

1.

Speaker Redmond: "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 Our service this day. Amen. Let us remember in our prayers, Nina, the deceased wife of former Representative Don Brummet, who died yesterday. O GOD, whose mercies cannot be numbered; Accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of thy servant, Nina departed, and grant her an entrance into the land of light and joy, in the fellowship of thy saints; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. May she rest in Peace and may Light perpetual shine upon her. Let us also remember today in our prayers, the thirty-ninth wedding anniversary of Representative Josephine Oblinger and her husband, Walter. O ETERNAL GOD, we humbly beseech Thee, favorably to behold Thy servants Josephine and Walter joined together in wedlock these 39 years according to Thy holy ordinance; and grant that they, continuing to seek first Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness, may obtain the manifold blessings of Thy grace; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. Bertrand Russell wrote: In all affairs, love, religion, politics or business, it's a healthy idea now and then, to hang a question mark on those things you have long taken for granted. Let us pray. O LORD GOD, our Companion and our Guide in the way of life, we give Thee our thankfulness for all the things of our life, and, especially, for this day here present as we serve as members of this Illinois House of Representatives. Refresh our minds; clarify our ideals; and enlighten our wills as we meet daily the new challenges that are thrust before us. Let us constantly re-examine our convictions and actions in the light of ever changing values to ascertain they are in harmony with that which is prudent and desirable to Thy ever-



lasting will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Collins to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Representative Collins not here? Representative Ropp."

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: "Committee reports. Representative Collins. Put him on the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources, wished the following Bills were referred action taken April 25, 1979. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Interim study. House Bills 913, 1488, 1539, 1004, 2037, 2084, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, and 2685."

Speaker Redmond: "Approval of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 32nd Legislative Day, Wednesday, April 18, 1979. The House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker in the Chair. Prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain. Representative Ropp led the House in the Pledge of Allegiance. By direction of the Speaker, a Roll Call was taken, who ascertained the attendance of members as follows:"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker. I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal, and that ~~JJournal~~ ~~#18~~ of April 18th and 19 of April 19th, 1979, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there any discussion? Question's on the motion. Okay. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The correct Journal numbers are 32 and 33 for the 18th and 19th of April."

Getty: "So amend my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Motion's been so amended, and the ques-



tion's on the motion. Those in favor say 'Aye'. 'Aye'.  
 Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it. Motion carried.  
 The Journals are approved. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 235, Henry; 237, McBroom;  
 238, Younge; 239, Kucharski; 240, Robbins; 241, Stuffle;  
 242, Currie; 243, Currie; 246, J. David Jones; 247, Braun;  
 248, O'Brien; 249, Willer; 250, Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. 235 by Marks (sic) talks about the  
 Missionary Baptist Church, Mr. McBroom tells about a  
 Mother of the Year, 38 (sic) honors Retailer of the Year,  
 39 (sic) notes a 50th anniversary, 40 (sic) spreads on  
 the record a school's girl's basketball team, Stuffle  
 informs about A.M. problems, Currie records a recognized  
 scholar, 43 (sic) heralds the South Shore Commission's  
 25th year, Jones talks about a 50-year piano teacher,  
 47 (sic) by Savage (sic), the wealth of Chicago, 248 by  
 O'Brien, the Lincoln Park Conservation, 249 by Willer...  
 this has to be...249 should be taken out, Mr. Speaker,  
 and 250 talks about an institution of marriage, and I  
 move for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. 249 should  
 be taken out."

Speaker Redmond: "What's with 250?"

Giorgi: "It's Redmon...Redmond's institution of marriage."

Speaker Redmond: "Tomaselli in that?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for  
 the adoption of the Resolutions? Those in favor say  
 'Aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it.  
 Motion carried. Resolutions are adopted. General Reso-  
 lutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 234, Borchers; 236, Culler-  
 ton; 245, Gaines; 249, Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment." Representative  
 Borchers."



Borchers: "I would like permission of the House to be excused for my absence at...at 5:30 last night. I was in the last Committee meeting. I think it was 5:15. I believe it was Executive. Things happened so fast, I can't, don't remember exactly which Committee. I'm sure some of 'em here...when I passed a...was there on the Bill or so will remember for me and back me up that I was there in one of the Committees at 5 o'clock. But I was notified that my granddaughter happened to be backed into, but we didn't know what the situation was, and there is no one in my family available except myself. So, when I found this out, I headed for home, and I was there, here all day in all the Committees, except the Session last night. It was just unavoidable, 'cause I felt I should know if there's anything serious or not. So I..I request permission to be excused."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Representative Walsh?" Hearing no objection, the record will be so recorded. Change of votes. Mr. Clerk, do you have any requests for change of votes?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz requests to vote 'Aye' on House Bill 751, Kempiner's 'Aye' on 749, Collin's 'Aye' on 666, Kempiner's from 'Aye' to 'No' on House Bill 875, Totten 'Nay' on 875, Tim Johnson 'Aye' on 807 and 796, McBroom 'No' to 'Aye' on Senate Bill 92, Pierce 'Aye' on 1184, Kelly 'Aye' on 841, McAuliffe 'Aye' on 303, Capuzi 'Aye' on 303, Conti 'Aye' on 551, Reed 'Aye' on a motion on House Joint Resolution 35, Alexander 'No' to 'Aye' on a Consent Calendar for April 24, Peters 'Aye' on 225, Swanstrom 'No' to 'Aye' on House Bill 597, Christensen 'Aye' on House Bill 597, Van Duyne 'Aye' on House Bill 597, and Campbell 'Aye' on House Bill 597."

Speaker Redmond: "Do they have leave to have the votes recorded as read by the Clerk? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. And incidentally, I make, make an observation



here that this system that we have is getting to be pretty horrendous. It poses a frightful problem in the Clerk's office. The recording, mechanical recording of the votes really is kind of a nullity when we do this. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "The Speaker of the Senate's gotta system that you can't beat. Once you vote, that's it, and there's no way you can change it. No way, and I'd like to see us get to that system right away if we can."

Speaker Redmond: "I would like...I would like to, and the Clerk's office would like it. This is, this is just awful. Representative Ryan says he likes it so well, he's gonna run for the Senate. Representa...Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like consent of the House to table House Bill 1764."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?" Hoffman: "House Bill 177...64." Speaker Redmond: "17...hearing no objection...1764 is tabled. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Priority of Call, Page 5, appears House Bill 4...847. Representative Stiehl is representing it. I understand you want to return that to Second. Am I right on that?"

Stiehl: "That's right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl desires to have 847 returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of amendment. Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Young. Amends House Bill 847 on Page 1, Line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young."

Young: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This amendment would request and require the Southwest Port District to assist and participate in the efforts of former employee groups to



promote job opportunities on the site that they have displaced and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker. Has the amendment been printed?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, it has not, and we can't consider the adoption of it, since it has not yet been printed and distributed. Leave it on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 486, Mahar. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Consent Calendar. First Reading on Page 28."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar. Second Reading. Second Day. Page 28 on the Calendar. House Bill 1289. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Dangerous Drug Abuse Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1290. A Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Drugs Abuse Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1850. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1150."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1150. Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, yes. Pardon me. That's on First Day. ...Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, Page 29. Representative Friedrich." Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker. Representative Getty has raised a question about one Bill, and I'm trying to get the answer, and I should have it in a few minutes. I would appreciate it if you could hold this just for a few minutes, just till I get...it has to do with an appraisal, Sir." If you want to eliminate the Bill from this Roll Call, we could do that. I have no objection to that."

Speaker Redmond: "That's too involved, I think."

Friedrich: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate on Page 22. 446."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 446. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Game Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer." Representative Boucek, Representative Daniels please sit down."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 446..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker. It's my recollection that last night this...there were 10 people requested this be put on Long Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that right, Mr. Clerk? It is on the wrong debate, but it still appears on the Short Debate Calendar. Proceed Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "House Bill 446 is a very basic Bill. Came out of Environment Natural Resources 13-0. It merely allows and provides in the statutes that with regard to hunting, presently, the law provides that no one can hunt within 200 yards of a dwelling. In the congested areas of our State, such as the chain of lakes in northern Lake County where there's a great deal of fowl, duck hunting, etc. the residents have, by and large, found that 200 yards



is not adequate. It's not adequate, because just as in a case of our speed limit. When we set this for 200 yards, the hunters always sort of fudge a little bit, and go down to 150 yards. And their homes, and their, their automobiles, their property, their children, themselves are being rained with buckshot. And in order to avoid this, it's suggested in the Bill that we change this minimum to 300 yards. During the time that Representative Harris had his Bill down here on...lead shot versus steel shot, I talked to some of the hunters from Cen...Southern Illinois. These are the very avid hunters, because they were down here on that very important issue, and I found none of them that were in any way disagreeing with this concept. Three hundred yards is a protective for the health and safety of the people. In their private homes, I think they have a right to this peace and quiet. That's all this Bill does. Incidentally, the Department of Conservation in no way opposed this, whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. My only comment on this we...would be. They were talking about a distance from here to the Armory, and certainly most of the hunting is done with shotgun and bow and arrow, and I could have a 40-acre farm and I couldn't hunt on it, because I had a neighbor that didn't happen to like me. And I think this is going too far and taking away the rights of other people. I think 200 yards is a reasonable distance. I think 300 yards is unreasonable."

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

Bradley: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to support what...the comments of Representative Friedrich. Two hundred yards seems to me to be a reasonable distance when you're hunting with a shotgun, and at, 300 yards wouldn't be enough if you were





hunting with a 30-30 rifle. And the Department of Conservation understands, doesn't oppose it, didn't take a position on the issue, and that 200 yards seems to be sufficient to me, and I'm gonna vote 'present' on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?' Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "I'd like to close, Mr. Speaker, if I may?"

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You have two interest factors here, and all of you know that I have sponsored many Bills pertaining to wildlife and conservation. Sort of pride myself on being able to carry Bills to that effect. The one interest factor are the people in their private homes. The other interest factor are the hunters. Now there is absolutely no need, whatsoever, to give a higher priority to hunters over people in their private homes. If you feel that we should maintain a system which presently is not working and notwithstanding what any of the prior speakers said, it is not working, I've got petitions from about 500 people in the chain of lakes area who testify that their homes are being rained on with shot, and that, in one case, one of the children were hit with this shot, then, if you do not believe that those people's rights should be protected, then you want to vote 'No' on my Bill. But, if you think that a person in his private home, maybe your home, should be protected, there's nothing wrong with 300 yards. Just consider hunting within 300 yards of your single-family home. Think about it. I don't think anybody'd want anything less than that. Two hundred yards is a pretty short distance when you hear those guns going off, and they go off very often during duck season. I think this is just a moderate approach, and the very fact the Conservation Department didn't in any way object to this, I think tells us something. I would urge an 'Aye' vote."



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

Skinner: "I would like to echo Representative Griesheimer's plea for a 'Yes' vote on this Bill. I've had numerous complaints from the village, from residents in the village of McHenry Shores right south of McHenry that hunters hunting at a state park, or in the river next to the state park are endangering the lives of the people living in the, in the municipality. It's really an incredible situation, and it may not be the same down-State. Perhaps there is some way that a compromise can be worked out with regard to distance from a, from an incorporated subdivision. Maybe it's different if it's not an incorporated subdivision, but when you have an area that is as populated, populated enough to become an incorporated village, and you've got shot coming down on people's heads, virtually, that just can't be tolerated doesn't seem to me. Not...besides the fact it's inconvenient, it might even be harmful to one's health."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Griesheimer has an excellent Bill here. As you may know, some novice hunter may confuse the rifle slug shotgun shell with a really regular shotgun shell that contains BB's and if a mistake like that's ever made...they look almost identical. You have to look carefully if you, the mistake is made and a rifle slug shell would hit your side of your house, it would probably cave it in, so I would urge a favorable support for this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm gonna support this Bill, but possibly for another distance. It's perfectly obvious that the effective



range of a shotgun shell, per se, even in double a buck might not exceed 60 or 70 yards. But, there is a noise factor that must be annoying to people in dwellings, and there's a psychological impact of hunters being that close to your home. On that basis, if no other basis, because it would not exclude a rifle which has a potential range of 7...700 to 1000 rounds...yards, rather. Even on that basis that I mentioned, I will support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker...and members of the House. I just want to tell you that we have actually had the experience of bullets of various types striking our home and other property, other buildings that we have, and this is a very disturbing thing, particularly if you're...if it's early in the morning or even late in the evening, or anytime. At one time we actually had a rifle bullet strike our house, and the hole is still there where that rifle bullet went in. Of course, that was from farther than 300 yards, but at least it begins to take shotguns and small arms out of the possibility of striking you or your family or, perhaps, some of your animals. So, I certainly would encourage a vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I got a great story to tell, but with 116 votes, I'm not about to do it. I'd just as soon you take the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'Aye' and 20 'No'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 736 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 985."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 985. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to judgments and the manner of enforcing the same by execution of the right for the exemption of real estate. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Schlickman. Schlickman here? Out of the record. 1060."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1060. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1060 is a simple amendment to the Environmental Protection Agency which extends to 180 days the process for a permit. The old time was 90 days, and while this is a doubling of that time, under the new Federal regulations that are required for public input, which is very, very important and which has been wanted by the public and by business for a long time. It is impossible to process these permits within 90 days, so I urge your support of this Bill."

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

Ryan: "Question. Representative Macdonald..."

Speaker Redmond: "Still on Short Debate, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Pardon?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're on Short Debate. I don't think questions are in order. Representative Telcser will raise a point of order if you..."

Ryan: "No, that's fine, Mr. Speaker. Let's follow that rule all day..."

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? Clerk will take the record. In this question there's 120 'Aye' and 17 'No', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby de-



clared passed. 1149. Representative Satterthwaite.  
Satterthwaite. 1149."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1149. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record. 1188."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1188. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I think we have the wrong...doesn't amend the School Code."

Speaker Redmond: "You say the School Code, State Board of Education, is what it says on here."

Yourell: "Oh, 1188. I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "1188."

Yourell: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1118 is a Bill that was developed by the Joint Committee Administrative Rule in response to rules concerning the Secular Textbooks Loan Program sponsored by the...Illinois Office of Education. The Bill would specify that the Office can utilize a priority system based solely on grade level in implementing the program. This will merely clarify the compliance of the rules with the authorizing statute and help to guarantee equitable distribution of available resources. The Office of Education does not have any objection to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'Aye'. Opposed vote 'No'. Have all voted who wish? Chamber lights are on. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. In this questions there's 129 'Aye' and 2 'No', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1309. Representative



Laurino. I guess you gotta fill out a slip. Does he have to fill out a slip, Mr. Clerk? Gotta fill out a slip."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1309. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Trust and Trustees Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill of the Joint Program, and it's called the Bar Association and Illinois State Bar Association. It sets out the responsibilities and the obligations of investment companies and of custodians. Came out of the Trust Committee of the Chicago Bar Association and I've been notified the Illinois State Bar Association is now endorsing the concept. The Bill was approved in the House Judiciary Committee I, and I ask for support."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'Aye' and no 'Nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1693. Representative Giorgi. 1693. Representative Giorgi."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1693. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to certain investments of public funds by public agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the House to have this Bill returned back to the Order of Second Reading for a clarifying amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Giorgi: "The amendment is being printed now."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objection, leave is granted and



will be returned to the Order of Second Reading, and held on Second Reading. 1840 is out of the record at the request of its Sponsor. Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day on Page 29."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 60. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act punishing persons hiding or concealing property levied by illegal processes or held under the distressed warrant. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 79. A Bill for an Act in relation to discrimination of real estate property ownership and disposition. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 356. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to certain Commissions. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1051. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1067. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Highway Advertising Control Act of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1069. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1071. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1077. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to protect workmen and general public from injury and death during construction or repair of bridges and highways within the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1079. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to repeal Sections in an Act providing for the licensing of livestock dealers, regulating such businesses, and providing penalties for violations thereof. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1080. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act providing for the licensing of feeding swine dealers, regulating such business, and providing penalties for violations thereof. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1082. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to 'relate' refrigerated warehouses and



the handling and storage of certain articles of food.

Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1083. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Fertilizer Act of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1084. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act of Slaughtered Livestock Buyers Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1085. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to the suppression and prevention of 'extirpation' of the contagious and infectious disease among animals. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1087. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Animal Welfare Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1095. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1097. A Bill for an Act to release the easement of highway purposes held by the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1188 ...1108. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights of property adjacent to Federal Aid Route 12 in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1109. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights to property adjacent to Federal Route 12 in Fayette County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1123. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey certain State-owned properties located in DuPage County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1159. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Code of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1186. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Game Code of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1193. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1212. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act of 1975. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1253. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation





to the adoption of persons and to the repeal of the Act therein name. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1254. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1304. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1325. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1445. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes held by the State of Illinois over, through certain land located in Champaign County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1446. A Bill for an Act to release an easement of other rights of highway purposes over and through certain lands and to restore access rights to property adjacent to Federal Highway Route 12 under the State of Illinois located in Cumberland County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1447. A Bill for an Act to release the easement for highway purposes over and through certain lands and to restore access rights of property adjacent to Route 12 held by the State of Illinois located in Cumberland County. House Bill 1453 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 1554. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1777. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fish, Fish Code of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1781. A Bill for an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1913. A Bill for an Act to revise the Consolidated Schedule of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1914. A Bill for an Act to revise the election laws in relation to absentee voting. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1951. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third



Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1966. A Bill for an Act to add Sections of the Family Practice Residency Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1969. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the licensing and regulation of homes for the maintenance, care, and nursing of persons who are ill, aged, or physically infirmed. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1970. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the establishment and maintenance of county multiple-county public ho...health departments. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1974. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act of 1971. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1986. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Department of Law Enforcement officers. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1990. A Bill for an Act to repeal an Act to require a label...labeling of nursing products sold to retailers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall these Bills pass?' Those in favor vote 'Aye'. Opposed, vote 'No'. Have all voted who wish? Let's take...Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take a record. In this question there's 141 'Aye' and 6 'No', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar. House Bill 741."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 741. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Hospital Licensing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been r...been read previously. Amendments #1 & 2 have been adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1 and 2?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."



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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of the members I'd ask that nine people join me in asking that this be put on..."

Speaker Redmond: "Second Reading, Representative Getty. You don't need that yet."

Getty: "Oh, I'm, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would conti...would consider holding this. I believe Representative Barnes..."

Speaker Redmond: "She indicates that is not her pleasure. Representative Puv..Pullens desires to have it advanced to the Order of Third Reading. Third Reading. No amendments from the floor, are there? Page 12. Any Floor Amendments on this? Third Reading. 1018."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1018. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to contracts for health and dance studio services. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Pierce. Amends House Bill 1018 on Page 1, Line 31 by deleting 'seven' and inserting in lieu of there 'one'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Yes. You have Amendment #2?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Pierce: "All right. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is aimed at curing the great evils that we've been reading about one of the metropolitan newspapers about dance studios. What the Bill is, is the Health and Dance Studio Act. And what the amendments does is a cut from seven years to one year, the time that a contract can be entered into by a customer of a dance studio or of a health studio. What we've found is that lonely people, widows, lonely young people, lonely single people, have been taken advantage



of and signed up to long-term contracts by these dance studios and by health studios. In 1965, in my first term in legislature, we passed the Health and Dance Studio Act. It doesn't have teeth in it. It did make a maximum seven-year contract that the dance studios could sign up their customers, and we felt that was much too long. The Bill, as I originally introduced it, was for two years, and that was proved...that was approved in Judiciary Committee. As several of the members said, 'Why not even shorten down to one year?', and that's what Amendment #2 does. It shortens the period to one year that the dance studio and the health studio can obligate the victims of their services, and we've been reading about what happens with these dance studios in one of our metropolitan newspapers. This Bill was introduced before that series ran. In fact, it was approved in Judiciary Committee before I had any idea about that series running. My view of that series, I believe it is important, it is significant that we reduce the maximum contract term for health and dance studios from seven years to one year, and that's what Amendment 2 does, and I urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would, would my colleague from Lake County give us a little demonstration of disco dancing? ...She went to the Senate. I defer to a Gentleman from Cook, Reverend, Representative Kelly. I...because Representative, Mr. Kelly, I understand, was once a dance instructor, and I saw him at the bowling party, and he did very, very well with the disco dancing. He wasn't exactly a reverend that night, either."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'Aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it. The motion carried. The amendment's adopted."



Any further amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1025."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1025. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to the regulation of practicing of nursing. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. Out of the record? Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 1065. Floor Amendment not printed on 1065. 1070. Representative Friedrich."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1070. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?" Any...is there any motion with respect to the Committee Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "No motion with respect to that, I take it?"

Clerk Hall: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1078."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1078. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any, any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No...none."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1100."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1100. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Secretary of the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois to convey a quick claim deed to certain real estate properties in Cook County in the Village of Oak Lawn. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from...Representative Barnes"



Barnes, J.: "First, I, I have an amendment, and it hasn't been distributed. I was wondering if we could hold the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll take it out of the record and hold it. As we understand, it has been distributed. Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Yourell: "Isn't, isn't Amendment #1 been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, the Clerk advises me."

Yourell: "Amendment #1 is my amendment with Jane Barnes, and what we did with the amendment, is to change the price of \$34,100 to \$1, since we have found precedent for that. And since that time, I have conferred with Representative Barnes, and she has indicated to me that she has filed Amendment #2, which I hope and understand, is identical to Amendment #1. Is that correct Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative Yourell. The reason that I filed just for the information of the rest of the body, because Representative Huskey also lives in Oak Lawn. We have a unique situation here in the 8th District. We all reside in Oak Lawn, and I thought that the three Representatives should be on this amendment, because it's for everybody's benefit."

Yourell: "Yes, we're including Representative Huskey in this Amendment #2. Speaker Redmond: "Representen." Yourell: "So, while we're...until Amendment #2 is distributed, perhaps, we ought to hold Amendment #1 there and skip the Bill for a while."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Let me get this straight now. You do not want to move with respect to Amendment 1. Is that correct?"

Yourell: "No. There's no use taking Amendment #1 off until we have Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. The chamber is happy to see such accord in the legislative district



which encompasses Oak Lawn. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement. We have with us the fourth grade class of the 'Mowequa' School, Grade School located in the 51st District. Represented by Representative Dunn, Representative Donovan, and Representative Borchers. We honor the kids. They're from the Fourth Grade of 'Mowequa' School."

Speaker Redmond: "1131."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1131. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Sandquist."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1, which was adopted in the Committee, and which was the Bill and passed out unanimously and put on a Consent Calendar, had a technical error in that the title of the Bill was not, was not in proper form. So, what I am doing, is to, is tabling Amendment #1; offering Amendment #2, which is the same amendment as #1 except for the correct title."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 1. Those in favor, say 'Aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Sandquist. Amends House Bill 1131 by deleting Lines 1 and 2, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes. As I just explained this is the same amendment but with the correct title, and the Bill is now in the form that it was passed out at, in the correct form, but the substance is the same as passed out at Committee



and put on the Consent Calendar, and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'Aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'No'. The 'Ayes' have it. Motion carried, and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1156."

Clerk O'Brien: "Can we turn that off?...House Bill 1156. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Community Mental Health Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 & 2...This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 & 2 were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1 & 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1426. Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. 1965."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1965. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Radiation Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading...House Bills, Third Reading, Priority of Call. House Bill 889. Representative Greiman please sit down."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 889."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 889, which has come to be called





the Strip-Search Bill is the result of, is the result of a..."

Speaker Redmond: "They amended it."

Willer: "...television program on February 12 that started a whole chain of events that showed us that 2 to 300 women complained in the Chicago area alone, that they had been strip-searched by the Chicago police for the violation of minor traffic regulations or misdemeanors. In the wake of that, many of us in the House and the Women's Conference, contacted our own police departments to find out what their rules and regulations were regarding Strip-Search. We found that throughout the state there are no uniform standards, and so, every police department is pretty much on its own. What House Bill 889 does, is simply lay out an orderly process for strip-searching, of the prohibition of strip-searches when someone is brought into a police station on a minor traffic regulation or a misdemeanor unless that misdemeanor involves drugs or guns. It is a fair Bill. I think a lot has been written about it and about the cause of it. I would be happy to answer any questions about it. I want to emphasize, this in no way stops any police department from doing a strip-search or a body cavity when they believe it is necessary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Polk: "I have one, one specific question. Do you know of any police departments other than the City of Chicago where, where this, where the police have violated this Act?"

Willer: "Twenty-three different suburban police departments were named in complaints filed given to either American Civil Liberties Union or the United States District Attorney's Office."

Polk: "Let me, let me rephrase it then, Ms. Sponsor. Do you know of any police department outside of Cook County?"

Willer: "No, I do not, but I, it seems to me that if we have



these..."

Polk: "Thank you. You answered my question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

Willer: "I just received a note that it happened in the little town of Independence, Missouri, which obviously is not Illinois, but we have reason to believe the practice is widespread."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Breslin: "Representative Willer. What is the legislative intent of this Bill?"

Willer: "The intent is simply to protect people from unreasonable search and seizure."

Breslin: "Okay, and when you refer to probable cause as a ri, criterion for making a strip-search, are you requiring the policeman to make a judicial determination of probable cause before it's reviewed by courts?"

Willer: "No. Absolutely not."

Breslin: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah. I wonder if the Lady would yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Leinenweber: "Could you tell us...that assuming the police want to strip-search someone, what is the procedure they must follow?"

Willer: "They must fill out a report. First of all, they must get permission from the Watch Commander or the person in charge of the police station. A report must be filed listing the date, the time, the name of the person detained and searched, the name of the arresting officer, the name of the person doing the search, and then that report must be filed, signed by the Watch Commander and a copy



of it given to the person who has been detained and searched." Leinenweber: "What requirements are there for doing it? I mean, do they have to make...you said something about probable cause..."

Willer: "Well, probable cause, as you know and as Representative Breslin pointed out, is a different...different matters from this Bill and the judicial proceeding. What we tried to define it, found we could not. It will...it seems to me, that it's simply based on common sense on the part of the arresting officer, based on his experience, the events surrounding the arrest, and if he, the arresting officer, believes that there is reason to suspect the person is concealing..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be, give the Lady order."

Willer: "...a weapon or drugs, that constitutes probable cause. He may then search that person."

Leinenweber: "What would be the basis for such a belief?"

Willer: "Well, policemen have often told me that after you're a policeman for a few years, you have what you call, sixth sense, about...and I think it's probably true. It may be someone that they recognize, who has been arrested before, and you realize this is only necessary to get this permission for people arrested in a minor traffic regulation, a violation of a minor regulation, and a misdemeanor that does not involve drugs or guns to begin with. So, you're talking about minor infractions of the law to begin with. Now say the policeman gets in his...well, I would say, a layman's term, a hunch, based on knowing the person, finding...that, to me, constitutes probable cause. They can always do a patdown, you know, they don't need a permission to do that. You can do a patdown, you can use a metal detector, and upon that evidence, you could certainly do a strip-search if you, the metal detector showed something, the patdown showed something. That's probable cause for a strip-search."



Leinenweber: "Do you feel, though, that if the policeman is exercising his hunch, that there may be contraband on the person, that this would permit him if he follows the procedure which you've set forth, to have a strip-search conducted?"

Willer: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And, in the event that the party who is searched feels that there's been a violation of your Bill, or this law if it became law, what is the recourse?"

Willer: "He can file a complaint if he feels that he has been physically battered even, he can file that type of a charge against the police officer. He can file a complaint and the officer would, would be subject to discipline under the police procedures for that."

Leinenweber: "Was there any testimony in your Committee that would indicate on the Bill, that would indicate that this would, the fear of disciplinary proceeding or a violation of your Bill would inhibit necessary searching?"

Willer: "I don't believe so. One other provision of the Bill I did not mention that we have in there. The policeman willfully and knowingly does this. So, I think a policeman who, in good faith, makes a mistake...the complainer would have to prove it was willing, willfully or knowingly done without any basis of probable cause."

Leinenweber: "Was this the effect of the Amendments which were adopted to the Bill?"

Willer: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "And that was a...is the Amendment 3, basically a rewriting of the original Bills put in?"

Willer: "Well, there were five changes in the Amendment, and I don't know as it rewrote it, but it certainly did, I believe, provide more safeguards for the policemen, clarified the original Bill, and if you wish to call it rewriting, but the...you have the changes there, I presume?"

Leinenweber: "In other words, you no longer, is there a war-



rant required?"

Willer: "There is a warrant required for a body cavity search except for a search of the mouth. That is still there, but we eliminated a search of the mouth as far as needing a search warrant for a body cavity search. That is a different matter than a strip-search, and we did change the original provision that it must be done by a licensed physician to someone under the supervision of a licensed physician. It could be a registered nurse, an LPN, it could even be someone, I believe, a matron who is trained by a physician and under the supervision of a doctor, could do a body cavity search under sanitary conditions."

Leinenweber: "Wait a minute. Let me clarify that for a minute. You say now under the terms of the Bill as amended, a body cavity search can only be carried out by a physician or a lay person..."

Willer: "No, no, no. I'm sorry. We, we changed it. The original Bill said only by a licensed physician. The Amendment reads: 1. You do not need a warrant for a search of the mouth. 2. As far as body cavity searches go, it no longer has to be done just by a licensed physician. It must be done by someone under the supervision of a licensed physician."

Leinenweber: "Does that mean that the licensed physician must be present..."

Willer: "No."

Leinenweber: "...at the time of the search?"

Willer: "No, not at all. Under our laws, and as we understand, under the supervision of a physician, the doctor does not have to be there, and the nurse practitioner is a good example of that."

Leinenweber: "Wait a minute now. When you say under the supervision, merely that the police officer has instructed the person how to do it, or must be in the building, or what?"



Willer: "The doctor must, some doctor must be contacted by a police station, and that doctor must agree to either do the body cavity search himself, which I don't think that will happen, it isn't necessary, or be responsible, supervise someone who will then be designated to do the body cavity search. It could be an RN, it could be an LPN, it could be the matron, who has been trained by the physician to do a proper body cavity search."

Leinenweber: "Was there any testimony in Committee on the Bill in reference to how much contraband is currently carried into penal institutions or detention institutions in body cavities?"

Willer: "No, there was not."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor. Just one question, Representative Willer. I think you've got a pretty good Bill here. Representative Leinenweber touched on it. Does your Bill, at this point in time as amended, and I'm sorry I didn't follow it that closely through the Amendment process, have any restrictions in your warrant or prohibition procedure, prohibitions that relate to correctional institutions, searches, strip-searches of correctional institutions on premises."

Willer: "If you were talking about prisons, absolutely not."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duester."

Duester: "If the Sponsor would yield, it is my understanding that one of the reasons the body cavity searches are conducted is that there either may be weapons or knives or materials that a person, who is going to be locked up in a jail overnight, for example, might use to either harm the person or harm some other prisoner, and that the justification is supposed to be that this is done to protect other people."

Willer: "That is correct."



Deuster: "And with that in mind, I understand the Bill as it is now written and amended would require that there be a search warrant issued?"

Willer: "That is correct."

Deuster: "And who issues that? A judge?"

Willer: "That is correct."

Deuster: "So, before they lock someone up, they must go find a judge, is that correct?"

Willer: "No. Before they do a body cavity search..."

Deuster: "I mean before they do a body cavity..."

Willer: "That's right."

Deuster: "...search. Before the lock up."

Willer: "That is correct. That is correct."

Deuster: "So, they would have to lock them up separately."

Willer: "That is correct."

Deuster: "And then, is, do you understand the, is it the principle burden or obstacle that this Bill might present to the police, being the requirement that the detained person would have to be locked up for, separately, while they are waiting for the court order?"

Willer: "There's no obstacle I see in that. The police departments have had no complaint. I have received no complaints from police departments about this. I am assured over and over by police throughout the state that body cavity searches, especially, are just never done. Are hardly ever done. Well, if that's true, then this is not going to propose that great a problem. As far as strip-searches, I don't see why a person has to be locked up in a cell for the minor infractions of the laws we're talking about. So, I, and I have honestly received no complaints from policemen about this Bill."

Deuster: "Well, are the body cavity searches, I understand they are persons who may well be arrested for what we would refer to as a minor traffic offense, but an offense for which there might be bond money required, and the person doesn't have cash, so they're detained..."



Willer: "That's right."

Deuster: "...overnight or something."

Willer: "Well, if they can't get the bond money brought to them, and...that's right. They may well be, but why in the world would you do a body cavity search or even a strip-search on someone who's brought in just because they can't make bond money. And, interesting enough Representative Deuster, we have no complaints from men on this matter. Why is it, if, if it's because to protect the police or their people, women are strip-searched, women are subjected to this indignity, but men are not?"

Deuster: "I understand. My last question is this: Is the Bill written in such a form that it does require the physical presence of a physician or not?"

Willer: "No, it does not."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Willer: "Certainly."

Getty: "Representative Willer. I just want to clear up a couple areas of legislative intent here. I want to be sure that if a police officer in good faith finds reasonable cause or probable cause in accordance with the terms of your Act to make a search. But, then based upon legalistic findings of the court, a court subsequently finds that there was, in fact, no probable cause for that search. Would that police officer be subject to the official misconduct penalty provisions of this Act?"

Willer: "I do not believe so, because we have put the words in there 'knowingly and willfully', and it would be the burden of proof to be on the complainant that he knowingly and willfully did this without probable cause."

Getty: "All right. So, that is clearly not the legislative intent of this Body to have some finding by a judge, of and by itself, that there was no probable cause in the





subsequent litigation of that criminal case be the basis and the, the sole basis alone of charges of official misconduct against that police officer. Is that right?"

Willer: "You, you are absolutely correct."

Getty: "Very good. Now I wonder if you could to make it clear, as possible, describe the sort of thing that would be covered by a strip-search?"

Willer: "You mean to..."

Getty: "What, what is the sort of action..."

Willer: "Oh,..."

Getty: "...that is performed, that, that is the strip-search. For example, it was suggested that a person might well be arrested on the beach during the middle of the summer, and might be dressed in a bikini. As opposed to one of the witnesses who testified before the Committee, who was arrested, taken out of the cab, in the Loop and brought to 11th and State, and subject, subjected to a very humiliating search where she kept on much more clothes than the average woman in a bikini would have. Could you describe the difference in how that would be accommodated and that it is not merely the amount of clothes that are involved?"

Willer: "That is, that is correct. If a woman who is brought in, say from the beach in a bikini, is searched, but nothing is removed from her, she is not strip-searched. If a woman who is brought in in the middle of winter, has a coat, sweater, slacks, blouse on, and that's what happened, is re, forced to remove her coat, blouse, slacks, open her brassiere, that certainly is a strip-search. And the difference, certainly, is part of the, a great deal about the strip-searching is the indignity inherent in this, and I would, I would submit that if, you know, if you're strip-searched, you know when you're strip-searched. And it certainly, there can be degrees, as Representative Getty has pointed out. I don't think



that in, that if a complaint was ever filed, it'd be very difficult for a judge to figure out the difference. And it is not the intent of this Bill to stop someone in a bikini being brought into a police station, and then say well, they're gonna scream that she was strip-searched. That's nonsense. Even though she has less clothing on than the women often had on that who were strip-searched."

Getty: "All right. So that, what, what you're saying, Representative Willer, is it was clearly the intention of the Committee and yourself and this Body to have the case judged on its own individual circumstances as to whether or not a strip-search has indeed taken place. And that the, often by itself, the amount of clothing remaining would not be the sole criteria. Is that correct?"

Willer: "That is absolutely correct."

Getty: "All right. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Getty: "I believe that Representative Willer has indeed, through the Amendment which was placed on in Committee, made a good Bill, a much better Bill, is a very needed addition to our law of criminal jurisprudence. I believe that it is most important that all members of our society be protected, whether they are arrested and brought into a police station, and they have money to make bond immediately or they don't. I believe that all people should be accorded dignity. I think it, it is unquestionable that there must be a differentiation between people who are arrested for mere traffic regulatory or misdemeanor offenses, and those who are arrested for serious felonies, those who are arrested with weapons or controlled substances charges, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Willer has drafted a very excellent Bill, and I am indeed pleased to support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Leverenz. Representative Ba, Jane Barnes."



Barnes: "Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation, because before it was drawn up, Ann Willer and I, sent out letters to all the police chiefs in our district to see what their guidelines were. I was rather surprised that in the 8th Legislative District after hearing from about 14 police chiefs, that there was no conformity in the guidelines that were in all of the separate stations. I was also pleased that several of the police chiefs replied in their correspondence that they also are looking for conformity, and they feel it's time that the State Legislature sets up the proper guidelines so that we are no longer faced with some of the harrassments of our good policemen that went on in Chicago and also the allegations that were made in some of the suburbs and unfortunately some of the suburban officials in our district were also accused of this type of impropriety. I think it's something that is necessary, so that the police can go about their jobs in a dignified manner and no longer be accused of ungentlemanly conduct where women prisoners are concerned. I urge an 'Aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "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. The motion carried. Representative Willer to close."

Willer: "Yes. Briefly, Mr. Speaker. We've heard enough testimony. I would only say that this Bill is in response to what can clearly be described as sexual exploitation, because women were the victims. I do think that the uniform standards laid down by this Bill will apply to both men and women, who are taken in the police stations, and I think it's a very good Bill. It's time is certainly now, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

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? Clerk will take the record. In this question there's 155 'Aye' and 2 'No', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 891."

Clerk Leonè: "House Bill 891. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Consumer Installment Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 891 is an Amendment to the Installment Loan Act...Consumer Installment Loan Act to increase the maximum amount that can be borrowed to up to \$25,000 and to increase the time into which it can be paid back for the higher amount loans up to 181 months. All of the States around us have either a...the \$25,000 limit limit or an unlimited amount. The question of the small...the former so-called small loans...the importance of this is with inflation, people need to borrow money at a higher... at a higher amount. They find that it is...is a lot of times better instead of refinancing their...their home with...when they've got a low...a small mortgage where the value of their property has gone up greater. This is a better way to do it so that they can have the money for expenses, educational, for trips or other things. I think it's a good thing. It passed out of Financial Institutions without a negative vote, and it would put Illinois on; as I say, on a par with the states around us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

O'Brien: "Representative Sandquist, is this the Bill which increases the lending limit that the finance companies



can lend a individual from \$10,000 to \$25,000?"

Sandquist: "Yeah, that is correct."

O'Brien: "Can you tell me, also, what the rate...or the percentage rate on a mortgage would be?"

Sandquist: "Well, under...under the Consumer Installment Loan Act the percentage rate is...is 1½% a month. That's the maximum, and...and for that part, over \$10,000, that is only on the unpaid balance...could...that amount could be charged."

O'Brien: "Well, then, what we're saying is that people who own homes and would like to get second mortgages on those homes to do some remodeling, should they go to one of these finance companies and borrow, say, \$22,000, \$22,500, whatever it is to put a bedroom on or a family room, that they will be paying up to 18% annually for that money?"

Sandquist: "That is correct, but, as I explained, it is a lot of times cheaper for them to do that than to refinance a low first mortgage loan on their property. That...it gives them an additional option."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, may I address m...may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "M...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that this is a very, very bad Bill. This is a Bill that will create an infaltionary aspect in the lending market in the State of Illinois. What we've got here is a Bill that will allow unsophisticated borrowers to go out to finance companies throughout the State of Illinois, borrow 12, 15, 20, up to \$25,000 from these finance companies, and then be...then, in turn, be charged 18% on this 20 to 25 thousand dollars. Now I don't think it's bad or wrong for...for small loans up to 5 and even up to 8 thousand dollars, but when we start increasing the percentage rate on borrowing money and set it up to 18% and increase the limits to \$25,000, I think we're gonna have



a lot of unsophisticated borrowers that are going to be really finding themselves in a trick bag on second mortgages and on remodeling, and, in addition to that, if the ...finance companies can go to 18%, up to 25 thousand dollars, you're gonna see the prime rate at 12 to 15 on up throughout the State of Illinois with all your banking institutions. That'll be the next move. This is a bad Bill, and I'd encourage everybody to vote 'No'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this legislation, and I'm surprised at what I just heard. I just heard a speech that is filled with elitism. A speech which says that this General Assembly ought to lead the people of this State by the hand. That they are not sophisticated enough to know when they go in for a loan and fill out all those papers, and the loan company shows them what their principal is, what their interest is going to be, and how long it's going to be for, that they haven't got the brains to say, 'Yes, I can afford this.' or 'No, I can't.' I'm surprised, coming from that side of the aisle, that form of elitism being spoken on the floor of this House. If you don't think people haven't got the brains they're born with to know whether or not they can afford that type of a loan, I really feel sorry for you. I think most people, if they do need this type of money to add onto their house, if they need a loan to tide them all over, ought to have that available to them, and all this Bill does is increase that limit. They know what the percentage rate is, and they know, according to the lending laws of this State, that they're going to have presented to them at the time they sign for that loan what the interest charges are going to be and what they're going to be paying. I think we have taken enough steps to give them the information they're going to need, and I, for one,



have the confidence in the people to know that when they put their name on that dotted line, they know what they're getting into, and I rise in support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "A question to the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Laurino: "On a 25 thousand dollar loan, for instance, how long would it take...well, let's say, how much of the... of the principal would be reduced in the first year at 18%?"

Sandquist: "Well, that...that...of the 25 thousand? I don't have the exact figure, but the most that it could be for a 25 thousand would be 181 months. So it would be paid off on...during that 15-year period, if the person wanted it that long."

Laurino: "Well,...I'd think they'd need it that long. How long...will...do you have any idea, any figures whatsoever what your...your average payment would be on a...an estimated loan of that size?"

Sandquist: "I don't have that with me, no."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me speak to the Bill. I think it's a very bad Bill, and I think the other side of the aisle's kiddin' themselves if they think that the people in this State of Illinois aren't going to be hoodwinked by something like this. I urge a 'No' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield? Representative Sandquist, what is the maximum length of time that someone under the small...under the provisions of your Bill can have...the maximum amount of loan financed? How many months or years can they go on the loan?"

Sandquist: "Well, up...up to 10 thousand dollars would be 121 months, or 10 years. From 10 to 14 it would be 169 months and from 14 to 25 would be 181 months."



Simms: "Well, is it not to say then what we're really doing then by this legislation, to a certain degree, is expanding the...the small loan to the large loan companies into the area of where they can be...where they can finance the purchase of homes? Is this possible under the provisions of your Bill? Not that you can buy much of a house, I suppose, today...on today's inflationary markets for 25 thousand. But, is it...would it not be possible that you could?"

Sandquist: "Well, there's no question that at the present time the loans in the area of the 10 thousand are primarily second mortgages on homes. So that...I don't think you'd use this for a first mortgage, though, but you would for remodeling and many other things."

Simms: "But, how about for a 25 thousand dollars? Could you use that as a first mortgage on a home?"

Sandquist: "If you wanted to, you could. Sure."

Simms: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would the...would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewing: "I'm not familiar with the Installment Loan Act. Does that cover banks, small loan companies, credit unions, just who's covered by this?"

Sandquist: "...The Small Loan Act covers the small loan companies."

Ewing: "Bank...banks would not be covered? This has no... does it increase their ability to make small loans?"

Sandquist: "No, it...no, it would not."

Ewing: "I see. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think Representative O'Brien said it very well. I look down at the Republican staff analysis, and I don't what know what the Democrat analysis says, but I see that the supporters





of this Bill are Household Finance, Hoffman Finance supports, Finance America supports, Service Finance Companies supports, and I handle probably 10 or 15 bankruptcies a year, and the same names and others appear on every bankruptcy, Household Finance, Hoffman Finance, Finance America, Servi...Service Finance Comapny, Avco Financial Services, and down the line. What these companies do, and if you're gonna extend this to 15 years and 25 thousand dollars, is to prey on the people who get in a trick bag and can't get out of it. There...there are oftentimes there...over...over the course of 15 years, they get to the place that they get so far behind that they give up, or that their payments that they are able to make don't even go so far as to reduce principals. But, I think that for a l...to a large extent, anyway, these companies, HFC and others, prey on the...on the small...the small person who can't get a loan somewhere else. And what we're gonna do is to create more instability in our financial system, more...more instability in our economic system, and really take advantage of the people who least can afford to be taken advantage of. Representative Kempiners says people don't know. The... that they are sophisticated enough to know. The people who are taken advantage of, that needs the kind of loan, are the ones who need protection. The reason we serve as the General Assembly, in some senses, is to protect those people, and they don't know, they don't know the trick bag they're putting...going to be put into, and they can't look 2 or 3 or 4 years, or, in some cases, 6 months down the line to see that all that's facing them in the face is a bankruptcy. And it happens time after time after time. It's not the banks, it's not the savings and loans 99 times out of a 100 that are creditors in bankruptcies. It's these small loan companies that take advantage of the innocent investor, and I would cer-



certainly say that this is going to be a significant step to add to the economic instability of our State and... and the general situation of credit, and I certainly join with Representative O'Brien and others in urging a 'No' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. I wish people would quit laughin', and I... I'm a Cosponsor of this piece of legislation. I believe, in fact, that the time has come for this kind of legislation. What you're talkin' about is a lot of people who cannot get loans from...from present institutions that need second mortgages, and this is the only way they can get 'em. You're talkin' about people that, because of their own security problems, they either have to take out another mortgage on their home through that same institution, pay a higher interest rate, or come to this Consu... through the Consumer Installment Loan Act and receive this kind of money. I think it's a good piece of legislation who...which time has come. It's unfortunate that Representative Kempiners has talked about this as some sort of partisan issue. It is not. Mr. Getty and I are both Cosponsors of this piece of legislation, and I'd ask for your 'Aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the previous question."

The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor, vote 'Aye'. Opposed, vote 'No'. ...previous question. Representative Borchers votes 'No'. Representative Schune...Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, is this a vote on the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "This is a vote on the previous question."



Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Former Member, Doc Skinner...Springer...

Doc Springer. Former Member, Doc Springer. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'Aye' and 49 'No', and the motion to previous question carries. Representative Sandquist. Fails, fails....fails, fails, fails, pardon me. Clear the Board now, will you? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would the Sponsor yield? Representative Sandquist, would you tell me what do the majority of states in our areas have as a limit?"

Sandquist: "Yes. The states surrounding us, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, all have the 25 thousand dollar limit, and Missouri is unlimited."

Getty: "All right. Is this...is this a national trend to raise it?"

Sandquist: "I believe it is. Yes."

Getty: "Would you explain to me and to the Members of the General Assembly what the effect would be if I were to own or a...a person were to own a home that would have a mortgage on it, say of 45 thousand dollars and be worth maybe 75 thousand dollars, if I were to seek to have refinancing, I, and I were to go to my savings and loan and ask him for a maximum loan, say of an additional 15 thousand dollars to bring it within the 80% limit, what would they charge me? What would the additional expense be? Say I had gotten that original loan, say 5 years ago when the rates were 7½% and the current mortgage rates are 10½% now, what would be the effect?"

Sandquist: "Well, what would happen is that your entire new loan for...for the mortgage on your property in your instance where you'd have 45 thousand would go to 60 thousand at the new 10½% instead of the lower interest which you had on your original loan. But...but by keeping your original long...low mortgage, you could borrow this ad-



ditional 15 thousand from the...from the finance company for the time you needed it, and it w...while that would be at a higher rate, the overall effect would be at a much lower rate, and you have this option to do it, and that's why this is important."

Getty: "All right, now. Would there also be points charged on the entire recast loan of 60 thousand dollars?"

Sandquist: "Yes, there would be. That's..."

Getty: "So, if that were..."

Sandquist: "...that's an additional charge."

Getty: "And if that were at 1½ percent, the prevailing rate, minimum prevailing rate today, that would be an additional 900 dollars?"

Sandquist: "Nine...correct."

Getty: "So that the...the net effect if I were to borrow money as a second mortgage, would be that over the period of the loan, the interest rates would be substantially cheaper, is that correct?"

Sandquist: "On...on the sec...on the second from the...the overall would be cheaper. Right. The overall effect."

Getty: "The overall loan, so that the net...net cost to the borrowers in Illinois in that similiar circumstances, would be less money, is that correct?"

Sandquist: "Would be less money, and that's what we're talking about here on this Bill."

Getty: "All right. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Getty: "I think that it's very important that the Members of the General Assembly realize that, as a matter of fact, under many circumstances this would be a savings. Not only that, there are many instances where the small loan, the relatively small loan, is the only stopgap between the borrower and the juice men. All right. If you can't get the money from a bank, through regular channels, and you have to go out and get that money, I would much rather



see the people of Illinois borrowing it, getting a second mortgage, borrowing it from a licensed, regulated small loan, installment loan company, than going to juice and taking their lives in their hands, and as a prosecutor I saw these kinds of cases. They're not limited to five hundred dollar loans. They go into the thousands, and this is the difference, and I think you have to make this distinction. You have to know that there are people who don't qualify to get loans from banks, and if they can't get 'em from banks, and they can't get 'em from small a loan company, and they need the money, juice is the only thing that's left. That's why I support this legislation, and I would encourage the Members of the General Assembly to do likewise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The only one we're missing from this scenario of Sandquist, Getty, Kempiners, and McClain, is Anita Bryant. You talk about a juice racket, she...she should sing a song for these four Gentlemen. Do you realize, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that to borrow 25 thousand dollars at 18 percent interest a year, that in 15 years it will cost 97 thousand dollars to be returned? Even the syndicate don't charge that much. These guys want to do it legally. Now, you know, years ago in politics one of the fairest games in...in...in debate was always the issue of money. Even Abraham Lincoln when he served as a Member of the General Assembly, campaigned solely on the interest of usury limitations and a need of it in Illinois. If this Bill is passed, if this Bill is passed, you talk about exploitation of the poor and the needy, this...they should get a banner for these Gentlemen for having the gall to introduce such a bad Bill. All it needs to do now is go on the Consent Calendar. I don't know why it didn't get there if it was so good. This is a bad Bill. All you're



going to do is force the poor to get poorer, and in politics, let me tell you, someday somebody's going to lead the band wagon in this country and start talking to the people about the cost of money and inflation. Everyone of you want to beat your breasts about how inflation should be beat. There's two causes of inflation. One, Federal spending and number two, high, nonproductive cost of borrowing money. There is no production. There is nothing to be garnered by charging more money for money in this state, and that's what they're asking you to do is to make inflation, even fuel, higher. My God, next... OPEC is going to give up the sale of oil just to get in the lending business in this state if we go to 18 percent. I urge a negative vote, and I think it should be defeated soundly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to clarify a couple of points that were brought up. One Gentleman said, I think it was Representative O'Brien, made the remark in reference to...that the loan companies were pulling a sort of sham on the lending public. Well, this is what we have an Illinois Truth of Lending for. The...also, I think it was Representative Johnson, asked if this dealt strictly with the lending companies. This area of the Act does deal with Household Finance and the finance companies, but Section 70...or Chapter 74 deals completely with the Installment Loan Consumer Credit Act. This is a good Bill. The people of Illinois, if they go into a finance company and ask to borrow money on a boat, a big boat, a big car, your cars today are costing more than 10 thousand dollars. This is the type of a thing, then Representative Johnson made the remark that...that the finance companies were sending them right into bankruptcy, but we've got a situation today that business people are not going to make a



loan just to be making a loan and end up having to re-possess their collateral. They're going to use a lot of due caution when they make a sizeable loan, and so I would ask that the Members of the House vote favorably on this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to correct some things that the Gentleman that spoke a couple of people before me said. Number one, I'd like know how he knows what the Mafia charges for interest. Number two, I'd like to point out that it is currently in the law that 18 percent is a permissible rate for both these types of institutions as well as those that extend credit through credit cards, charge accounts, and so on, and so forth. This Bill does nothing whatsoever to alter that principle to change the rate, to add more dollars, or more cost for that money. In essence, what this Bill is doing, is allowing the little guy to, once again, try to become an entrepreneur. If you currently have a real estate and you have a loan on that, regardless of the amount, at a conventional financial institution, and you want to get a second mortgage on it, by law, state banks cannot allow you to do that. This Bill allows the individual the right to get into buying additional properties, an apartment house, or something like that, if he wants to get into the business and would allow him to get a second mortgage in that kind of a situation. I submit to you that, indeed, it is opening up money markets for those that are not traditionally there, and that, in fact, this is a little people Bill instead of trying to get money for those people that don't need in the first place. I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think I know a little bit about this subject, and possibly a little



more than the Gentleman from McHenry. I was in this business for 15 years, and I know something about the regulations that are imposed upon the finance companies. I have no interest in it now, Representative Hanahan. Right now the finance companies are paying one percent a month for their money. Right now they are under all kinds of regulations, including truth in lending, all kinds of disclosure, plus the anti-discrimination laws, and certainly this is not unreasonable if you want to go back to the time. The other thing, that business is always competitive. If certainly if somebody can get the money for a lesser rate, they're entitled to do it, and the other thing that's pointed out here are the number of bankruptcies, and certainly that adds to the cost of operation, too, and that's all in the cost, and I know, because I've gone through it, and by the time your thing gets through court in a bankruptcy suit, I can tell you there's nothing left for the finance company. At least there never was in any case that took bankruptcy on me. So, I'd say again, we're spending millions on education. We ought to assume that everybody has a little sense, and certainly they are obligated to explain every detail of a loan to a lender when...to the borrower when he comes in."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have with us Sister Patricia and the eighth grade class from the Queen of Martyrs in the 28th District represented by Representative Jones, Representative Keane, and Representative Chad Mahar. The Queen of Martyrs. They're a great class."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Now that we know that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Representative Hanahan wants to be the Ayatollah Khomeini's Finance Minister. I'd just like to





point out that this Bill really reduces nothing more than to a matter of simple freedom. A person wants to borrow money; a person wants to loan money. And we're simply voting on whether or not this Legislature will let 'em make the loan and borrow the money, and, perhaps, avert a bankruptcy. I urge passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many of...of you Gentlemen here have sat in bankruptcy court, but I had to go sit in there one day and wait on a...try to collect a little note that I had on a man, and I had to wait for about two hours, and that was a good education watching the husbands and wives come in and talk and see where they had bought this easy money to do something with and not only did it take what they wanted to do, but it took their home with it, their car, left them very little, and I just can't see why we should raise this rate like this, because you can borrow money in southern Illinois to do things like this with a good independent bank structure, and you should think about it for a change."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We trained coats last time. Let's try the previous question one more time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130...142 'aye' and 6 'no', and the motion carries. Representative Sandquist to close."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You've heard a lot of interesting debate on this point. Some of it, I think, is completely off line. Something that has nothing to do with the Bill, because all we're really talking about, as someone has said, is the freedom of choice for the individual, and if you think that..."



that small loan companies are going to make loans so that they can send people into bankruptcy where they lose everything, you don't know anything about business. This is something to help people to borrow money, and...and it's to take care of things where they've got a great increase in the valuation of their house because of increased real estate values, and this is one way they can use that valuation without...without losing their low interest rate on their first mortgage. This is a good Bill. It gives the people freedom of choice, and that's what we're talking about. Let the person go ahead and do that. It's not going to hurt anybody, but it's going to help them when they need the money, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

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? Representative Bullock!"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I served on the House Financial Institutions Committee when this Bill was heard, and I, too, had some of the reservations that the opponents of this Bill express until I was better informed by Representative Sandquist and others. The Bill does not affect the interest rate. The Bill addresses the subject as to the availability of money for second mortgages. Many individuals, perhaps, have reached their limit in borrowing under conventional financial situations. This Bill would give some added leverage to persons who may need to repair their homes, who suffered some impact due to weather severity or other types of financial predicament. I hope Representative Sandquist can get the sufficient number of votes to place this Bill on postponed consideration and take a couple of Amendments to clean it up. I have suggested some Amendments to him, and because he is a dear friend, I chose not to bother his Bill, but now that the dye is cast, and I think you can't beat a guy when he's



down, we could make a pretty good Bill out of this if we could let him put it on postponed consideration. It has a good concept, but I think it sort of got lost in a lot of the rhetoric that was preceding the Roll Call. I'm going to give Representative Sandquist an 'aye' vote in hopes that he gets it on postponed consideration, so that we can clean it up and help the people who need it most. Those who've reached their limit in conventional borrowing and need some help in the repair of their homes, and I hope that Representative Sandquist and I and others can make this a good Bill, so for that reason, I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 72 'aye' and 77 'no'. Representative Sandquist is recognized."

Sandquist: "Postponed consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. 925. Representative Skinner."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 925. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly.

This is a Bill that will give county governments additional power in preventing driveways every 50 feet on major highways. Now, those of us that live in the northern part of the Fox River Valley or in the southern part of the Fox River Valley and want to get from end to the other and know there's only one way to go, and that's Randall Road. Randall Road is a county highway, not a state highway, and what this Bill attempts to do is to make it tougher to...well, it attempts to make it tougher for people to be able to cut into the highway to slow down the traffic. I'd still like to be able to go Auror...to Aurora ten years from now at 45 miles an hour instead of having



to go at 30 miles an hour like one has to go on Route 31.

I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 4 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1010."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 10..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Is that correct? Okay. 1010."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1010. A Bill for an Act in regard to the Insanity Defense. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to have House Bill 1010 brought back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted and returned to the Order of Second Reading. "

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, is there Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 amends House Bill 1010 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu of the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 is basically a clean-up Amendment, which takes care of some problems that were discovered in the Bill, and in addition to that, it provides that those persons in need of mental services would be governed in accordance with the terms of the Mental Health Code when they are inpatients. It makes it clear that the law relative to this would apply equally to juveniles and it streamlines, in some respects, the hearing procedures, and I would ask leave for the



adoption of the Amendment and point out that it strikes everything after the enacting clause to make the Bill a cleaner Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1047. Representative Donovan."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1047. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Donovan. Donovan. Maybe it's Mrs. Martin's case to see it."

Donovan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1047 authorizes park districts to issue Revenue Bonds for the purpose of constructing airports and landing fields in their districts. Currently, only municipalities, counties, airport authorities, park districts can issue Revenue Bonds. In our district, Decatur, is the only park district that operates an airport. Joliet, Canton, Beardstown, and Vandalia are the only other communities within the entire state that run their airports through park districts. This Bill provides that park districts wishing to construct additional runways or airport facilities will be able to finance them with Revenue Bonds. These Bonds are paid solely from revenue. The rest of the Bonds are payable solely from revenue that they derived with their airport operations. There is a seven percent interest rate limit, and this goes along with holding the line on property taxes and financing some of the airport expansion through Revenue Bonds. The key point is that it will not raise taxes, and we have



support from the Department of Transportation, Illinois Public Airports, and the Illinois Association of Park Districts. I would ask your favorable vote on House Bill 1047."

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

Borchers: "Speaker and fellow Members of the House. We need this...this authority so we can extend some of our runways. It's always possible...it's always possible that we might have a Concord land, and if we do, we want to be ready for 'em. But, I would appreciate your...vote of both sides of the aisle, and I especially appeal to my own side. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Representative Donovan, has this Bill been amended at all to...you're allowing park districts to acquire a considerable amount of debt, but there is no voter approval for that debt. Is that correct?"

Donovan: "It is a Revenue Bond, and that's right, we have no referendum, but it's a Revenue Bond."

Totten: "I...I think the Bill would be in much better fashion if, because of the substantial debt that they could acquire, that if there was voter approval to it I would rather see it in that fashion than the fashion in which you're presenting it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further. Representative Dunn. Question, Representative Tuerk. Representative Telcser, will you please sit down. I can't see..."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tuerk: "As I read this, there's no provision for a public hearing, either."



Donovan: "There is at the...I believe there is at the meeting.  
Let me find here."

Tuerk: "You mean a meeting of the Commissioners or Trustees?"

Donovan: "Yes, there's a provision here on page 1 that's about  
...'plans and specifications shall be on file in the of-  
fice of the secretary of the district and shall be open  
for the inspection of public'. That's about line 27 through  
32 on page 1."

Tuerk: "Yeah, but that's...that's no public hearing."

Donovan: "Right."

Tuerk: "Would you agree with that? That that is not a public  
hearing."

Donovan: "The public has access to it, though."

Tuerk: "Oh, well that...that's a lot different. Now, in ad-  
dition, park districts have the power now to assess one  
half of one percent of assessed val without referendum.  
Now, why wouldn't your park district be going along that  
route rather than asking for more authority, which, in  
effect, would be taxing?"

Donovan: "Well, of course, that..."

Tuerk: "I understand the concept of Revenue Bonds, too."

Donovan: "Yeah."

Tuerk: "I understand that, but it already has the authority  
to go one half of one percent of assessed val."

Donovan: "All right. I...I think the issue still is Revenue  
Bonds. Why should you go that when you can sell the Bonds  
and raise it without taxing real property?"

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Donovan: "It's an, also..."

Tuerk: "Excuse me. Go ahead."

Donovan: "It's an, also, a vehicle to finance airports..."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I think there is a  
provision in the Park Code, which allow them now to do  
what they want to do through General Obligation Bond. I  
understand the principle of the Revenue Bond, and I have



no quarrel with that, except that I think without the public hearing, etc. that this is not a good policy to adopt at this time without, especially without a public hearing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Will the Speaker yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Braun: "Representative, does this Bill apply to all park districts in the state?"

Donovan: "Only five."

Braun: "Only five park districts."

Donovan: "Only five."

Braun: "Thank you. Is Cook County included?"

Donovan: "No."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a former air...chairman of an airport authority, what's most I...airports within the state are operated by airport authorities. They have all this power now to issue Revenue Bonds and build buildings, and the lease from the buildings pays back the...the funds, but there are five airports in Illinois that are operated by park districts. This legislation just gives them the same powers that the airport authorities have, and I...I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Would the Sponsor yield now for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Telcser: "Representative, could you tell me if this would affect the Chicago Park District in its relationship to Mets Field?"

Donovan: "In relationship to what?"

Telcser: "I believe Mets Field..."

Donovan: "No. No. No."

Telcser: "...is on park district land. I'm not quite sure, but





my question to you is 'Does your legislation affect the Chicago Park District?'"

Donovan: "No, it would not."

Telcser: "It would not?"

Donovan: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative Donovan to close."

Donovan: "Again, the main...the main issue, I think, here today is Revenue Bonds, and clearly that's a user type of tax. I believe it to be a good Bill to allow the five park districts that it does deal with the ability to finance their existing and continuing expansion. There is very little...there was only...it passed the Committee by a 12-2 vote. I...I believe it's a good Bill. I hope you vote favorably for it."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of my colleague's first piece of legislation in the General Assembly to encourage you to give him an 'aye' vote. This Bill will not result in a tax upon anyone. The Bill provides solely and only and exclusively for Revenue Bonds, and, as you know, Revenue Bonds must be paid back by the improvement that is constructed with the money from the Bonds. The full faith in credit of the taxpayers does not underlie these Bonds. Nobody will be taxed for these Bonds. This is just allowing the Decatur Park District and certain other park districts in the state to do what other airport authorities are doing. We happen to have an anomaly in the statute



here. We're just trying to correct that. There is no tax going to be levied on anyone as a result of this Bill. It will simply enable the Decatur Park District and others similarly situated, if they find themselves in a position, to construct improvements which can be paid for out of revenue to do so. An authority they do not have at the present time, so I would encourage you to vote for Representative Donovan's first Bill. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. In this question there's 94 'aye' and 33 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We are fleetingly joined by our former Member, former Representative Martin. Now in the Senate. Hiding in the back there. Representative Martin. She only...she only served a very short time here. Thank God. 1130."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1130. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the River Conservaty District Act. First Reading...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now simply what House Bill 1130 does, it actually amends the River Conservancy District Act, and it adds just one more, and a much easier and simpler, way for River Conservancy Districts to really expedite the development of water sheds through the use of this Act. Federal funds are now available for the, let's say, the development of a water shed, but the actual land to be purchased for these water shed plans has to be made available actually through local funds. Let's see, under the present Act, River Conservancy Districts, they have two means actually by which they can do this. Actually, they can now levy, or they can do it by special assessments. I think all of...actually all of those who know about municipal government actually know that special



assessments are a long and dragged out and a costly means. You have to sue each owner and in a municipal government, a few years ago, we actually had set up what we call the Special...let's see, Special Service District Area Financing, and this is where you can designate an area and only those people that are within the area that are to receive the benefit are actually taxed through the Ad Valorem Property Tax. If there is anyone who is not familiar with what Special Service...let's see, Special Service District Area Financing, I would be glad to explain that, but anyone who is with municipal governments certainly knows that that has been a very fine means to do these improvements and to expedite the projects. Actually, I might say that Special Service District Areas, before they are even designated, are...are usually for the most part, they are negotiated, and they are agreed upon prior to the action creating them. There are many public hearings that are involved with Special Service District Areas. I think it is a great means by which...actually, the River Conservancy District Areas can carry out the mandate that they have, and that is that they are organized to provide irrigation and flood control, conservation, and recreation. It is my understanding there are about 28 River Conservancy Districts within the State of Illinois, and this would be just another means that would be able to help them to do the job that they are asked to do. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor tell the General Assembly if spec...if this Special Service Area tax device could be used to repair or build dams?"

Williams: "No, I don't believe so. That Bill, incidentally Representative Skinner, as you know, you and I are Co-sponsors, that is in the Executive Committee, and we have the appropriation for that. It's on the...you know, In-



terim Study, and we will be able to do that with this..."

Skinner: "Well, I'm wondering..."

Williams: "...you know, other legislation."

Skinner: "...It seems to me that the Special Service Area tax is an extremely broad-based tax. You can use it for almost any reason you want to. I don't see why it couldn't be used to finance a dam."

Williams: "Yeah, I'm not sure. It may well be. I'm not that familiar that they could use that, but it would certainly be probably a way that if they are able under the present Act, and this would certainly expedite the means by which they could do it. Yes."

Skinner: "I would point out that under the Special Service Area Act for counties, I believe it is Rock Island County, has used the Act to build some type of levee or some... something to do with water resources, and I think that would be parallel to building or repairing a dam. I would stand in strong support of this Act, as you may or may not know, a special assessment is not deductible from one's income tax while a Special Service Area tax is, and I hope that maybe even my own county government may get progressive enough someday in order to use this type of an approach to build roads and subdivisions, which they allowed to be plotted without adequate roads, but hope spring's eternal in McHenry County for roads."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Vinson."

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

Williams: "Yes."

Vinson: "The question, I don't quite understand from reading the analysis, and I only partially heard your explanation, Jack, can people whose land is not affected or by the river, do they have a vote in whether this is imposed on the landowners along the river?"

Williams: "The way the Special Service Area would be set up,



they would designate an area in which, actually, that improvement is to take place, and only the people in that designated area would be actually taxed by it, and that is another advantage of this."

Vinson: "It's a good Bill."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Winchester: "Jack, since you're setting up sort of a new taxing district, will...will this be with or without a referendum as far as the tax is concerned?"

Williams: "Well, I would have to tell you how Special Services Areas actually operate within municipalities. First of all, the corporate authorities would hold actually a public hearing on the area that would be then established as a Special Service District Area, and there's a written notice that will be sent to all landowners in the proposed area, and then the notice is published in a newspaper, and at that hearing, any objections are heard. All right, the second step would be following a hearing. Actually, the corporate authorities would create the Special Service Area by ordinance. If there is a tax to be levied, you have to have another public hearing. The...and then when you do have the Special Service Area, the levying of the tax, or any increase in the tax rate, actually can be blocked by a 51 percent. Special Service Areas, again, are usually a small area, and their size and also the function, is usually actually negotiated actually prior to this."

Winchester: "That's...that's fine. Thanks, Jack."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Representative Williams, under your Bill, would it be possible for a drainage district to come within the juris-



diction or function of this legislation?"

Williams: "This Bill here actually has to do with actually River Conservancy Districts which are actually a special district unto themselves, so offhand I would say that... that the drainage districts will be separate from this."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein, do you seek recognition? Representative Deuster, do you seek recognition? Representative Campbell, do you seek recognition? Representative Walsh, do you seek recognition?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I recall when the Special Service District legislation for municipalities was up some years ago. It created quite a stir, and there was considerable discussion about it. I honestly think there was more justification for that than there is for almost any other unit of government that I can think of. It was done at that time for the purpose of creating malls. I recall in Oak Park...that which may have...may have been the thing that kicked it off, they...there was a Special Service District created, which included only business people. There were no residents at all, and there was almost unanimous consent of the business people that there ought to be a mall, and that they were the ones that ought to be taxed for it. Now, when you get to homeowners, I think you have a little different situation when you get to...to other units of local government other than municipalities. You run the risk of providing services in different measure for the residents of that particular Special Service District. I think we ought to be a little bit careful of extending this from municipalities to other units, because there's no question about it, it's a tax rate increase or authority to issue Bonds without a referendum. It is that, purely and simply. But, when you consider the...the possibility of rendering different services, depending upon



where someone lived within a particular Special Service District, I think you run the risk of doing people a great injustice, so for that reason, I intend to oppose this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, 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. Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I believe this does...actually give the River Conservancy Districts that option to really save the people in the area that long and dragged out added cost of having to go on a piece by piece basis under the, let's say, Special Assessment process, and, I might add, that River Conservancy Districts, at the present time, actually have the power to tax. They have the power to levy, so this does nothing more, as a matter of fact, I think Special Service District Area Finance, really because of the many public hearings that are required, and the fact that each of the owners does have to have a written notice, and I think there is a lot of protection, and I think it's a good Bill, and I would appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'"

Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing, do you desire to explain your vote? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 194. Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner. 194. Representative Skinner. Will the members of the press please stop bothering Representative Skinner. He's got a Bill up."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 194. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that Representative Stearney is here. He isn't. Uh-oh."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Skinner: "How about Representative Capuzi?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, he's not here."

Skinner: "Oh, well. I have to wing it again. This Bill is the follow-up to the Lester Crown Memorial Anti-Bribery statute that we passed two years ago. As you may remember, the chief executive of that Sterling Firm Materials Service admitted under oath that he took 5 to 10 thousand dollars out of his safe to bribe Legislators. One of those Legislators now serves in the House having been found innocent by the decision of the Federal Judge in question. But, we thought that, perhaps, we ought to send a message to companies like Materials Service. Companies that, apparently routinely, attempt to influence the Legislature through the conveyance of money to various Members of the Legislature. Hopefully, the process stop, but one never does know. So, what we did, what Representative Stearney proposed, that anyone who had been convicted of bribing a state official or who had admitted under oath that he had...that he had attempted to bribe a public official, a state official would no longer, ever, be able to do business with the State of Illinois, and I stress the word 'ever'. No exceptions. We give you one chance at the public trough, and once you blow it, once you end up thinking that you...that you're above the law, and you're going to bribe a State Legislator, or a Member of the Executive Branch, or a Member of the Judicial Branch, by the way, that no longer would that company be able to do business with the State of Illinois. Now, most of you know about this Bill because of the license plate





case, where Secretary of State Dixon determined that one of the employees of the Arkansas firm had been convicted of bribing some official of the State of Illinois, and he refused to give him the license plates bid, after which it went to, I believe, Texas and New York and some other prison system. I think it wasn't a prison system. It was up in Minnesota. These firms sued. Was it...was it Poly Vend? I'm not sure what the name of the firm was, but, anyway, they sued in Circuit Court, and the Court ruled that there had not been sufficient due process in the law. Well, both Representative Stearney and Representative Breslin, and myself, all got the same idea that we certainly shouldn't allow the Circuit Court or even an Appellate Court to overturn the intent of the Legislature when it was so easy to fix it by putting in due process. The due process...the Amendments that are in this Bill have been crafted by Representative Breslin, and she will be able to defend any of them if anyone wishes to hear a defense. I think they're well drafted. I respect Representative Breslin's skill as a...as an attorney of...She will answer the technical questions. I'll be happy to answer the philosophical ones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Cal, to...am I to understand you with these large conglomerates with all these corporate offices, that if somebody from General Motors attempts to bribe somebody in Washington or in any of the state Legislatures that we're not to buy Buicks or Oldsmobiles anymore?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Representative Conti, we're talking about bribing state officials. Illinois state officials."

Conti: "I'm talking about General Motors or any other..."

Skinner: "You've got your life."

Conti: "You mean to tell me..."



Skinner: "General Motors..."

Conti: "You mean to tell me the corporation's going to be held responsible for its corporate offices?"

Skinner: "If General Motors can't get the message through to their employees that they are not supposed to bribe officials of the State of Illinois, you bet your life that General Motors will not have any business with the State of Illinois. They can pack up their bag and take it back to Detroit."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, if eith...if either the Sponsor or Representative Breslin or anyone would respond to this question, following the thought that Representative Conti put forth, suppose you have a corporation that says, 'Look, we've read in the newspapers about others bribing Illinois Legislators. We think this is terrible.' They send out a memo, and they say, 'There'll be none of that in our corporation.' Then they have some...some employee or somebody who thinks it'd be a smart thing to bribe somebody. The bribe is accomplished, and the corporation finds out about it. They bring him in. They fire him. They get rid of him, and they did...they knew nothing about it. They didn't encourage it at all. Is the corporation to be deprived forever from doing business with the State of Illinois if, you know, in good faith they got rid of the employee, and they've done everything possible to prevent sort...that sort of conduct? Is there anything in the law or the Bill that would deal with that concern that I have, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Well, first of all, Representative Deuster, corporations do not send naive people to talk to Legislators, and the answer I would give to your question is if a corporation cannot get the message through to that employee, and that employee bribes anyone in the State of Illinois who is an employee of the State of Illinois, that company



is never going to go do business with the State of Illinois again. Never. Now, that ought to be explicit enough to get through to the corporate mentality of any company that ever wants to do business in the State of Illinois, in my opinion. Including Lester Crown."

Deuster: "Never means all eternity. Is that right?"

Skinner: "Never means until you and I aren't here anymore, or until somebody wants to change the law."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gent...Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

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

Skinner: "Certainly."

Wikoff: "Cal, I have a question. What would be the effect if a disgruntled employee of this same General Motors outfit decided that he wanted to put his company out of business in Illinois and purposely went out and bribed somebody just for this to happen?"

Skinner: "I think it's time for Representative Breslin to give a good legal answer to a question like that. How about it, Peg?"

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

Breslin: "Okay. Gentlemen, those are issues of facts, which will be decided by the trial court. If the company had no relationship to the briber or the purpose of the bribe, then I'm sure that the hearing officer or the trial judge will so decide. The purpose for this hearing is to determine whether or not they were, in fact, involved and found guilty of the bribing conduct. The hearing will not go into the guilt or not guilt, just as to whether or not these are the parties that were so convicted."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this proposal, because all too often the notion has prevailed in the business world that



briber can always affect the bribee in such a way that the bribee is the one that pays the tab in case...where they're uncovered, where a bribe is uncovered, and, I might add, that unfortunately in this case the Gentleman or the Representative who was found so guilty will never ever be in this House, so I don't think it's too much to ask the same of the corporation, and I find that almost, as Representative Skinner implied, impossible for a corporate officer to act unbenounced to the will of his Board, and I think it's proper, also, as Representative Breslin has pointed out, to adjudicate the degree of culpability in the Courts, but if, in any case, it is found that the corporation is guilty, I think they should suffer the same penalty as the bribee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I had my light on at the time that Representative Williams was making his presentation..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly just shut it off. Just press the button."

Grossi: "...I do wish to explain my vote at that time, also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's not important."

Grossi: "I understand it was not intentional. Thank you."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. All opposed. Previous question's been moved. Previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my Minority Leader seemed to be saying he didn't want debate closed. Maybe I misunderstood him? Representative Ryan, did you want debates closed or not? Oh, I'm sorry. He was gesturing to some-



one else then. I don't think we need to say too much more. I don't believe that corporations can act without having a human being involved. It isn't some corporate letter-head that took the money out of Lester Crown's Materials Service personal safe, and gave it to the lobbyist. I wish that Materials Service had learned a lesson from this, but from information I have since the entire company was granted corporate immunity by the U. S. Attorney's Office, their lobbyist is still down here. Their still... their lobbyist is still talking about Cadillacs and girls. Their lobbyist will still be active in this Legislature, and I would ask that the Legislators, perhaps, send the company another message by passing this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 194 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye'. Vote me as 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 324."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 324. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a little Bill. It's a good Bill, and it's an important Bill, because it... it affects election to the Illinois House of Representatives. It got out of the Election Committee 17-1. This Bill was filed, really, in behalf of all of us here, and, of course, it does affect anyone who would run for State Representative in the future. The synopsis is accurate. It would amend the Election Code to provide that if a Legislative Committee fails, and that's the important word, fails to fix and determine the number of candidates to be nominated by its party at the Primary for Representative in the General Assembly within the time prescribed



by law, only two candidates shall be nominated by such party of such Primary. Now, some of you, I'm sure all of you know that the Legislative Committee determines whether two or three candidates of their party will run for State Representative. Normally, it's two, but they can have three. The reason for this Bill is that the State Election Board ruled, a few years ago, that if the Committee fails to make a designation, if the designation gets lost in the mail, or for some reason doesn't get there, then there will be three candidates running of that party. That is a result that would be, probably, not expected, and it's hard to say what the affect would be on anybody's candidacy if either he had to run with two running mates or if he had to run against three Members of the other party. Repres... Representative Hanahan is a Cosponsor of this Bill, and we have filed it in behalf of all of you, so that something unexpected would not happen by inadvertence. I ask for your support. Is there any questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there...is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 324 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question ther's 146 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 374."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 374. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that all of you will be happy to know I believe this is my last Bill from the Law Revision Commission. Please, hold the applause."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr Schlickman on the floor?"

Terzich: "No. He's...he said he'd think, that's all. But,



what House Bill 374 does, it amends the Environmental Protection Act. It removes the provision held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The Bill would remove a provision which allowed the EPA to prepare and present enforcement cases before the Pollution Control Board without being represented by the Attorney General. The Supreme Court held this provision unconstitutional and stated that the Attorney General must represent the EPA in all legal matters. This is a housekeeping procedure recommended by the Law Revision Commission, and, also, with the approval of the Environmental Protection Agency."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Terzich: "I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 374 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Glen. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. It's been brought to my attention, for the purpose of an announcement, that the phones in the Capitol building, in the entire State complex, have been out of order for approximately half an hour due to some equipment malfunctioning at the main of... Bell Telephone Exchange Office. Now, the phones are, supposedly, in the process of being repaired, or the Exchange is correcting that situation, and you'll probably be getting some phone calls at this time if you're trying to make any calls. Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Well, thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. As much as they charge us for this system, as many thousands of dollars it is, do we get any kind of a rebate for this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can look into it. House Bill 385."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 385. A Bill for an Act in relation



to commercial relocation or removal of trespassing vehicles from private property, amending certain Acts herein name. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have this Bill returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of adopting a couple of Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Place the Bill on Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor? Has the Amendment been distributed? The Amendment has been distributed. Amendment #1. Read it."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 amends House Bill 385 on page 2 by deleting lines 6 through 34 and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Clerk Leone: "...inserting in lieu of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who is...who is offering the Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "O'Brien-Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Clerk Leone: "O'Brien-Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan O'Brien, on Amendment #1."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Representatives, this is an Amendment that, I believe, Representative Wolf has agreed to. I have a Cosponsor with me on the Amendment, Representative Lee Daniels. The Amendment, simply, puts a limit on the amount that a towing company can charge. The limit is set at thirty-five dollars. In addition to that, the Amendment also puts a limit on the amount of miles that a car can be towed from a location to 10 miles."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Amendment, Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. The Illinois Commerce Commission has recently issued and extended an order allowing for charges for towing





companies to be thirty-five dollars, and for the maximum mileage to be 10 miles per tow. We are putting this in the form of legislation, because it has come to our attention that towing companies throughout the state are making an underhanded attempt to raise the fee from thirty-five dollars to a rather substantial amount and to prohibit any limitation on mileage for tows. What happens is, a lot of these towing companies go to a tow from long distances to a very remote spot where their towing pond is kept, and once the consumer finally finds out where his car is and travels the long distance to get there, a lot of time has elapsed for which they are charged storage fee, and, in addition, they charge additional charges depending on the length of tow, so it jacks the price up from, perhaps, thirty-five dollars to, in some cases, over a hundred dollars. The Illinois Commerce Commission, in its wisdom, has issued an order that the maximum length should be 10 miles, and that the maximum charge should be thirty-five dollars. All we want to do is put that Illinois Commerce order into the statute to prevent any backhanded lobbying efforts by the towing companies in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, on the Amendment."

Brummer: "Yes, on the...does this apply to all over the State of Illinois? Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Daniels, I believe. Mr. O'Brien? Would you repeat the question for Mr. O'Brien?"

Brummer: "Does the...does the mileage limitation apply to all areas of the State of Illinois?"

O'Brien: "The synopsis indicates that this Bill applies only to Cook County. We have a companion Bill that is coming up the road that applies state-wide. I think I'd have to defer to the Sponsor of the Bill in relation to the Bill. The Amendment, actually, applies to the Bill, and if the



Bill applies state-wide, then the Amendment would apply state-wide. Evidently, ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wolf, can you answer that question?"

O'Brien: "...is just Cook County-wide."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Unfortunately, I don't have a copy of the Amendment.

If it...if it amends the Section in Chapter 95 and a half, which is the Motor Vehicle Code, that is Cook County only."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, on a point of order. What's your point?"

Marovitz: "The point is that the legislation's Relocation Tower's Act that we passed last session, which I was the Sponsor of and which Speaker Lechowicz was, also, principal Cosponsor of, that legislation did, in fact, apply only to Cook County and gave other counties in the state the opportunity to opt in, if they so wished."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any other questions, Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "Well, I wanted to only point out if...if the Bill had application state-wide, the 10-mile mileage limitation may be an undue restriction in some areas of down-state Illinois, in...in that there may not be any towing or pool yard, or whatever you call them, within 10 miles of the point from which the vehicle's being towed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, on the Amendment."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I want to ask, I'm not sure who, again I want to follow up on Representative Brummers, but I'm not sure that he got a correct answer. As I read the original Bill as it came out of the Committee, it amends an Act concerning liens and the Illinois Vehicle Code. Now, that, as I understand it, those provisions apply state-wide, not just in Cook County. Now, does Amendment #1... does it amend Repres...Lechowicz-Marovitz law, which was signed last year, which did apply only to Cook County, or does it amend the specific Sections of the Codes, which



comprise Representative Wolf's Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I'm not sure just exactly..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we just take this thing out of the record for the time being? Everybody get their files together. We'll get back to it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for the purpose of an introduction."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Up in the corner here, I believe, is the school...students from the Divine Infinite School represented by William Walsh, Emil Boucek, and Ann Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 385 will remain on Third Reading...Second Reading, I'm sorry. Now, we'll go back, and we order a Priority of Call. House Bill 444. Mr. Griesheimer on the floor? Take it out of the record. Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry, if I may. Could you tell us what the status of how many Bills that we've still got in Committee to be...to meet the deadline on Friday? Do you know how many Bills there are there yet?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll try to get that answered for you, Sir."

Ryan: "Well, I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, because if there are the numbers that I think that are there, I feel that we probably ought to stay here this weekend to get these Bills out of it...out of their Committee, and to protect..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all..."

Ryan: "...the Members' rights here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's always a possibility, Sir."

Ryan: "Well, I think that would be an excellent suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I think that ought to be done, or the Members are not going to be able to have their Bills heard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 458. I'll get to you in a second. Rep..."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 458. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Director of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey certain real es...real properties. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Ryan is absolutely right, and I have filed a motion to...on the...with the Clerk to do something about the situation that's been created in this House due to the deadline."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I told you we'd get back to you on it. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland, on House Bill 458."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The synopsis is..."

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

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it'd only be fair that you hear Representative Totten out. He is a Member of this chamber, and I don't know why you should cut him off. He hadn't completed his statement, and I think you ought to let him, at least, complete his inquiry or whatever it is he had."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll be more than happy to recognize him after we get through with this Bill, which is on Third Reading, Sir. Mr. Friedland, please continue."

Friedland: "Thank you for your consideration, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the synopsis and the Digest is absolutely correct concerning this Bill. It would authorize the Director of Mental Health to convey two parcels of surplus property following proper appraisals. One parcel for the Kane County Forest Preserve and another to the Association for Individual Development, an association which assists handicapped people, and I urge your favorable consideration in this measure. Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Only because I think we've got to follow our own rules, Representative Friedland, and I'm not aware if on Second Reading this Bill was held, because our rules require if it is not and if the authorization is given to other than the governmental unit, that there be an appraisal filed on Second Reading with the Clerk of the House, and I'm just checking to see if that was done, because if it hasn't done, I think you have some problems, and you may end up in court, anyway."

Friedland: "No, Representative, the appraisals...one appraisal... it's required by the legislation for two appraisals. One appraisal has been submitted to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and they did approve the measure on that basis."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and I always like to help John with his Bills. I'd rather follow our own rules, because I think that was the purpose for this rule being adopted, so that we have some indication as a Legislative Body when these types of conveyances or authorization Bills are passed."

Friedland: "Well, then, perhaps, it was my error, but I had assumed that the Chairman of the Executive Committee would do, with the appraisal, the proper thing, whatever that might be. Transform...transmit it to the Clerk or..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us what the appraisal was? How much per acre?"

Friedland: "I could give you the total appraisal. One...the larger parcel to the Forest Preserve was appraised at eighty-one thousand, two hundred dollars, and the smaller parcel was appraised at forty-eight thousand, five hun-



dred dollars."

Skinner: "So, it's about two...two thousand dollars an acre?"

Friedland: "Well, I don't know. Divide it out and..."

Skinner: "I, personally, would rather put a...a regional shopping center there rather than in Dundee, but if the Forest Preserve wants it, such is life."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this Bill, but I would like to call to the attention of the Members and the Reference Bureau the description of House Amendment #1 printed in the Digest, which says, 'adds to description of property and makes some changes'. Isn't that what an Amendment does, 'it makes changes?'"

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, I...I...the Amendment is a technical Amendment adopted at the...by...requested by the Department of Transportation to protect an easement for...in the property in case they intend, in the future, to expand the highway there, and, at this time, I'd urge favorable consideration of this measure."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, babe."

Pullen: "I indicated that I am speaking in support of the Bill, and I'm not intending to give the Sponsor any trouble. I'm just suggesting that if it's technical changes, the description should say, 'make some technical changes'. I cannot believe that the Reference Bureau would print in the Digest under an Amendment, 'make some changes'. It's incredible, and I hope that never happens again. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. All opposed. The previous question's been moved."



The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland, to close."

Friedland: "I'd urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 458 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Ryan, I asked the Parliamentarian of the House to check with the Speaker to try to get an answer to your question. Mr. Totten, I'll get to you immediately after we go back to Mr. Wolf's Bill, which is on Second Reading, and that, I might add, should just take a very brief moment in time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, on House Bill 385. It was on Second Reading. Amendment #1 being offered by Representative O'Brien and Lee Daniels. There was a discussion. 385. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain the Amendment."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, to explain Representative Leinenweber's question in relation to whether or not the Amendment applies state-wide or Cook County, we have been informed by staff and shown that it applies only to Cook County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Any additional discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on the Amendment? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 amends House Bill 385 as follows. On page 1 by deleting lines 29 through 32. On page 2 by deleting lines 1 through 5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Whose Amendment is it?"

Clerk Leone: "Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, on Amendment #2."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 clarifies the mechanics"



liens Section of the Bill, which makes the requirement for the signs. That does not apply to residential property. That is clearly reserved and intended, exclusively, for the use of the resident or the occupant, and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on Amendment #2? All those in favor of Amendment #2 signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. All opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. As I indicated, I extend Representative Ryan's remarks and maybe offer some information to the...to the Speaker. The report that we received today shows that there were still sixteen hundred and fifty Bills in Committee. I don't know what was reported out of Committee today, but even if it was four hundred Bills, it still leaves twelve hundred Bills for us to consider in the next week. If we're interested in quantity, rather than quality, then we may view what I'm going to say a little differently, but I think that this Body a deliberative body. For us to be forced to consider over twelve hundred Bills in one week, especially with the Committee rule that we need a majority of the Members of the Committee in order to pass a Bill out, we're working at counterpro...in counterproductive areas. This and next week when Members are putting their own Bills up before Committees, and their own Committees are meeting, there will very seldom be the majorities needed to take action on legislation. That may be good or bad, depending on whose ox is getting gored, but the deliberative Body process, I think, is the most important one, and there are many areas, many pieces of legislation of substantial substance still less to be...





left to be considered by Committees of this House. Some of which, if they were deliberated carefully, may take the full four hours that some of these Committees are allowed to meet. I concur with Representative Ryan that this House ought to be in Session this weekend, probably more so than it should be in Session the weekend at the end of June, to consider these matters. Therefore, I have filed with the Clerk of the House a motion of which Representatives Kane and Representatives Mautino are joining me to suspend the deadlines for the rest of this Session, and I would move for adoption of that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're not on that Order of Business. When we get to that Order, I'll call you. The Gentle... House Bill 507. Mr. ...what purpose do you seek, Gentleman seek recognition? Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Then I would like to move to go to that Order of Business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does he have a written notice? Does he have a written notice? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in response to the motion of Representative Totten and others, it seems to me that a motion of this nature ought not to be considered by this Body without some due reflection. Also, it is a motion which has been offered to the Body without referral to the Committee which, most appropriately, ought to consider the motion, which is the Rules Committee, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if there is need for serious discussion of this question at this time between the respective leaderships of the House, that at this time I would request leave of the House to convene a meeting of the Rules Committee in the Speaker's Office, while the House continues in Session."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I got a better idea, and I always



like to alert new Members to the legislative process as quickly as possible. We go through this every Session, when we get into this time crunch, and it always comes on the last day, on the getaway day, when there's always a big uproar, and a good reason to leave. You know, it always happens. Now, we were here at 7:30 in the morning yesterday. We worked till almost 10:30. We don't have to have an excuse to leave. Let's just go home. We don't have to have this uproar. We do it all the time, so I want those new Members to know what we're going through. It's all window dressing. We've got to have a big uproar and a reason to leave, because it's...you know, it's about three o'clock on Friday. We don't need an excuse. We worked hard all week. Let's go home."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, made a motion to have immediate leave, so that the Rules Committee could meet now and discuss this important question. On that question, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a matter that's of grave concern to all of the Members of this chamber, and I see no reason to go to the back rooms to discuss it. Every Member, as indicated by the closing arguments last night on the floor of this House, have an interest in what we're talking about here this afternoon, and I think if we're going to debate it, it ought to be debated right here, so I would object to the Gentleman's motion."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Minority Leader has previously suggested that we would be well-advised to work this weekend, and as a follow up to that suggestion, I would now like him to delineate for us a proposed schedule of activity for Saturday and Sunday, and I'd like him to tell us how much time he think we ought to devote to Committees and to floor action."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And also to posting rules, Sir."



Madigan: "I asked him..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I think it would take 107 votes."

Madigan: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just want to give him a hand. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, had I had that one vote to be Speaker, I'd probably answer your question, Representative Madigan, but I think that we ought to address Representative Totten's motion, and that would probably eliminate what we're talking about here, and that's really what this discussion is all about, is to eliminate the deadline, and, in response to your question, Representative Totten's motion will certainly take care of that, and then we won't have to worry about being here this weekend."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the problem is when will we consider the Bills that are before us? Will we put the time in now? Will we put the time in later? Will we reject certain Bills in Committee or will we let all Bills out of Committee because of the continual consideration of the Bills? The Speaker has indicated to me that he is receptive to the previous suggestion of Mr. Ryan that we work the weekend, and my offer to you, Sir, was you made the initial suggestion, now I'd like you to tell me how much time do you want to put in Committee? How much time on the floor? We are receptive to your suggestions, Sir."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Speaker indicated earlier in the day that we were going to work until four o'clock, I believe. It seems to me that we would be in good order if we proceeded until that time and kept to the business of the Members of this House on the floor, not getting sidetracked into some kind of a procedural motion of this sort. We still have some time



that we can spend here today to get something accomplished, and I hope that the time I spend here today is not wasted on this kind of discussion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point's well taken, Ma'am. The Gentleman from Champaign...Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we routinely adopt motions to suspend the rules. Motions to suspend the rules that result from the requirement of deadlines, and those requirements are for a six and a half day posting rule. We suspend that motion routinely, and it cuts off the participation of the public and other individuals that are interested, and we cut off an awful lot of participation, and most of that is caused by the deadlines. There is no way that any of us who have gone through the Committee hearings of the last two weeks and looking forward to the Committee hearings of next week. We all know that there is not going to be due consideration given to those sixteen hundred Bills. If all of those Bills do come out of Committee, we are going to be faced with that chaos on the floor of the House for the succeeding two weeks. All of it caused by artificial deadlines, and I think that we ought to give consideration to Representative Totten's motion to suspend those rules for the remaining of this...remainder of this Session. Whether we do...whether we take up that motion today or take it up next week, I think that it's a serious motion. It should be seriously considered, and that it ought to be brought to a vote of the full House."

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

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to delay us any longer than we've already been delayed on this subject matter, but I...I have a message for the new Members, too. One is that next week is, short of delaying the deadlines, next week the Committees will almost hardly recognize the Bill, except by a number, and out Bills come by the gobs, and



when they get, finally get passed, those that passed, many, many of them will be killed in the Senate regardless of their merit. Now this happens every year. We waste our time getting up here on the floor and talking about giving everybody a fair shake. I'm one of those who said we should maintain the deadlines. I was opposed to 'em to start with. I was saying that June 30th ought to be our deadline, and what we don't have passed, dies, and if everybody knows that, he'll get his Bill in soon enough, and get started with it, but I am absolutely opposed to postponing the deadlines. I think if there's something important enough to run the State Government, we can change the rules at that time and pull it back off of the Table and pass it, but I think we ought to stick with our deadlines."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, all these opinions and sermons from the other side are very interesting, but the fact remains that, by Representative Totten has made a perfectly legitimate motion to change the Order of Business, and I think that's what's before us."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, every year we busily crank out two to three thousand Bills for the Senate and ask them to consider it within the period of thirty days. We all know that probably less than ten percent of the Bills, which we consider so important, so unkillable, so necessary to the people in our districts, are going to die. Every year we have the same results. Only about two to three hundred Bills are going to survive the Senate. If you don't know it, I'm telling it to the freshmen Members now. We always accuse the Senate of not giving us due consideration, but our basic problem is we pump too many Bills out to this floor knowing that they can't all live. If we would exercise a little discretion within



the Committees, we would have a better chance to have legislation by this House enacted into law, so, again, I'll vote with you to maintain a deadline or do it anyway you want to, but, again, only about ten percent of the Bills that we pump out are really going to live, and I think we rest ourselves in folly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think the matter before us is a motion by Representative Madigan to have the Rules Committee consider all of the issues that are being raised by the Members on the House floor, and the Minority Leader suggests that it be...it was to be done in a back room. If he doesn't like that, we can do it in a side room. We can do it down in a Committee room, where the public can hear, but I think the Rules Committee should decide what procedures we should follow for the rest of the Session. That is what is before us right now, and I feel that we should vote on that motion made by Representative Madigan at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Rule 22 be suspended?' Does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, persist in his motion to suspend Rule 22, so that the Rules Committee can meet and discuss this important subject? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we move to Mr. Totten's motion. That was certainly put ahead of Representative Madigan's motion, and that's not...that's got to be in Order and it's got to be in Order first, I would think."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Madigan made..."

Ryan: "Mr. Totten made his motion ahead of Mr. Madigan, and if you're going to consider motions, it ought to be Mr. Totten's motion that you consider first, and if you would consider that motion first, you'd resolve this problem



one way or the other."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're trying to resolve the problem, Mr. Ryan, and I believe Mr. Madigan made a motion to suspend Rule 22 so that the Rules Committee could meet in any room you'd like, outside if you'd like, and discuss this important subject. It will require 89 votes. On that question, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, why can't we take Mr. Totten's motion first? And if that fails, we can go to Mr. Madigan's motion. I don't understand why you're ignoring Mr. Totten's point."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm not ignoring anyone, Sir. I'm trying to recognize him."

Ryan: "Well, why don't you take his motion? He put it first."

Speaker Lechowicz: I am trying to recognize him. I went to... I was discussing his...in fact, the entire Membership heard the discussion, heard the arguments. Mr. Madigan rose and asked that the Rules Committee have leave to meet while the House was in Session to discuss this and come back to the Membership with an answer."

Ryan: "I think the Membership..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You said you objected to that."

Ryan: "...will give you the answer to call on Representative Totten's motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You said you objected to that, and now we're talking about suspending the Rule 22."

Ryan: "I object...I object to the reason that you ought to go to Mr. Totten's motion first."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He wasn't recognized for that motion."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, is Representative Madigan..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, number one, the Rule 10B does say that any Member may, at anytime, make that motion, and that motion was made in accordance with Rule 10B, and



I question whether Mr. Madigan's motion would take precedence over that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, unfortunately, we were on the Bill. 10B was filed after..."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...his original filing, and if you want to check with the Clerk, he's standing right there, and that's exactly what happened, Mr. Collins, ..."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, let me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...so your point...your point of Order is not well taken. Check the filing dates and who filed what and what time it was filed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, is that correct?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think the transcript would show that I filed the written motion on 10B before Mr. Madigan made his motion. I don't know whether he made a substitute motion, which is what he would have to do, but if we...if, Mr. Speaker, we went to 10B, which I think the motion is in order according to the Rules, and then went to the motion, and if the House so resolved, then probably the Rules Committee ought to meet, because we're going to resolve the question right on the House floor, and I think all the Members want that input into it, because they're all affected, and I think we're in order and that the Order of Business should be for the Chair to consider my motion to move to that Order of Business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, whatever the Rules Committee decides, we'll have to come back to the floor for consideration. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you explain our posture at this time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The posture is before us is your motion to suspend Rule 22 so that the Rules Committee can meet and discuss this important question, and come back to the Membership while we're in Session."





Madigan: "How many votes are required on that motion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Eighty-nine."

Madigan: "Would you please put the motion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Rule 22 be suspended?' On that question, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. The Gentleman from Lake on the question, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "In case anybody didn't hear that, I said, 'The hell with their bluffs.' Because I said it like I've said it before, and if anybody wants me to give my Jack Hill impersonation, I'll do it, but I'll save that for another day. I now move a substitute motion that we adjourn until Tuesday at 2...11 a. m. ...10 a. m. Hit that gavel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall the House stand adjourned till 11 a. m. Tuesday...10 a. m. Tuesday?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned."



## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 27, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0060	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0079	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0194	3RD READING	PAGE	64
HB-0324	3RD READING	PAGE	69
HB-0356	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0374	3RD READING	PAGE	70
HB-0385	2ND READING	PAGE	72
	2ND READING	PAGE	79
HB-0446	3RD READING	PAGE	7
HB-0458	3RD READING	PAGE	75
HB-0741	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-0847	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0889	3RD READING	PAGE	24
HB-0891	3RD READING	PAGE	36
HB-0925	3RD READING	PAGE	51
HB-1010	2ND READING	PAGE	52
HB-1018	2ND READING	PAGE	19
HB-1047	3RD READING	PAGE	53
HB-1051	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1060	3RD READING	PAGE	12
HB-1067	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1069	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1070	2ND READING	PAGE	21
HB-1071	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1077	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1078	2ND READING	PAGE	21
HB-1079	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1080	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1082	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-1083	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1084	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1085	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1087	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1095	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1097	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1100	2ND READING	PAGE	21
HB-1108	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1109	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1123	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1130	3RD READING	PAGE	58
HB-1131	2ND READING	PAGE	23
HB-1156	2ND READING	PAGE	24
HB-1159	3RD READING	PAGE	16

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 27, 1979

PAGE 2

	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1186	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1188	3RD READING	PAGE	13
HB-1193	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1212	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1253	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1254	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1289	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1290	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1304	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1309	3RD READING	PAGE	14
HB-1325	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1445	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1446	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1447	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1554	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1693	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-1764	MOTIONS	PAGE	5
HB-1777	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1781	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1850	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1913	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1914	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1951	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-1965	2ND READING	PAGE	24
HB-1966	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1969	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1970	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1974	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1986	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1990	3RD READING	PAGE	18
SB-0486	1ST READING	PAGE	6

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 27, 1979

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE
FURTHER RESOLUTIONS - COMMITTEE ON ASSIGNMENT	PAGE
EXCUSED ABSENCE	PAGE
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE
HB 1764 TABLED	PAGE
REP. TOTTEN MOTION TO SUSPEND DEADLINES	PAGE
SUSPEND RULE 22/RULES COMMITTEE MEETING	PAGE
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE