds for the computer to work on the switchboard, I would now move to suspend the Appropriate Rule to allow an explanation by the Sponsor of the Bill that is being considered...for...for.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now this is permissive, Ma'am, is that correct?"

Breslin: "That's correct, completely permissive."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor does not have to be here... and is permissive and it's a maximum of twenty minutes. There is objections being raised...and it will take 89 votes. All in favor of the motion vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman



from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Well the problem I have with this, we've had three days to look these Bills over. I don't know what the others have done, I've already marked the ones I'm going to vote 'yes' or 'no' on. We've studied them. It does take thirty minutes to clear the machine, but I think that it will take about thirty seconds for you to name the Bill, the Clerk to read it by title and so on. So we're talking about a minute a Bill. We're talking about two and a half hours now and I don't know who you can shut off in thirty seconds around here. I've never seen anybody talk thirty seconds around here yet. So we're probably going to get up to two minutes a Bill and then you're going to be here four hours on this list when you should be...less than that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Friedrich, I share your concerns but, you know, there is a clock up here and when I'm up here I use it. And anyone else who is sitting here can use the clock at thirty seconds as well as a minute. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Getty: "I would just like to make clear that we're referring only to the Sponsor and to nobody else in the explanation."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. That's the whole point and that's the only reason I object. We've had this stuff on our desks for three or four days now, if you're going to allow...and I've got Bills on here. I want people to understand that. And I've got Bills like others on the regular Calendar. But if you're going



to allow the Sponsor on the no debate to have thirty seconds to explain the vote, then you've got...it seems to me the only fair way, you have to allow someone that has some opposition to it also thirty seconds and it would defeat the whole purpose of no debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 'ayes', 44 'noes'. The Lady's motion does not prevail. So we'll go to the order. And it's the intent again to...the Speaker mentioned it earlier, that we are going to this order of business for approximately one hour."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion, but I would just like you to hold the motion perhaps for...until you get through with this order."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I know the no debate list was passed out earlier today and it was passed out yesterday, but we've had so many things being passed out of here, I wonder if there's a...are there copies of the no debate list around?"

Speaker Redmond: "There's one over on Wyvetter Young's desk. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order, I guess. But it just seems to me that there are many of us who are always here on these silent nights and we spend our time here because we feel it's important we do so. Yet, we find that people that aren't here, who have taken off, are going to be voting on these Bills like they were here. Now I think that's a personal affront to the rest of us who have stay here and do our job to have these people



voted with us as if they were here doing the job for their district. And I resent that and I resent it very much. And if I see names on the board that are of people that aren't here..because I'm going to ask for a verification if it takes us a week."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the Gentleman's point is well taken. You know, I asked you not to vote any switch but your own repeatedly, but evidently it is very audible. Please, do not vote any switch but your own. If you vote for...if you vote for a colleague you may think you're doing the colleague a favor but in many, many instances you're...you're not helping them at all. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that Representative Hanahan is in Pontiac."

Speaker Redmond: "No, he's...Bloomington...he's in Bloomington on the way to Pontiac. He's following a scent. House Bills, Third Reading, No Debate Calendar on page 18. House Bill 111."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 111. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 123 'ayes' and 5 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 251."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 251 passed previously."

Speaker Redmond: "320."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 320. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have



1979  
House  
HB 453

303.

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 127 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 348."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 348."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. They have to wait until that board clears, is that our problem, John? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 421."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 13 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 453."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 453. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 499."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 499. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources, research data collection and environmental studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye' and 44 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 505."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 505. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 6 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative...former Representative Geo-Karis is here to use the phone again. 505. (sic)"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 525. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal...."

Speaker Redmond: "Whoa, whoa, whoa."

Clerk O'Brien: "...525. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. What happened to 505, John? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 532."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 532. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state monies.



Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 17 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 6...663."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 663. A Bill for an Act to amend the County Treasurer's Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 667."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 667. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 163 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 682."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 682. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act and an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye', 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 691."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 691. A Bill for an Act to define and regulate contracts for invention development services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 11 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 700."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 700. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 723."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 723. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 754."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 754. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'aye' and 2 'no'. The



House  
HB 944

Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 809."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 809. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 828."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 828. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye', 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 944."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 944. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 947."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 947. A Bill for an Act to amend the unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.



On this question there's 148 'aye' and 6 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 948."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 948. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 16 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 953."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 953. A Bill for an Act relating to the purchase of automobiles which meet federal minimum average fuel economy standards Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 981."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 981. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 987."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 987. A Bill for an Act relating to assistant state's attorneys. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 991."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 991. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite. Will you turn her on?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I just lost my rhythm. What happened? Are we having electronic problems?"

Speaker Redmond: "You did what?"

Satterthwaite: "This broke in to the pattern of voting and I wondered what had happened?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to have to appoint a Commission...slight appropriation. 1027."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1027. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1048."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1048. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning jurors. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 49 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1063."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1063. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code...excuse me. A Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of an Act relating to the Illinois Waterway. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 142 'aye' and no...9 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1088."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1088. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for representation and identification in certain civil law suits. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority



is hereby declared passed. 1125."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1125. A Bill for an Act relating to decrease of fees of certain sheriff services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 137 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1128."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1128. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in...1128...is this the record on 1128, Mr. Clerk? We printed out at 1125. What is it, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Roll Call on 1125 was 137 'yea', 10 'nay', 8 'present', 22 absent."

Speaker Redmond: "Is this the Roll Call on 1128 on the board now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The board didn't lock after that last Roll Call. It remained open."

Speaker Redmond: "Clear it, yeah. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1129."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1129. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that printed on the...1128 yet? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who



779  
House  
HB 1156

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 17 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1139."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1139. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to require prompt payment by the State of Illinois for goods or services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1156."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1156. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Community Mental Health Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 9 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1226."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1226. A Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 30 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1230."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1230. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Local Mass Transit District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1248."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1248. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1264."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1264. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Greiman: "A poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "There are none. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, is it possible to poll the paper clips?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well it's a Bill to...get the Board of Education in Chicago in compliance. I want the absentees polled."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. Wait a minute. Where's the Parliamentarian? The Parliamentarian advises me that we did not suspend that rule so the Gentleman is in his rights. Poll the absentees on 1264. Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn if we're going to horse around with stuff like this. That's the reason that stuff was put on here, so we could clear up the Calendar. Now if he's going to be a poor loser, just let him quit, we'll adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Members of the House, we didn't delete that provision that you would ver..."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right."

Schneider: "...just polling of the absentees or verification. Representative Mahar made that point at the very beginning and I don't think we ought to deny a Sponsor that opportunity win or lose. So...we may be delayed. It has nothing to do with being a good sport, whenever that was a factor in this game, I can't recall. But that's irrelevant."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt. Capuzi. Domico. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Hanahan. Kucharski. Laurino. Marovitz. Oblinger. Pechous. Schlickman. Stearney and Walsh."

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

Leinenweber: "Change me from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Marovitz. Marovitz. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "My switch is down but it's not recorded as down on my voting apparatus. I'd like to be recorded 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Marovitz as 'aye'. Representative Abramson, 'no'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "If there's 89 votes I'm going to verify it. If we're going to play this kind of game, we're going to play it all the way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn, 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Alright if I might just make a brief statement."

I'm not going...I'm going to table the Bill, Mr. Friedrich. Mr. Friedrich, I'm going to table the Bill. Just relax, Sir. A few minutes ago...I'm just going to rise a point of personal privilege, that I've never risen on, that everybody rises on this place. A few minutes ago, half hour ago, I made a speech that was apparently political. Okay, I have a Bill that conforms state law with federal law. That's all it does. It's a simple nothing Bill. I certainly, certainly don't want...I understand there are probably...whoever is offended by what I said, because it was political, is going take it out on this Bill. And that's the way it is. And, Mr. Speaker, whatever the Roll is, please take the Roll. I don't want to have it any further. Let the Bill then die or whatever has to be done, Sir. But I would like to be recorded as 'aye', I pushed the wrong button. If I could have leave to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Page..."

Greiman: "...recorded 'aye' on my own losing Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Page...Representative Barnes. Barnes. Record Representative Barnes as 'aye'. Representative Harris 'aye'. Representative Dunn 'aye'. Representative Yourell 'aye'. Will you bring a paper clip to Representative Greiman? Representative Willer."

Willer: " 'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: " 'Aye'. Representative Christensen... Willer...Christensen...Slape 'aye', Birchler 'aye', Leverenz 'aye'. The Clerk says that we went too fast for him. We'll have to have a new Roll Call. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative



Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to point out that the number of people that are changing their votes from 'no' to 'aye' were on that side of the aisle. So there was...we're not talking about a political thing that was involved here, there were as many Republicans as Democrats voting 'no' on that last Bill. I voted 'yes' last time and I'll vote 'yes' again, that's not the point."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, May I...Representative Greiman asked to have the Bill tabled, apparently you didn't hear him."

Speaker Redmond: "He said after the Roll Call was taken. Have all voted who wish? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I'm going to accuse somebody of playing games, now he's doing the same thing. Let's get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "You've given him the authority to call the absentees and all the horsing around, now if we're going to go full debate, I want a verification. It's as simple as that. We set up a procedure here for speeding this thing up..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...the Gentleman is within his rights. But I'm just telling you now, at midnight the hammer comes down and if you don't...if you don't have all your Bills and your friends and your colleagues' Bills passed, don't blame the Speaker. Representative Mahar. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, I made a statement when we started on this thing and I mean it. I see people on that board right now voting green that haven't been here for hours. And if we have to go..."

Speaker Redmond: "Call out some names and we'll take..."



Mahar: "Well, I see Hanahan, for number one up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan, take his...lock his switch.  
Anybody else?"

Mahar: "And Dawson and Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Dawson is around here. Is Van Duyne here?  
Van Duyne here? Take Van Duyne off the Roll Call.  
Well I don't know who's here and who isn't here."

Mahar: "Mr. Laurino is also showed as voting 'present'.  
There are about eight or ten people that have been  
gone for several hours and I said I resent the  
fact that they're being voted on these Bills that are  
favorable to them and they're gone and I've got to  
stay here."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't quite understand why it is so  
hard to get the Members to understand that our rules  
prohibit voting someone elses switches. Now I want  
...I want to tell you something. In my first term  
here somebody thought that they were doing Representa-  
tive Bill Scott a favor and they voted him on a  
Bill. That night he was giving a speech in  
Bloomington and the Bloomington Pantagraph tore his  
hide off. So what I said, if you think you're doing  
him a favor, you aren't. Don't vote anybodys switch  
but your own. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Point of personal privilege. I can't imagine  
the Editor of the Daily Pantagraph ever doing some-  
thing like that to a Representative from our  
district."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's just hard to believe, but  
that's what happened. And I'm just telling you,  
you don't have the slightest idea where these  
Members are and if you think you're doing them a  
favor, believe me, you aren't. So don't vote  
anybodys switch but your own. Representative  
O'Brien. O'Brien. O'Brien."



O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, my suggestion would be in relation to those switches that are being voted by individuals that aren't here is that you simply take the key, put it on your podium, when they come back in the room they can pick up their key and then we'll know that they voted their switch and that will answer all of the questions."

Speaker Redmond: "The only problem is that I don't know who's here and who isn't here. Have all voted? Are you satisfied on this one, Representative Mahar? Okay. Take the Roll Call. On this question there's 104 'aye' and...Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Since Mr. Greiman persisted in his rights to do all the things he does, I want to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "You're perfectly welcome. On this question there's 104 'aye' and 50 'no'. Representative Friedrich has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to say that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to say that while we are all disappointed that the fast process has broken down for a few minutes, not all of us would accuse Mr. Greiman of monkey business because allowing us to poll the absentees and verify was something that the Republican Members of the Rules Committee insisted on several times and he is perfectly within his right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "There's Representative Van Duyne, now do you want me to lock his switch and keep the key up here?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I know that some of these votes



are honest, conscientious votes. I think I also know that some of them are in retaliation. I might remind Mr. Friedrich as I look at the Calendar, your two Bills are the last on the No Debate Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'll respond to that, they're clean-up Bills from the Reference Bureau and if you don't want to clean them up, I could care less."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the...the Gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Borchers. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'm going to withdraw my objection. But I'm one of the fellows that helped set us this procedure and I thought it was a good deal. But when we've got somebody over there that wants a special deal, then I'm...the next time it happens I'm going to ask for a verification. You can depend on it. But I'm going to let it go but I hope Representative Greiman and others have learned something out of my request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdraw his request. Representative Simms."

Simms: "I'd like to have my vote changed to 'no' on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Simms to 'no'. What is the count? 103 'aye', 51 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1270."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1270. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquor. Third



## Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those voting in... 'aye'... vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This question, there's 139 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1272."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1272. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the General Not For Profit Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 139 'aye' and 6 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1273."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1273. A Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1274."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1274. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye', 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1291."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1291. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Dangerous Drug Abuse Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1293."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1293. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1300."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1300. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. The Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 12 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1307."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1307. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority



is hereby declared passed. 1328."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1328. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 1358. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in... have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 14 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1358. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1361."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1361. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 34 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1377."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1377. A Bill for an Act relating to real property tax homestead improvement exemption from certain dwelling units. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 12 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1396."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1396. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1410."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1410. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 17 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1422."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1422."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "It's been called to my attention that there may have been an error in that last Bill. I believe that...I believe that Bill was moved to the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't taken that order yet, Representative Getty."

Getty: "No, this..."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't put the motion to put them on the Spring Calendar. He signed the thing but we haven't done it yet."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1422."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "With leave of the House, I'd like leave to place...I'd like to move to place House Bill 1410, which was just passed, I guess I have to move to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you have to move to..."

Marovitz: "Move to...having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1410 was passed. I had made a commitment to put House Bill 1410 on the Spring Calendar. I'd like to do that whether it's by leave of the House or moving to reconsider since the Bill did pass. I want to keep my word. And if this is the proper procedure, I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1410 passed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which 1410 passed. Those...leave for the Attendance Roll Call. Have you filled out a slip? We'll use the Attendance Roll Call on the Gentleman's motion. You have filled out a slip?"

Marovitz: "No, I haven't but I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Marovitz: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 1222." (sic)

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1422. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle. Whoops. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1423."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1423. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 128 'aye' and 15 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1426."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1426. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1434."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1434. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 61 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1457."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1457. A Bill for an Act to amend the Usury Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. What did you say? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye' and 44 'no'. And the Bill having received



the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1462."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1462. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I just wanted to...I wanted to vote....be recorded as voting 'no' on that."

Speaker Redmond: "On what?"

Bradley: "14...oh, sorry. It's just coming up."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 71 'aye' and 81 'no'. Gene Hoffman. This question ....this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1463."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1463. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1470."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1470. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 9 'no'. Take another Roll Call on this one. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take



HB 1571

record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1479."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1479. A Bill for an Act in relation to deputize school crossing guards. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 17 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1485."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1485. A Bill for an Act to protect the confidentiality of information and records of rape victims' organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1501."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1501. A Bill for an Act in relation to notice or protest to proposed Amendments in zoning ordinances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? You better be careful...better be careful...discretion. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 9 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1508."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1508. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. That's Weber...the first Bill Weber Borchers has passed. And I think the secret is no debate. 1510."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1510. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "This question...shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1529."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1529. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The question is, shall...take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1535."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1535. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to radiation installation to require monthly inspections by the Department of Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1540."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1540. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning land titles. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hoffman in the Chair."

Unknown: "The first loser in no debate gets his chance."

Speaker Hoffman: Who said that. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 147 'aye' and 7 'noes' and 1 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1574."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1574. A Bill for an Act to amend the State University's Retirement System, Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 8 'noes' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1579."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1579. A Bill for an Act to amend the downstate Teacher's Retirement Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 140 'aye's', 10 'noes' and 5 voting 'present', having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1617."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1617. A Bill for an Act to amend the Circuit Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this vote there are 148 'ayes', 7 noes' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1622."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1622. A Bill for an Act relating to the prevention of duplication of survey inspections and investigations of nursing homes by certain state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? And, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 157 'ayes', 2 'noes' and 2 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority it is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1676."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1676. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 148 'ayes', 5 'noes' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1687."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1687. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to require the teaching of the general practice of medicine in all medical schools established and maintained by the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this there are 129 'ayes', 24 'noes' and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1688, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1688. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 33 'noes' and 9 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, this Bill is declared passed. House Bill 1699."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1699. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 153 'ayes', 3 'noes' and 4 voting 'present'. And House Bill 1699 is declared passed...having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 13...pardon me. 1703."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1703. A Bill for an Act to provide penalties for the filing of false returns by state preparers and taxpayers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "This question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 67 'noes'



and 10 voting 'present'. This vote having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1712."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1712. A Bill for an Act creating the Violent Crime Study Commission and defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes', 60 'noes' and 5 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1725."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1725. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this vote there are 149 'ayes', 0 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1726."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1726. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Rape Victims Emergency Treatment Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 24 'noes' and 4 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. 1734."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1734. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Police Training Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 7 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1757."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1757. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is...the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 140 'ayes', 7 'noes' and 4 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. 1759."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1759. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 39 'noes' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having...having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1782."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1782. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Has everybody voted who wish? Everybody voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 18 'nays' and 3 voting 'present'. On this...having receiving the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1787."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1787. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Hospital District Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 2 'nays' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1790."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1790. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Franchise Disclosure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 8 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1802."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1802. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "We'll be at ease here for a couple of seconds while they catch up with the machine. The Representative from Cook, Mr. Piel."



Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was wondering while we had a little break if it would be out of order...if we could change our format a little bit and possibly run to House Bill 2700?"

Hoffman: "Your demeanor answered your own question. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake arise, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I have heard enough debate. I move the previous question."

Speaker Hoffman: "I am told that you weren't recognized for that purpose. House Bill 1802."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1802. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 25 'noes' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1804."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1804. A Bill for an Act in relation to the establishment of public transit employee training programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 10 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1805."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1805. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 13 'nays' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1811."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1811. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Franchise Disclosure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from McLean arise, Representative Bradley?"

Bradley: "Mr...."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question...let's see where we are. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 14 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1812."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1812. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to contractors and materialmen's liens known as mechanics liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1869."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1869. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "1869. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye' and 0 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1874."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1874. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1900."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1900. A Bill for an Act in relation to the recovery of waste oil. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1903."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1903. A Bill for an Act relating to the emancipation of certain minors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



112 'aye' and 35 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1906."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1906. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning currency exchanges. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 1907. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 15 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1907."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1907. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1939."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1939. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1950."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1950. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1955."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1955. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'aye' and 0 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1963."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1963. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1967."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1967. A Bill for an Act to revise the law to the registration of vital records and repeal parts of Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1976."



179  
House  
HB 2012

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1976. A Bill for an Act in relation to the requiring of the economic impacts study for proposed regulations of the Institute of Natural Resources and the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1978."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1978. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Use Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It kind of blinks at you. I say, it blinks at you. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and 4 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2012."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2012. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2019."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2019. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have



all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2020. Former House Member, very brilliant House Member, Harold Washington, now a Senator...formerly Chairman of the Judiciary Committee...Father of Class X...stop and frisk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2020. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. They've run out of business in the Senate so Senator Washington is over here filing some motions. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2065."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2065. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2072."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2072. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning political activity of state employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 99 'aye' and 41 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is



hereby declared passed. Representative Greiman, having voted on the prevailing side, moves that the vote be reconsidered. Representative Kornowicz moves that it lie on the table. And the question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, ...'no'. 2074. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I'm on the wrong side. I wanted to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "2074."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2074. A Bill for an Act relating to certain fees of licensees under an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2078."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2078. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 4 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2089."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2089. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 8 'no'. The



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2020...2120."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2120. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2128."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2128. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2130...2129, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2129. A Bill for an Act directing the Department of Public Health to issue certain grants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 117 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2130."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2130. A Bill for an Act requiring certain tests on motor fuel storage tanks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 100 'aye' and 47 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2132."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2132. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 121 'aye' and 29 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2149."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2149. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections and the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 2152. Take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2152."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2152. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 7 'no'. And The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2179."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2179. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 15 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2186."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2186. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2192."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2192. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the creation, maintenance, operation and improvement of the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2200."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2200. A Bill for an Act to providing funding for protection for non-game wildlife by providing for an income tax check-off. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye', 14 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is



79  
H  
H  
HB 2226

hereby declared passed. 2204."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2204. A Bill for an Act in relation to state reimbursement to school districts for certain special education projects. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2207. 2207."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2207. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It's the intention of the Chair to finish the bottom of this page and then go back to this other list that we have. And if everybody behaves themselves, we'll be on that about an hour, if everybody behaves themselves we may be able to finish this No Debate Calendar. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2226."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2226. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2233."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2233. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections<sup>o</sup> of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2240."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2240. A Bill for an Act in relation to public purchases and contracts for public work projects. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2298."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2298. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the County Home Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Telcser. Telcser, are you seeking recognition? Representative Telcser. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, a couple of things. One, I don't want you to forget we have some O.C.E. Bills which have to be called sometime this evening for various agencies. And also, I wonder, if...how firm you are on your decision to move off of this order of business? I think a lot of Members have Bills on



this order and they're obviously having a 99% pass ratio. If you move along and get into some long debate on something else, we may never get back to this. And...I know Representative Peters just told me he has a Bill that you're just going to miss that he's been waiting for. Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm not that firm..."

Telcser: "...Winchester has one."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm not that firm. I just wanted to do it the way that I think is...what's the sense of the House? Representative...it seems to be the sense of the House to keep going. So...2300."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2300. A Bill for an Act creating the County Housing Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'aye' and 38 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2301."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2301. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2302."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2302. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to define and regulate political activity by merit employees of the state and repeal an Act named herein. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 81 'aye' and 66 'no'. And the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 2303."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2303. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2335."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2335. A Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts named herein in relation to water resource projects. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2367. 2335?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2367."

Speaker Redmond: "2367."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Voluntary Health Service Plans Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2369."



1762333

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2369. A Bill for an Act requiring state agencies to list their programs in priority order. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2387."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2387. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 23 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2389."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2389. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2392."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2392. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could use a...have a little common sense. I know we have a category on the last page of our Calendar. Why couldn't we just take them all in one shot?"



Speaker Redmond: "Because that isn't the common sense way to do it. It louses up the Clerk's office. It louses up all the Members. They want to come up and change and get off a Roll Call. If you have 90 and three people come off and take it off, you've lost your Bill."

Van Duynes: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "We've tried it before and it doesn't work."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, I know you're my aged, you know, advisor and so on, and I respect your view. But I want to tell you something. I've been here for many hours and I watch them and the only way...you can get one off of there is raise all kinds of confusion. So, the general consensus of opinion is, that every one of the rest of these are going to pass and so we might as well at least save our time."

Speaker Redmond: "The best way is for people to be quiet and let us proceed here. 2392. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. That applies to you too. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2393."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2393. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. As long as she likes you, that's all that's important. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2398."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2398. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act.  
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2410."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2410. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's 2410."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2410. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Did you bring a pen? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 11 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2416."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2416. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2417."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2417. A Bill for an Act to require various state agencies to report to the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission concerning the effects of agency's actions on the state long-term



79  
S. J. 500  
R. B.

debt. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 10 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2421."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2421. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to meetings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2429 the next one, Mr. Clerk? 2429."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2429. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Chicago Regional Court District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye' and 32 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2500."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2500. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Crime Victim's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Marovitz."



179  
Boucek  
48

Marovitz: "I hate to ask this, but I'm going to ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 86 'aye' and 64 'no'. Representative Marovitz has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr.... Representative Braun, for what purpose do you arise? Change the Lady from 'present' to 'aye'. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Daniels, 'aye'. Representative Boucek, 'no'. Representative Reed, 'aye'. Now what's the count? We've got three more 'ayes'. Braun, Daniels and Reed...and Representative Grossi. Grossi changes his from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Rea, 'aye'. Okay. Dump it and get a new Roll Call. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 51 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2546."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2546. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2546. 2548."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2548. A Bill for an Act to regulate the surface mining of coal and to provide for the conservation and reclamation of lands disturbed by surface and underground coal mining. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have



all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2587."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2587. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to Clerks of courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 2593. We'll take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2593."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2593. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 9 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2613."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2613. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 27 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2637."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2637. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to require labeling of equipment and facilities for use...transportation, storage or



manufactured...of hazardous materials. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2641."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2641. A Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts herein named in relation to the Governor's Traffic, Safety and Coordinating Committee. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 2642 (sic). Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2642."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2642. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and 0 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2643."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2643. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 157 'aye' and 1 'no'. The



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2644."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2644. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2659."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2659. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to establish Appellate Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 24 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2678."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2678. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2679."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2679. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 152 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2715."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2715. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 7 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2718."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2718. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Crime Victims Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 7 'no'. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 18 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2719."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2719. A Bill for an Act in relation to counter claims by the state in actions against it in Courts of Claims and counterclaims by defendents and suits brought by the state in circuit courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2734."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2734. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 22 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2740."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2740. A Bill for an Act to provide for reclamation of land and water affected by coal mining which have been abandoned. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2746."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2746. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye', 0 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2750."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2750. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 152 'aye', 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2766."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2766. A Bill for an Act relating to real property tax homestead improvement exemptions for certain multiple dwelling units. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2766."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 27..."

Speaker Redmond: "2767."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2767. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Represent...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2771."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2771. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 2778. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 18 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2778."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2778. A Bill for an Act in relation to the nonsubstantive revisions of Sections



of various Acts and technical errors in existing laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2779."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2779. A Bill for an Act in relation to the nonsubstantive revisions or renumbering of Sections of Articles necessitated by Amendments or additions to Sections of Public Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', 4 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2780."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2780. A Bill for an Act in relation to nonsubstantive revisions of various Acts to replace obsolete references to certain suspended Public Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. You took the record didn't you? Have all voted who wish? On this question, 148 'aye' and 4 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan.



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, a press release has recently been circulated by the Illinois Public Action Council discussing three Bills which failed today dealing with the question of insurance rate regulation and insurance company redlining in Chicago. All three Bills failed and, accordingly, there were probably ninety to a hundred people who failed to support the Bill either voting no or present or not voting at all. The Public Action Council for their own reasons decided to single out certain Representatives, five in number, all of one political party and they happen to be Members of the political party which overwhelmingly supported the passage of the Bills. They're not the political party that did not support the passage of the Bills. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who worked diligently in the preparation of these Bills. I participated in meetings with democratic Members of the Insurance Committee on three or four different occasions and I know they met on occasions other than those to draft these Bills. There was a sincere effort to draft Bills that would appeal to the entire Democratic Party and hopefully pass this House. I for one resent the action of the Public Action Council in singling out certain Representatives for criticism in their failure to support these Bills which I presume was well thought out by the individual Representatives, and I'm sure they have their own individual reasons for failing to support these Bills which they are fully entitled to possess. These people, Mr. Speaker, have been seen on several occasions using the telephones in the offices of the Capitol Building and the Stratton Office Building, drinking coffee from Representatives' offices and using the Zerox machines which are all over these buildings, and I do wish on my



part to serve notice to these people that they are no longer welcome in the legislative offices or they're not welcome using legislative phones and I know I'm not authorized to ban anyone from public offices, but, for my part and I know I speak for many others when I say this they are not welcome any longer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I concur in the remarks of the Majority Leader and I just want to point out that the agency which are the organization which issued this press release is partially funded by the Office of Consumer Services in the Governors Office of Manpower and I think it's incumbent upon each of us to in the appropriations process to remember that."

Speaker Redmond: "We now have to go to the order of House Bills Third Reading. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker I certainly couldn't be any more eloquent than the Majority Leader, but he failed to mention that in the press release they were very inaccurate in their statement. Some of the gentlemen of this side of the aisle that they point out who had voted against all those Bills was not an accurate statement at all. I can think of one gentlemen in particular who voted present on one Bill and voted for the other two Bills. I can't for the life of me understand how an organization could be so inaccurate in a press release as this particular statement. I'm sure that the members of the press will not pay a whole lot of attention to such an inaccurate statement as this organization would release to them tonight, and I have to confess, I guess it's a time maybe for confession, that I have allowed, because I couldn't do a whole lot about it I wanted to be a gentlemen. One member of this organization, and what really disturbs me more than that is a former Member of this particular Body who I have found in my office which is open to all the Members on this side of the aisle because it's more



convenient for them to go back and receive a phone call while we're on the floor of the House and we've been working twelve and fourteen and sixteen hours a day, but to find this gentleman in my office it was not within my scope of being a gentleman to order him out. It looks as though I'm going to have to do that and I have a heavy heart in saying that because having served with anybody in this General Assembly I felt as though it was a great honor to serve with them, but I am going to have to respectfully request that that gentleman, I'm sure he's within distance, hearing distance of my voice, respectfully request that he no longer comes back and avails himself of my phone and I can remember not too long ago that the certain member of the press wrote quite a long article about us and our phones and where we're calling and thank goodness you Mr. Speaker, limited the phones to the State of Illinois. From now on that gentleman could go to a pay phone as far as I'm concerned and make his particular phone calls. It's an inaccurate statement that they put out are the gentlemen that are mentioned I realize would not stand probably and defend themselves. They don't need me to defend them. Those Bills were debated long and hard and they, in their opinion, voted the way that their constituency who elected them to represent them, they voted the way that they would... their constituency would want them. It's with a heavy heart that I stand tonight because of a former Member being involved in a organization, in association with an organization such as this that would be so inaccurate as to the voting record of Members of the Illinois General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I... I feel as depressed as all the rest of the Members do. To my knowledge, my office has never been opened to them and if it has been it isn't now and I will revoke the privilege of the floor to the gentleman that you're talking about. Now I would suggest... I would



suggest that we come to this Order of Business at midnight. We have many Members that have Bills here that they want to hear and I personally request that you let the time between now and midnight be used to take care of Members' rights with their Bills. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, as one of the Sponsors of those Bills, and I don't want to...I just want to take about thirty seconds, and I think I can speak for both Representative Marovitz and Keane. We worked long and hard on those Bills. We wanted them to pass and we worked hard for them to pass. But I do not, and Representative Marovitz does not and Representative Keane does not and...and did not, and do not and will not approve of that type of tactic. We had nothing to do with it. I have personally talked to them about it and chastised the Members that were involved in putting out that press release. And I want the Membership to know that none of us were involved in that and do not and will not approve of that type of action."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Order...Third Reading Bills. We have...we have to go to certain Bills that are necessary for state government. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 2004. Representative Matijeich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2004. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to Chain of Lakes, Fox River Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "This...this is the...this is the appropriation for the Chain of Lakes Commission which is now three million dollars, a little over three million dollars. No, this was debated in Second Reading and it's the appropriation for all of the ominous Commission and omnibus Boards and...Commission Bills. And it's now



a total of three...three million, thirty-three thousand, four hundred and seventy-one. And I urge the passage of House Bill 2004."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 44 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2098, Representative Kempiners. Is he here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2098. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for expenses for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the OCE for the Department of Mental Health and its total as amended is four hundred and sixty-eight million, four hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars. And I urge your support of House Bill 2098."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2425, Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2425. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the expense of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2425 appropriates a million, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars in the general revenue dollars for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 23 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2427."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2427. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser asks leave to take 2428 as a companion Bill. Does he have leave? Will you read...read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2428. A Bill for an...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Okay, go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, these two Bills are the authorization and the appropriation for the Capital Development Board. It was introduced at one hundred and thirty-one...one hundred and thirty-one million, nine hundred and twelve thousand, seven hundred dollar level. It is now at two hundred and forty-six million, five hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars, an increase of a hundred and fourteen million, six hundred and forty-four



thousand dollars. I'd be glad...millions of dollars. And I'll be glad to answer any questions. No questions?"

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, are these two considered together, these two Bills?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the one Bill, I believe, will require 107 votes for passage."

Speaker Redmond: "You're correct. You're correct."

Madigan: "2428."

Speaker Redmond: "You're correct. The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Just to call attention to some of the Members that...who supported and voted for Amendments to 2427 are now voting...not voting for the appropriation. And I think that's a highly irresponsible action. If you're willing to go on record to support a program you ought to be willing to vote for the cost of that program."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...these questions there are 108 'aye' and 36 'no'. Having received the extraordinary Majority are hereby declared passed. 2574."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2574. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Registration and Education which is seven million, fourteen thousand, four hundred dollars as it came out of Committee with cuts of almost



seven hundred thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 36 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2579."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2579. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. Representative Barnes is next up. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Law Enforcement Commission. It would appropriate fifty million dollars, an eleven million dollar increase over last year. And I request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "I don't want to interrupt but I want to point something out to the Membership. We've had a Sponsor ...I could have voted against that Department of Registration appropriation...for all the hard times that they gave both the Republican and the Democratic staff. And here is the Sponsor of the Bill, because she wants a perfect voting record with the conservative union, voting 'no' against her own Bill. I've never seen anything like that before. And I ought to reconsider the vote with such a...such a practice like that going on."

Speaker Redmond: "25...we're on 2579. Does she want to respond? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman on the other side



of the aisle does not know why I voted 'no'. And he was perfectly within his rights to vote anyway he chose also."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 2579, Representative Vinson's Bill. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'aye' and 24 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Con...Majority is hereby declared passed...Constitutional Convention. 2763, Representative Barnes. 2763."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2763. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Public Library Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes on 2763. Library.

Barnes: "That was in the...204...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You don't need this one? Okay, out of the record. Back to the request order. The first Bill was 1807, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, your...the digest on 1807, the House Amendment #1 is in fact the Bill so don't look at anything else there. The Bill, just as it relates there, this is a product of the Mass Transit Study Commission, Subcommittee of Transportation, and I shall read the digest. It deletes the material on Jostling and replaces as follows; provides that a person is guilty of jostling when he intentionally and unnecessarily places his hand in the proximity of a person's pocketbook, pocket or handbag or makes physical contact with another person at a time when a third person's hand is in the proximity of such person's pocket or handbook. These acts must be performed with the intent or knowledge that is for the purpose of obtaining or extracting unauthorized



control over the property of the owner. It gives a prime...prime facie evidence of the intent or knowledge of jostling which is, under this Bill, a Class A misdemeanor. This is was requested to the Subcommittee by the Chicago Police Department and it is an attempt on our part to address the problem of purse snatching and pocketbook wrestling on the mass transit system. I move for the adoption and solicit your support on House Bill 1807."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1807. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'... Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well...gosh..."

Speaker Redmond: "Talk to Senator Weaver."

Johnson: "Yeah...that's right...good Bill. Everybody should vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye', 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1855, Representative Steczko."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1855. A Bill for an Act to amend the Drawing and Summonings and Examining Jurors Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczko."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, House Bill 1855 is jointly sponsored by Representative E.G. Steele and myself. And it would provide for the permissive use of drivers license lists in addition to registered voters lists in the calling of names for jury duty. The Bill is permissive. The Office of the Secretary of State testified in Judiciary I



Committee that the fiscal impact on the state would only be approximately five thousand dollars a year. I would answer any questions but would appreciate an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1464."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1464. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning governmental tort immunity. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1464 which you'll find on 1228 of your digest amends the Governmental Tort Immunity Act. It allows local public entities to insure themselves against and pay for, from the tort fund, claims arising out of the Unemployment Insurance Act. It allows them to raise the funds for these claims through its rate making power. It places unemployment insurance compensation in the same section of the law as you'll find with workmen's comp. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Von Boeckman on deck. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 22 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1443."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1443...."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock.

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point?"

Hallock: "I put House Bill 1400 on the call early this morning and every time I appear on the podium, it's farther down the list. I know it when you get to 1400..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll get there. I'll get there in time. We're on 1443, Von Boeckman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1443. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been waiting all day too and..and what the product of House Bill 1443...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...what do you want Representative Telcser?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, the confusion at that podium is a lot worse than it ever was when Mr. Blair was Speaker. Now Represent..."

Speaker Redmond: "I have to...I have to agree with you, Mr. Telcser. You were on his side at that time."

Telcser: "Representative Hallock has asked for 1400 all day long and you've deliberately not called it and it's a question of State Government and of major public policy. Why won't you give Representative Hallock a shot at 1400?"

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody...Representative Von Boeckman. He's in the Order in which it came up. Representative Von Boeckman. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if it would make him feel better and if he'd like to go now I'll wait a few minutes. But...well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1443 is a product



of a...House Resolution 995. What House Resolution 995 at the last Session asked the Motor Vehicles Law Commission to do is study the motor vehicle registration records. We have found that the motor vehicle registration records have a crash data that is not precise. We did an indepth study on this, had testimony all over the State of Illinois, and the Commission's first impulse was to restrict all the information to the insurance companies. But...I ask your favorable support. It's a good piece of legislation. It protects the consumer."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition to Representative Von Boeckman's....Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask one question if I might of the Sponsor. I'd like to know if this Bill means that the motor vehicle record that is received from the Secretary of State can no longer reveal if an individual has been involved in an automobile accident? Is that what this Bill does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we had hearings and the insurance company..."

Schuneman: "No, I just want an answer, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Yes, it just strikes that because..."

Schuneman: "Is that what it does? Okay."

Von Boeckman: "because all of the records are not complete in the...in the..."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill if I might. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "I understand, I think, what the Sponsor is trying to do here. He probably feels that by passing this Bill he would help some people obtain insurance because the state record would not reveal that those people had been involved in an automobile accident."



And to that extent, he may be helping some citizens of Illinois. But I would point out to you that most citizens in this state are receding an advantage by having this information available. Because most citizens have not been involved in a automobile accidents and the Secretary of State's records prove that they have not been involved in an automobile accident. And therefore, they receive a lower premium on their insurance. And I think it's a mistake to pass a Bill like this which says that that information is not available. And I'd urge an ...a vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further. Representative Von Boeckman to close."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest Mr. Schuneman check his...with the insurance companies because they endorsed it. Because all the accident records are not complete, there's none from Cook County, none from St. Clair County forwarded to...for the information on the file. And there is nothing on the record that proves who is at fault in an accident. And the insurance companies endorsed this and they said it wouldn't make any difference on the...on the reclassifications. And the...the Secretary of State approves this and I think it's one of the best pieces of legislation that we could do to help the consumer."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 79 'aye' and 64 'no'. Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Von Boeckman: "I'd like a poll of the absentees."



Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees are E.M. Barnes, Bluthardt, Capparelli, Capuzi, Deuster, Domico, Epton, Gaines, Hanahan, Hoxsey, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Klosak, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, McAuliffe, Malloy, Oblinger, Pierce, Robbins, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Stearney, E.G. Steele, Vitek and Williams."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there's a misconception here. I think it's a good...I'd like to explain my vote, if I may? I...the Commission worked long and hard and we studied the issue and it's really a good Bill. And I'd like..."

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

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, aren't we passed the point of explaining votes here? We've had a poll of the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, we are."

Schuneman: "...absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, we are. Representative Capparelli 'aye'. Representative Satterthwaite 'aye'. Anything further? Represen...what's the count? On this question there's 81 'aye'...Piece 'aye'...82 'ayes'. Jaffe 'aye', 83 'ayes'. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "If this gets up to 89 votes, I'd like to verify."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, 'aye'. Anything further? What's the count? 84 'ayes', 64 'nays'. Representative Von Boeckman. Von Boeckman. 84 'ayes'. This Bill...Schneider 'aye', Harris 'aye', Steele 'aye', Hannig 'aye', Campbell 'aye', Ralph Dunn 'aye', Jones 'aye', Robbins 'aye'. Now what's the count? Representative Marovitz 'aye'. Dunn...Ralph Dunn... John Dunn 'no'. What's the count? 90 'ayes', 64... 65 'noes'. Does the Gentleman persist in his request



for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. This Bill having received...Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "No, we withdraw the request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1829. Representative Dunn. Representative Piel. Representative Hallock, you were not here at the Roll Call this morning. The Bill you're inquiring about is on page 10, Priority of Call. These Bills that we have in here were here long before the Bill that you're talking about...and you're asking to go out of order."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "1829. Representative Johnson. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, how many people were here on that Roll Call that you've been carrying around in your pocket?"

Speaker Redmond: "You weren't. Representative Piel, for what purpose do you arise?"

Piel: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Point of Order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Father Krueger you and God are my witness, if I have not been here every single day at the time that we give the prayer, every day. Now George, you're not here. Ropp even missed one day and I had to give the Pledge of Allegiance. Now...now if you look on page 8, look on page 8, you will see House Bill 1305. Look at it, look at it. Take time and look on page 8. Look on page 8 and you'll see Matijeich, House Bill 1305."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege, please? Mr. Speaker, this morning



...I won't be rude to you, Representative Matijevich, if you don't be rude to me. Thank you very much, Sir. This morning, Mr. Speaker, I met with you at nine o'clock this morning, is this correct? You and I entered the Chambers at nine fifteen and I asked you at that time where the line was going to form. I was the first one in line. At that time, Sir, about nine twenty-five, nine thirty, Mr. Hallock was exactly two behind me. My Bill was called early this morning. He was in line for 1400, two behind me, at nine thirty this morning, Mr. Speaker. Now what's fair is fair, Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Piel: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll be real fair now. We'll go to 1920...1829 and we'll hear Mr. Johnson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1829. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson. Representative..."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Hallock, esteemed colleagues, this is Representative Stearney's Bill, bipartisan support, supported by the CTA. It's a simple merely Bill on the separation agreements. I ask for a favorable Roll Call. It came out of Committee unanimously."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Well we've been revising the marriage...Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act repeatedly. I don't recall this Bill. This is on the Debate Calendar and I would like to know what this Bill is about."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "What this Bill does is to provide that if the court can throw out a separation agreement if it finds that its unfair, unjust, unreasonable. Presently, the court can only throw out an agreement if it finds the agreement unconscionable. This is...this came out of Committee unanimously and its a very simple Bill. And I ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Brummer: "Is...are those terms unfair, unjust or unreasonable defined in there? Are there any standards or is that the only languaged used?"

Johnson: "No, this is...this Bill is the suggestion of 'Judge Fleck' and it's just defined in there...used... those language. I don't know how much more specific you can be than that. This Bill had...Representative Stearney really cares about this Bill and...I think it's a good Bill. I hate to see it be caught in this morass. It's a very simple Bill. It had bipartisan support. It came out of Committee unanimously and I just ask for your support. Representative Stearney had other business and asked that I handle it."

Brummer: "I have one more question."

Johnson: "Okay."

Brummer: "Are you saying that if the parties enter into an agreement voluntarily with the advise of lawyers on either side that the judge could still throw that agreement out..."

Johnson: "I'm..."

Brummer: "...if we pass this law...if we pass this law?"

Johnson: "The present law says you can throw the agreement out if its unconscionable. This simple varies the terminology. Judge Fleck and the people who deal with this every day say it just makes it more workable and easy. It's a very merely Bill."



Brummer: "Well, it doesn't seem to have any purpose then if...if it's merely restating current law."

Johnson: "It does restate current law. It substitutes the language, unfair, unjust and unreasonable for the term unconscionable."

Brummer: "Well, the unconscionable standard is probably a more severe standard than one that is merely unfair or unjust. What you may deem to be unfair may, in my opinion, be unfair. (sic) And it seems to me what we're really doing is completely substituting the...the judgement of the court for the judgement of the parties and their attorneys."

Johnson: "Well it's kind of funny, Representative Brummer, you were in Committee and you voted for the Bill. I don't know why you changed your mind now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise on Short Debate?"

Katz: "Well I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. It's getting late but I really...was not in Committee and I didn't vote for it. I think that it is a bad Bill and I simply want...will wait to explain my vote. It's seems to me that what it is saying is that every time a court approves a separation agreement, the court is finding that it is fair and just and reasonable. Now that's ridiculous because the court can't look at every agreement and see whether it's fair and just and reasonable. They can't pass those judgements and I don't think you should expect the court do it. That's what the lawyers are for. And I believe that this is not simply a merely Bill, that it puts the court in the position it should not be in. It puts the court into the position of approving and finding as reasonable an agreement of this character and I would oppose the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf on the Short Debate."



Wolf: "Explanation of vote. If this is a merely Bill I merely want to explain my 'no' vote. I'm voting merely 'no' because the Sponsor merely went home."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'aye' and 66 'no'. And the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed (sic 2134). Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill that just failed, I know darn well...I'd give odds that the Sponsor of that Bill wasn't here at nine thirty this morning and I also know he wasn't...he isn't here now. Now fair is fair. Representative Hallock has been asking you to call for 1400. He was here. He's on the Roll Call that you're hiding in your pocket. Representative Pullen has been here every day and she's on all those Roll Calls that you have in your pocket. Now, Mr. Speaker, how about showing a little fairness to this side of the aisle or to the Members of this whole House. Now, Representative Matijevich said that he and you and Father Krueger were here this morning and I know damn well Father Krueger doesn't have a Bill. So let's be fair about this and call the Bills. And then call John Matijevich's Bill right ahead of John Hallock's and then we'll have all three of them."

Speaker Redmond: "213..."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you're abusing that Chair again, Mr. Speaker. This is shameful. This is terrible to treat the Membership of this House the way you do. And I agree with Representative Telcser, on his worst day, Bob Blair never looked as bad as you do."

Speaker Redmond: "2134, Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2134..."



Speaker Redmond: "For what purpose do you arise, Representative Hallock?"

Hallock: "Speaker, I move that we extend that deadline so we can hear 1400 which you have been putting off all day long because..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. I've called Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a good Bill, this is an important Bill...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2134. A Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "This is a good Bill, it's an important Bill. It's a Bill to reform the State Civil Service System, to give us a bureaucracy that is manageable and responsive. It creates a term appointment process for the top thousand bureaucrats in the state. It's something we've badly needed for a long time. It makes them realize that on a day certain, they will be held accountable by the public. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Barnes. Representative Stuffle in opposition?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, this Bill attempts, I think, to go the wrong way. Instead of working on the people at the bottom of the scale where the job classifications and qualifications do not involve any great abilities, this takes the career people out of the Personnel Code. And for that reason I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich in opposition."

Friedrich: "I want to ask the Sponsor, is this part of the Peter Principle? You're assuming these guys have advanced beyond their competency and you want to get rid of them?"



Vinson: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the question, Dwight."

Friedrich: "Well the Peter Principle says that you get promoted beyond your competency to produce and I assume that's what you're getting at here."

Vinson: "That's right. They get promoted beyond their competence and they get insulated. This removes just a little bit of the insulation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 11 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 4...no, 2348. Representative Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2348. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm dying of double pneumonia, I've got a sore throat, but I stuck it out and I appreciate you calling the Bill. It's... it's not a bad Bill. It's solves our road problems. It puts more money back in the road fund and I think everybody could support it. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 10 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2741. Representative Dawson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2741. A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson."

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



this Minimum Wage Law Bill will increase our minimum wages from \$2.90 an hour, except for the first year, except for young people under 18 years of age... we will raise to \$2.50 an hour. And in 1980 we will raise them...the minimum wage to \$3.10 per hour and... for people underneath 18 to \$2.65 and hour. And in January of 1981, the \$3.35 an hour...and for people under 18 a \$2.85 per hour. May I ask for your support, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone...anyone in opposition? Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill on the simple principle, again, that we have a situation where we are mandating minimum wages on the small employer in Illinois at a time when we are going in, perhaps, to an economic recession caused by a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. This isn't the time to throw people out of jobs or the small employer or people who have marginal positions. And this is just adding to the unemployment problem that we are going to have in the State of Illinois. And this legislation has been further amended through the Amendment process to include other areas which I will not get into because of the hour. But I would urge that the Members...closer look at this Bill and cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate. You can explain your vote. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Birkinbine. One minute to explain his vote."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would suggest to you, and particularly to the Members of the Black caucus here in the Illinois House, that there is probably no law that we pass or



that government at any level passes that more directly increases the high rate of unemployment among teenage people out of work then increasing the minimum wage. I would suggest to the Members of the Black caucus or people who have interest in any minorities with a high rate of teenage unemployment, that this is going...only going to exacerbate that problem and make things worse. I suggest you vote against it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always good to hear those that are always rising in defense of big business, occasionally rise in the defense of the worker who makes wages that are below the poverty level in this state. It's always good to hear those people talk and say that this is really going to hurt the poor. Well really it isn't going to hurt the poor. The other day we put an Amendment on here by Representative Catania for household workers. Household workers that come into your house and clean your toilet and clean out your ashtrays and mop up your dirt and we pay them \$2.00 an hour or \$1.65 an hour. You know what we're asking you to do? We're asking you to pay these low wage workers \$2.90 an hour, \$25.00 a day, \$5000.00 a year. Now isn't that something. That is really something to stand up and say that this is inflationary. Less than 1% of the workers, less than 1% of the wages, in this state are paid for people earning below the minimum wage. Somehow this is inflationary. Somehow this is going to hurt the poor. It's going to hurt the poor to give them a decent wage. It's going to hurt the poor to bring them a little bit above the poverty level. Isn't that a shame that we're going to hurt the poor by paying them a wage that they can actually survive on."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, actually what this minimum wage does is proprot to conform to the federal minimum wage. It goes far beyond that and let's not kid ourselves. In all instances, it's not inconcert with the federal minimum wage and there may be problems with the Federal Minimum Wage Act. I suggest to the Members of the House to turn this Bill down at this particular time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's interesting. We've got a great labor leader on this side of the aisle who hasn't been here all day, who makes \$25,000 a year, who is an advocate of the people that aren't getting a minimum wage and he's not here to defend them. Why should I? Where is he? Where is this great labor leader?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm responding to the remark from the other side of the aisle that those Members of the Black caucus should be voting against this Bill. Well may I say to you, since I know from personal knowledge, that the majority of persons in the work field of the domestic workers are homemakers or household persons belong to the Black race, I stand in support of minimum wages so they can try to pull themselves up by their boot straps."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to that before... I happen to be handling this Bill myself and I happen to be a union member for fifteen years and my card is paid up now. I don't worry about Representative Hanahan if he's not here. I'm speaking up for myself



and for the other people that are here. I been here all day just like everybody else."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Hanahan is in Pecatonica which is right near Rockford."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye'...97 'aye', 55 'no'. Representative Simms has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Everyone be in your own seat. Be in your own seat. Representative Dawson. Representative has requested..."

Dawson: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "...a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. Abramson. Bluthardt. Capuzi. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Hanahan. Hoffman. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe. Meyer. Oblinger. Peters and Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Could you ask those on the other side of the aisle to follow Hanahan's Rule..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, sit down. Sit down. Be in your own seat and when your name is called please...come on... out of deference and courtesy to your Members. We're trying hard to reach Bills here. Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoke all day and I've been here all day. And here we're talking about the lowest class of people that are working. We've voted for judges, we've voted for state's attorneys. What I'm saying to you now, this is the last Bill that will go out of this House if it's verified and it's defeated. It's the last Bill because every one from here on will be verified."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Please, sit down in your own seats and raise your hand when your name is called."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti...no'. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hannig. Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Koskinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a moment, Mr. Clerk. I like, once again, to remind the Members that we only have until midnight to request Bills to be put on the Spring Calendar. Anything...anything that looks like it may be visited on Memorial Day, you better...if you want to save it you better sign the sheet up here. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Koskinski. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Malloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Henry. Slape. Stanley. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duynes. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Willer. Williams. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"



Lechowicz: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. What are we starting off with?"

Speaker Redmond: "How many? 96 'ayes'."

Lechowicz: "96 'ayes'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Yeah, Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Simms: "Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty. How's he recorded. Remove him."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty...voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Simms: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Bullock. You're not Bullock, your Jones. Did you forget? How's he recorded? Take him...he's not in his seat."

Simms: "Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Darrow is here."

Simms: "Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded? Domico. Is he here? Remove him."

Simms: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Goodwin."

Speaker Redmond: "Goodwin here? Goodwin here? Remove him."

Simms: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly here? Remove him."

Simms: "Kozubowski."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Kozubowski here? Remove him."

Simms: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's right here."

Simms: "Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Kosinski here? Remove him."

Simms: "McGrew."



Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Simms: "O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Simms: "Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Polk."

Simms: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Ronan. Remove him."

Simms: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "Sharp. Remove him."

Simms: "Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Steczo. Steczo here? Here is he."

Simms: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Van Duyne here? There's Van Duyne."

Simms: "Representative White."

Speaker Redmond: "Is White here? He's in the back."

Simms: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "Willer's here."

Simms: "Representative Williams."

Speaker Redmond: "William's here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Simms: "Representative Garmisa. We took..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Garmisa here? He's in the aisle."

Simms: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Mugalian."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "In the back."



Simms: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "In the back."

Simms: "Kulas."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Representative Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Simms: "Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Catania. She's right in front of you."

Simms: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Williams has returned, put him back on."

Simms: "Representative Telcser."

Speaker Redmond: "Telcser is in the middle aisle."

Simms: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score? Representative Margalus, for what purpose do you rise? Margalus."

Margalus: "Mr. Speaker, please change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. What's the count? What's the count? On this question there's 89 'aye'...how many 'no'? 56 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1473, Representative Schlickman. Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you rise?"

Satterthwaite: "Having voted on the prevailing side of the previous question, I ask that...that motion be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite having voted on the prevailing side moves that the vote by which it passed be reconsidered. Representative Pierce moves that that lie on the Table. The question is on Representative Pierce's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. 1473, Representative Schlickman."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1473. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1473 is an Amendment to the Illinois Banking Act. It's an Amendment that would have limited application but is of vital importance to the depositors of this state. The Bank deals with the problem of failing banks and would give, where there was an absolute necessity, would give authority to the Commissioner of banks to engage in a supervisory merger. The bank...the Bill, by Amendment, has the support of all elements of the industry including the Illinois Banking Association and the independent community banks support it and need it by Bill...Harris, former State Senator and Commissioner of Banks. I know of no opposition and I solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that all those motions which have been filed with the Clerk requesting that Bills be placed on the Spring Calendar be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. 1211."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 120...137 'aye' and 3 'no'. The motion carries. 1211, Representative Kornowicz."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1211. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "...to amend the...an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Committee, this is a Bill that I got caught in between the switches so I need your help. It amends the...an Act concerning public utilities that provides that railroad companies shall inspect and test all signs, signals, automatic crossing gates and certain railroads. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, what order is this on the Calendar? Is it on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Ryan: "No. Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes. Short Debate. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ewell: "I want to know if the Gentleman wants some help?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 55 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Schlickman. Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have been very critical of the Speaker during this past Session, particularly with respect to how I thought the House ought to be operated. Going into debate, Mr. Speaker and Members, I didn't think we would be able to accomplish what we did accomplish. Frankly,



I think a minor miracle occurred. And I do want to extend my compliments to the Speaker, to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the Adjournment Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 53. Resolved by the Senate of the Eight-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois that the House of Representative is concurring herein that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 25, 1979 it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 29, 1979 at 12 o'clock noon. And when the House of Representative adjourns on Friday, May 25, 1979 it stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 30 of 1979 at 1 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, earlier there was some conversation about this Public Action Committee. And I just want to tell you about one more activity they're engaged in because it may involve you. In one case, they were in the district of one of the Senators, in this new area, using his name to solicit funds. It was quite a while before he found out that they were doing that. So I would suggest to you that you be aware of that and also aware of the fact that they're going through your election disclosure and...economic interest



disclosure too. So this little outfit is pretty busy so I suggest you keep your eye on some of the other things they're doing too."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. They went through my disclosure and they sent me a contribution. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I just wanted to thank everybody here for voting for my funeral Bill that was on the No Debate Calendar. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "...Have leave to have House Bills 426, 1993 and 1994 on the Spring Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "There's a motion down here, Representative Jones. Did you file a motion? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to belabor a point but earlier tonight on the same point that Representative Friedrich just raised. I read the press release that was written. It was a vicious, vicious attack on some of the finest of our colleagues of this House on either side of the aisle. Now we have our differences and we win some and we lose some. But that was a terribly vicious attack and I, for one, resented it deeply and applaud the Majority Leader who I thought took a courageous stand and stood up here and exposed the Illinois Public Action Council for what it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 50...House Joint Resolution 58, Marovitz. House Resolution 311, Taylor. 313, Waddell. 314, Waddell. 315, Waddell. 316, Waddell. 317, Waddell. 318, Chapman. 320, Peters. 321, Kornowicz. 322, Oblinger. 323, Tuerk. 324, Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Marovitz's 58 honors honors Bob Taylor's 311 notes that John Wayne has got



the gold...the Congressional Medal of Honor. Waddell's 313 talks about the way of life. 314 by Waddell talks Marjorie Cox. Waddell's 315 honor Lorraine Green. Waddell's 316, Jessie Bowdish. Waddell's 317, Dale Weber. Chapman's 318, the girls from Arlington High. Peter's 320, National Council...Scouts. Kornowicz's 321, St. Pancrions School. 322 by Oblinger, a historic New Salem State Park. 323 by Tuerk honors an anniversary. 324 by Steczo, a wedding anniversary. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi...moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 307, Tuerk, to respect the memory of Doctor Stanley Niehaus. House Resolution 312, Conti, to respect the memory of George E. Spatuzza House Resolution 319, Friedrich, to respect the memory of Charles E. Spears."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, do you need any time for Perfunctory? Representative Madigan, ten minutes for Perfunctory."

Madigan: "Providing ten minutes for a Perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn until Wednesday at 1 p.m., Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for...that we adjourn until 10 o'clock...1 o'clock, Wednesday after ten minutes Perfunctory. 1 o'clock, isn't it, Jack? It's 1 o'clock."



Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. We now stand adjourned except Representative Collins. He can stay. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I may not be here for the invocation every morning but I'm here for the benediction."

Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following...to...Joint Resolution to wit: House Joint Resolution 57, concurred in by the Senate May 25, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills with the following title and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills 890, 905, 906, 889, 1000, 1002, 1025, 1038, 1047, 1053, 1061, 1072, 1084, 1100, 1117, 1246, 1251, 835, 844, 859, 883, 884, 872, 892, 895, 911, 923, 932, 939, 940, 942, 773, 729, 752...hold that, back from 773, then 927, 952, 963, 973, 974, 1001, 1037, 1040, 1164, 1172, 661, 667, 669, 689, 708, 723, 724, 730, 745, 746, 750, 751, 752, 761, 765, 767, 768, 793, 825, 828, 931, passed by the Senate May 25, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 346, Dyer. A Bill for an act in relation to detention of and shelter care for juveniles. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 716, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights of Bureau Count. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 717, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to restore an access route in Bureau County. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 790.



Davis. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading...First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 801, Bullock. A Bill for an Act to amend the Comptroller Merit Employment Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 873, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1046, Farley. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Legislative Space Needs Commission. First Reading of the Bill. That last Bill was 1045. Senate Bill 1070, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1099, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1412, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating licensing regulation of community currency exchanges. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1424, Dyer. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0004	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0016	2ND READING	PAGE	222
	3RD READING	PAGE	223
HB-0065	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-0111	3RD READING	PAGE	302
HB-0114	3RD READING	PAGE	42
HB-0162	3RD READING	PAGE	67
HB-0179	3RD READING	PAGE	5
HB-0251	3RD READING	PAGE	136
HB-0265	3RD READING	PAGE	151
HB-0272	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HB-0320	3RD READING	PAGE	302
HB-0348	3RD READING	PAGE	303
HB-0350	3RD READING	PAGE	20
HB-0421	3RD READING	PAGE	303
HB-0450	3RD READING	PAGE	83
HB-0453	3RD READING	PAGE	303
HB-0499	3RD READING	PAGE	304
HB-0505	3RD READING	PAGE	304
HB-0509	3RD READING	PAGE	134
HB-0525	3RD READING	PAGE	304
HB-0532	3RD READING	PAGE	304
HB-0552	3RD READING	PAGE	80
HB-0662	3RD READING	PAGE	164
HB-0663	3RD READING	PAGE	305
HB-0667	3RD READING	PAGE	305
HB-0682	3RD READING	PAGE	305
HB-0690	2ND READING	PAGE	219
HB-0691	3RD READING	PAGE	306
HB-0700	3RD READING	PAGE	306
HB-0723	3RD READING	PAGE	306
HB-0745	3RD READING	PAGE	7
HB-0754	3RD READING	PAGE	306
HB-0809	3RD READING	PAGE	307
HB-0828	3RD READING	PAGE	307
HB-0829	3RD READING	PAGE	77
HB-0834	2ND READING	PAGE	225
	3RD READING	PAGE	231
HB-0837	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HB-0893	3RD READING	PAGE	137
HB-0900	3RD READING	PAGE	56
HB-0926	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HB-0944	3RD READING	PAGE	307

HB-0947	3RD READING	PAGE	307
HB-0948	3RD READING	PAGE	308
HB-0953	3RD READING	PAGE	308
HB-0981	3RD READING	PAGE	308
HB-0987	3RD READING	PAGE	308
HB-0991	3RD READING	PAGE	309
HB-1027	3RD READING	PAGE	309
HB-1030	3RD READING	PAGE	267
HB-1031	3RD READING	PAGE	29
HB-1048	3RD READING	PAGE	309
HB-1063	3RD READING	PAGE	310
HB-1068	3RD READING	PAGE	310
HB-1088	3RD READING	PAGE	310
HB-1125	3RD READING	PAGE	311
HB-1128	3RD READING	PAGE	311
HB-1129	3RD READING	PAGE	311
HB-1139	3RD READING	PAGE	312
HB-1156	3RD READING	PAGE	312
HB-1211	3RD READING	PAGE	393
HB-1225	3RD READING	PAGE	103
HB-1226	3RD READING	PAGE	312
HB-1230	3RD READING	PAGE	312
HB-1248	3RD READING	PAGE	313
HB-1261	3RD READING	PAGE	6
HB-1264	3RD READING	PAGE	313
HB-1270	3RD READING	PAGE	319
HB-1271	3RD READING	PAGE	103
HB-1272	3RD READING	PAGE	320
HB-1273	3RD READING	PAGE	320
HB-1274	3RD READING	PAGE	320
HB-1292	3RD READING	PAGE	321
HB-1293	3RD READING	PAGE	321
HB-1299	3RD READING	PAGE	186
HB-1300	3RD READING	PAGE	321
HB-1302	3RD READING	PAGE	10
HB-1307	3RD READING	PAGE	321
HB-1319	3RD READING	PAGE	287
HB-1328	3RD READING	PAGE	322
HB-1353	3RD READING	PAGE	295
HB-1354	3RD READING	PAGE	295
HB-1358	3RD READING	PAGE	322
HB-1361	3RD READING	PAGE	322
HB-1372	3RD READING	PAGE	82

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

PAGE 3

HB-1377	3RD READING	PAGE	322
HB-1396	3RD READING	PAGE	323
HB-1410	3RD READING	PAGE	323
HB-1422	3RD READING	PAGE	324
HB-1423	3RD READING	PAGE	325
HB-1426	3RD READING	PAGE	325
HB-1434	3RD READING	PAGE	325
HB-1443	3RD READING	PAGE	373
HB-1457	3RD READING	PAGE	325
HB-1462	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-1463	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-1464	3RD READING	PAGE	372
HB-1470	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-1473	3RD READING	PAGE	392
HB-1479	3RD READING	PAGE	327
HB-1485	3RD READING	PAGE	327
HB-1494	3RD READING	PAGE	286
HB-1501	3RD READING	PAGE	327
HB-1508	3RD READING	PAGE	327
HB-1510	3RD READING	PAGE	328
HB-1529	3RD READING	PAGE	328
HB-1535	3RD READING	PAGE	328
HB-1540	3RD READING	PAGE	329
HB-1542	3RD READING	PAGE	61
HB-1573	3RD READING	PAGE	85
HB-1574	3RD READING	PAGE	329
HB-1576	3RD READING	PAGE	27
HB-1579	3RD READING	PAGE	329
HB-1617	3RD READING	PAGE	329
HB-1622	3RD READING	PAGE	330
HB-1676	3RD READING	PAGE	330
HB-1679	3RD READING	PAGE	169
HB-1687	3RD READING	PAGE	330
HB-1688	3RD READING	PAGE	331
HB-1694	3RD READING	PAGE	252
HB-1699	3RD READING	PAGE	331
HB-1700	3RD READING	PAGE	296
HB-1703	3RD READING	PAGE	331
HB-1706	3RD READING	PAGE	89
HB-1712	3RD READING	PAGE	332
HB-1725	3RD READING	PAGE	332
HB-1726	3RD READING	PAGE	332
HB-1734	3RD READING	PAGE	333

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

PAGE 4

HB-1757	3RD	READING	PAGE	333
HB-1759	3RD	READING	PAGE	333
HB-1780	3RD	READING	PAGE	58
HB-1782	3RD	READING	PAGE	333
HB-1787	3RD	READING	PAGE	334
HB-1790	3RD	READING	PAGE	334
HB-1802	3RD	READING	PAGE	334
HB-1804	3RD	READING	PAGE	335
HB-1805	3RD	READING	PAGE	336
HB-1807	3RD	READING	PAGE	371
HB-1811	3RD	READING	PAGE	336
HB-1812	3RD	READING	PAGE	336
HB-1816	3RD	READING	PAGE	235
HB-1829	3RD	READING	PAGE	378
HB-1855	3RD	READING	PAGE	371
HB-1869	3RD	READING	PAGE	337
HB-1873	3RD	READING	PAGE	66
HB-1874	3RD	READING	PAGE	337
HB-1891	3RD	READING	PAGE	108
HB-1900	3RD	READING	PAGE	337
HB-1903	3RD	READING	PAGE	337
HB-1906	3RD	READING	PAGE	338
HB-1907	3RD	READING	PAGE	338
HB-1939	3RD	READING	PAGE	338
HB-1944	3RD	READING	PAGE	98
HB-1945	3RD	READING	PAGE	133
HB-1950	3RD	READING	PAGE	338
HB-1955	3RD	READING	PAGE	339
HB-1963	3RD	READING	PAGE	339
HB-1967	3RD	READING	PAGE	339
HB-1976	3RD	READING	PAGE	340
HB-1978	3RD	READING	PAGE	340
HB-2004	3RD	READING	PAGE	365
HB-2012	3RD	READING	PAGE	340
HB-2019	3RD	READING	PAGE	340
HB-2020	3RD	READING	PAGE	341
HB-2049	3RD	READING	PAGE	209
HB-2065	3RD	READING	PAGE	341
HB-2072	3RD	READING	PAGE	341
HB-2074	3RD	READING	PAGE	342
HB-2077	3RD	READING	PAGE	294
HB-2078	3RD	READING	PAGE	342
HB-2089	3RD	READING	PAGE	342

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

HB-2098	3RD	READING	PAGE	366
HB-2120	3RD	READING	PAGE	343
HB-2128	3RD	READING	PAGE	343
HB-2129	3RD	READING	PAGE	343
HB-2130	3RD	READING	PAGE	343
HB-2132	3RD	READING	PAGE	344
HB-2134	3RD	READING	PAGE	382
HB-2149	3RD	READING	PAGE	344
HB-2152	3RD	READING	PAGE	344
HB-2162	3RD	READING	PAGE	133
HB-2164	3RD	READING	PAGE	66
HB-2165	3RD	READING	PAGE	258
HB-2168	3RD	READING	PAGE	210
HB-2179	3RD	READING	PAGE	344
HB-2185	3RD	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2186	3RD	READING	PAGE	345
HB-2192	3RD	READING	PAGE	345
HB-2200	3RD	READING	PAGE	345
HB-2204	3RD	READING	PAGE	346
HB-2207	3RD	READING	PAGE	346
HB-2210	3RD	READING	PAGE	138
HB-2213	3RD	READING	PAGE	14
HB-2226	3RD	READING	PAGE	346
HB-2233	3RD	READING	PAGE	346
HB-2240	3RD	READING	PAGE	347
HB-2245	3RD	READING	PAGE	178
HB-2273	3RD	READING	PAGE	256
HB-2274	3RD	READING	PAGE	172
HB-2282	3RD	READING	PAGE	115
HB-2283	3RD	READING	PAGE	115
HB-2284	3RD	READING	PAGE	57
HB-2298	3RD	READING	PAGE	347
HB-2300	3RD	READING	PAGE	348
HB-2301	3RD	READING	PAGE	348
HB-2302	3RD	READING	PAGE	348
HB-2303	3RD	READING	PAGE	348
HB-2310	3RD	READING	PAGE	86
HB-2335	3RD	READING	PAGE	349
HB-2348	3RD	READING	PAGE	383
HB-2354	3RD	READING	PAGE	11
HB-2355	3RD	READING	PAGE	12
HB-2356	3RD	READING	PAGE	11
HB-2357	3RD	READING	PAGE	68

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

PAGE 6

HB-2358	3RD READING	PAGE	69
HB-2360	3RD READING	PAGE	70
HB-2362	3RD READING	PAGE	211
HB-2367	3RD READING	PAGE	349
HB-2369	3RD READING	PAGE	349
HB-2377	3RD READING	PAGE	81
HB-2378	3RD READING	PAGE	81
HB-2387	3RD READING	PAGE	350
HB-2389	3RD READING	PAGE	350
HB-2392	3RD READING	PAGE	350
HB-2393	3RD READING	PAGE	351
HB-2398	3RD READING	PAGE	351
HB-2410	3RD READING	PAGE	352
HB-2416	3RD READING	PAGE	352
HB-2417	3RD READING	PAGE	352
HB-2419	3RD READING	PAGE	70
HB-2421	3RD READING	PAGE	353
HB-2425	3RD READING	PAGE	366
HB-2427	3RD READING	PAGE	367
HB-2428	3RD READING	PAGE	367
HB-2429	3RD READING	PAGE	353
HB-2440	3RD READING	PAGE	266
HB-2471	3RD READING	PAGE	298
HB-2492	3RD READING	PAGE	275
HB-2500	3RD READING	PAGE	353
HB-2546	3RD READING	PAGE	354
HB-2548	3RD READING	PAGE	354
HB-2574	3RD READING	PAGE	368
HB-2579	3RD READING	PAGE	369
HB-2587	3RD READING	PAGE	355
HB-2593	3RD READING	PAGE	355
HB-2603	3RD READING	PAGE	13
HB-2613	3RD READING	PAGE	355
HB-2614	3RD READING	PAGE	107
HB-2637	3RD READING	PAGE	355
HB-2641	3RD READING	PAGE	356
HB-2642	3RD READING	PAGE	356
HB-2643	3RD READING	PAGE	356
HB-2644	3RD READING	PAGE	357
HB-2658	3RD READING	PAGE	212
HB-2659	3RD READING	PAGE	357
HB-2678	3RD READING	PAGE	357
HB-2679	3RD READING	PAGE	357

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

HB-2715	3RD READING	PAGE	358
HB-2718	3RD READING	PAGE	358
HB-2719	3RD READING	PAGE	358
HB-2734	3RD READING	PAGE	359
HB-2735	3RD READING	PAGE	56
HB-2740	3RD READING	PAGE	359
HB-2741	3RD READING	PAGE	383
HB-2746	3RD READING	PAGE	359
HB-2750	3RD READING	PAGE	359
HB-2766	3RD READING	PAGE	360
HB-2767	3RD READING	PAGE	360
HB-2769	3RD READING	PAGE	135
HB-2771	3RD READING	PAGE	360
HB-2778	3RD READING	PAGE	360
HB-2779	3RD READING	PAGE	361
HB-2780	3RD READING	PAGE	361
SB-0030	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0041	1ST READING	PAGE	148
SB-0044	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0046	1ST READING	PAGE	148
SB-0047	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0048	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-0065	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-0080	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0123	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0140	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0154	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0172	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0346	1ST READING	PAGE	397
SB-0625	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-0716	1ST READING	PAGE	397
SB-0717	1ST READING	PAGE	397
SB-0758	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-0775	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-0790	1ST READING	PAGE	397
SB-0801	1ST READING	PAGE	398
SB-0873	1ST READING	PAGE	398
SB-0930	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0955	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0970	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-1045	1ST READING	PAGE	398
SB-1086	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1099	1ST READING	PAGE	398

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 25, 1979

PAGE 8

SB-1110	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1200	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1241	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-1360	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1375	1ST READING	PAGE	149
SB-1389	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1404	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1412	1ST READING	PAGE	398
SB-1424	1ST READING	PAGE	398
HR-0307	3RD READING	PAGE	396
HR-0312	3RD READING	PAGE	396
HR-0319	3RD READING	PAGE	396
SJR-0053	3RD READING	PAGE	394

## SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. ROPP - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
HOUSE RECESSED	PAGE	148
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	148
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	148
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	149
SPEAKER FLINN - HOUSE RECONVENED	PAGE	150
SPRING CALENDAR MOTIONS ADOPTED	PAGE	392
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	395
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	396
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	397
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	398