

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

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. St. Thomas a' Kempis wrote, 'It is no small matter to lose or gain the Kingdom of God'. Let us pray. Almighty God, our Eternal Father in heaven, we extol Thy Holy Name and give thanks for all Thy wondrous blessings. Do Thou stand ever before us that we may cleave to Thee and the ways which Thou hast set before us to follow. In our labours as Members of this House of Representatives direct us that we may ever hold fast to our faith in Thee and do only such things that will assure our being within Thy Kingdom, that being so directed we may fulfill our endeavors to bring joy and happiness, peace and prosperity, to all the people of this State of Illinois; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Pledge of allegiance."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your own switch only. Take the record. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1505, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to provide for the protection for the public health and safety by prohibiting the possession, delivery, manufacture, or advertising of drugs, paraphernalia. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1571, Bradley. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1572, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Board



of Trustees to the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1574, Bradley. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Regents First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1575, Keane. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of state colleges and universities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1576, Stuffle. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Community College Board and Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1577, Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1581, Christensen. A Bill for an Act prohibit the importation of set nuclear reactor fuel into the state for storage of disposal. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 16... Senate Bill 1583, Dwight Friedrich. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Reference Bureau. First Reading of the Bill. Dwight, I need your signature on that. Senate Bill 1613, Polk. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1622, Reilly. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Human Rights and the Human Right Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1632, Ralph Dunn. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mines and Minerals. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1709, VonBoeckman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1729, Schneider. A Bill for an Act relating to the education of certain children. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1747,



Campbell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1752, Telcser. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1808, Braun. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone that... pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Anyone that has a Bill on Third Reading or Consideration Postponed that wants to return it to Second for the purpose of an Amendment? Representative Watson, do you have one that fits that category? You what? Are you ready to bring them back and put the Amendment on is my question? What Bills are they? What is it? That's Bradley's isn't it? Oh. Okay. Representative Henry. 28... Representative Henry requests 2846 be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Is there objections? Hearing none, Second Reading 2846. Representative... out of the record. Representative Younge, do you have one?"

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. 3325."

Speaker Redmond: "What is it?"

Younge: "3325."

Speaker Redmond: "3325. 3325. The Friday deadline doesn't affect that one. Does that make any difference? I'm trying to get everything 'foised' here that... What's your pleasure? You want to bring it back?"

Younge: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, 3325 is returned to Second Reading. Any Amendment from the floor, Mr. Clerk? Anyone over on the Republican side that has a Bill that they want to bring back to Second Reading? You just..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Younge. Amends House Bill 3325 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following. An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Amendment is to make the appropriation directly to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and to correct an error in the title of the Local Development Commission, East St. Louis Economic Development Commission. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. Motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, First."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1808, Braun. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1813, Sharp. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1815, Oblinger. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of hospis. care. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1834, VonBoeckman. A Bill for an Act in relation to the practice of nursing. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1837, Sam Wolf. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Tri-City Regional Port District Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Former prestigious Member of the House now Senator Jack Murlow is in the chamber. He isn't running again."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1844, Campbell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Tax. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1886, Sharp. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1956,



Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Downstate Public Transportation Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's hold these now and go back to House Bills, Second Reading and see if we can move any of those. House Bill... how about 697. I guess we don't have the fiscal impact note... pension impact note."

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is not filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1295. Out of the record. 2705, McPike. Out of the record. 2762, Yourell. 2762. Out of the record. Out of the record. 2845. Representative Stuffle, for what purpose do you rise?"

Stuffle: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Do you intend to return to this order of business today given the slack attendance at this point and time and the fact that the Members that are here may find it difficult to move controversial Amendments at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'm... right at the moment I'm just trying to see if I can find something to do. Representative Henry, on 2845. Is there any Amendment from the floor on that?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2845. A Bill for an Act in relation to employment development corporations. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Henry. Amends House Bill 2845 on page one by deleting line one and two and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 2845. Amendment #1 deletes everything after the enacting clause in House Bill 2845. It replaces with a new program to bring financial assistance to new product development in the state. The Amendment creates



the Illinois Product Development Corporation. The Corporation requires a public... governed by a board of seven directors appointed by the Governor. The purpose of this Corporation is to encourage and stimulate the development of new products, devices, techniques, or processes established by smaller Illinois companies. Through the infusion of risk capital, such financial assistance would be made only where financial aid would not be otherwise be available from the commercial service... forces. The expected benefits of the state from this effort is increased employment and tax revenue by the creation of new permit manufacturing jobs."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment 1. Is there any discussion? Question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carried. Amendments adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On through that category, let's go back to Senate Bills, First Reading. 1893."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1967, Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2020, Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Local Mass Transit District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2013, Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2014, Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to State Finance. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Back to House Bills, Second Reading on page two. 3173."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3173. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 3173 by Representative Currie."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie on the motion."

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

Amendment #2 would apply the provisions of House Bill 3173 to all counties except Cook County. I think that's an unnecessary and in fact inappropriate Amendment and my motion to table it is based on my sense that the farmers of Cook County need exactly the same kind of care and help that the farmers of the other 101 counties in the state require. I would urge the House to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it's my understanding in discussing this Bill with the Assessors Office in Cook County and with the leadership when the Bill was in the Rules Committee and the Revenue Committee that the County of Cook did not wish to be a part of this Bill, and that's the reason we took them out in the Revenue Committee. I've had no different signal from the leadership on this side of the aisle nor from the Assessors Office in Cook County. If Cook County wishes to be in the Bill, that's fine with me, but the sentiment expressed to me and to my knowledge it has not changed. It is in opposition to that concept, and for that reason, I would oppose the motion to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's conceivable that the Representatives from Cook County may change their minds about whether they want to be in this Bill or not if we adopt Amendment #7 which would limit the increase in property tax and property tax assessments for homeowners to the same 8% as we are limiting the assessment increase for



farmers. So perhaps those Representatives in Cook County might want to reconsider their not wanting to give tax relief to farmers in Cook County which is what this Amendment would do."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further on the Amendment?

Question's on the Lady's motion to table Amendment #2. Representative Currie."

Currie: "I just wondered if one closes on an Amendment.

I would say that the Sponsor of the Bill is telling us what the leadership and what perhaps the Cook County Assessors Office was doing and what they felt when the Bill was originally introduced. It seems to me that we have a responsibility to go beyond what the leadership in this General Assembly thinks is good for the farmers of Cook County and to be concerned about those people in the State of Illinois wherever they are and in whichever county they live. And it seems to me our responsibility. Even if Representative Stuffle as Sponsor of the Bill didn't see it that way. It's to see to it that there is fair play throughout the state; to see to it that those individuals who are farming in Cook County where the Assessor, it seems to me, is in no way necessarily better suited to judging the quality of the soil and doing the kind of assessments that is the concern of this Bill all together. This House has a responsibility to see to it that all the farmers of the State of Illinois are included in this helpful provision." I urge us to adopt Amendment... to adopt this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Lady's motion to table Amendment #2. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, the previous attendance was 69, I think we better have another Attendance Roll Call hadn't we? Maybe I'm in error."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, your count wasn't right on the first one. All those voted who wish? On this question there's 59 aye and 14 nos. Take the record on it, Mr. Clerk. And the motion prevails. The Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Bradley. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended by inserting immediately after Section..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the Sponsor of the Amendment here? Who is it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure, Mr. Clerk... I mean Mr. Stuffle?"

Stuffle: "Representative Bradley and I discussed this Amendment. As far as I understand at this point it's his belief and mine that it's no longer necessary because we checked this out with the Reference Bureau. There is already a reference in Section 627-146 of the Revenue Act that would make this operative in the case that a local assessment official would not implement the current farmland assessment law or a future one that amends 20E. The Amendment's really unnecessary. Representative Bradley understands that. I would wish to proceed with the rest of the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and Section 20F-1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that Amendment #4 is now out of order because it amends the Bill with the inclusion of Amendment 2 which was tabled. It inserts language..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wasn't 4 Bradley's?"

Stuffle: "No, 4 is Giorgi's. But it amends the Bill, if you look on line four of the Amendment, by inserting



words before the words 'in counties'. Those words are no longer in the Bill as amended. The Amendment is out of order for that reason I would submit."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, "Parliamentarian advises me that Representative Stuffle's point is well taken."

Giorgi: "Well, all I'm trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is limit... put a cap on assessments to manufacturing plants and truck manufacturing plants and auto manufacturing plants. I think we all want to do that. We want to help industry. We want to restrain the local level of taxation on manufacturing plants because of the jobs... economy provides..."

Stuffle: "Point of order."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, I raised a point of order and I would like for the Chair to rule on that. He's discussing the Amendment. That's not the issue before the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me the Amendment is out of order. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Sponsor is amenable to amending it on its face. All we do is take out line five and then the language would be correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Representative Giorgi, I'm not amenable to that because if this is not ruled out of order, then I've got another point of order for you on this one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that... I move that that be done on its face with the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentelman has requested leave to amend Amendment #4 on its face. What is... specifically is the Amendment... is the change that you desire?"



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, to delete 3, 4, and 5 from the Amendment #4. That's lines 3, 4, and 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to object to this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Takes unanimous consent. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker... I'm making the motion that the Amendment be amended on its face and lines 3, 4, and 5 be deleted from Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that it requires unanimous consent to amend the Amendment on its face. You will have to file another Amendment in proper form." Representative Stuffle.

Giorgi: "... would the Sponsor of the Bill pull the Bill out of the record till I get this correction in?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Representative Giorgi, I cannot do that. Given a time limit to this House, this Bill has sat here for consideration and, in fact, you gave me your word you would support the Bill and I was not aware you would offer any Amendment until the other day. And I cannot proceed in that manner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I respect the Sponsor's feeling not to take the Bill out of the record and I'll still support the Bill because I believe in the concept."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Currie. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "The Chair has ruled that Amendment 4 is out of order because of the reason I cited, the fact that the Amendment amends something no longer in the Bill. If the Parliamentarian would look at Amendments 5, 6, and 7 they do the same thing. They amend things not in the



Bill and I believe that they are out of order. I would like a ruling on that based upon the same ruling that Amendment 4 was out of order. I believe these are. They insert language in exactly the same place where Amendment 2 existed, no longer does because it was tabled, and I would ask that you rule 5, 6, and 7 out of order for the same reason as 4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

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

I think that Representative Stuffle is quite right. Having voted on the prevailing side, I would like the House to reconsider the vote by which Amendment 2 was withdrawn from the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... tabled... 2 was tabled."

Stuffle: "Point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle on a point of order."

Stuffle: "What is the issue before the House? Is it not the issue of the question of whether or not 5, 6, and 7 are out of order? On my request for a ruling on that it would persist."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie, what was your motion?"

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. My motion was with respect to Amendment #2 and it is that having voted on the prevailing side, I would ask the House to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 3173 was tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that's the proper motion and it takes precedence over anything before this Body now. Now the question is on Representative Currie's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was tabled. Those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Representative Skinner on the motion."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to admit error. Representative Stuffle has won up to everybody who wanted to amend this vehicle which is the only tax relief Bill that is available, and if you want tax relief



for home owners, I think you ought to be voting to table this Amendment." We can cut Cook County in afterwards."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 62 aye and 31 no and the motion prevails and the vote by which Amendment #2 was tabled is reconsidered. Now that we have... we have voted to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was tabled, I've been advised by the Parliamentarian that the correct procedure now is that Amendment 2 is not on the Bill now. That if anybody wants to address that problem. All we've done is vote to reconsider. So there should be a vote on the adoption of 2. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House adopt Amendment #2 to House Bill 3173."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Currie is moving to adopt Amendment 2 which I offered in Committee.

Is she in order to do that at this point and time since I am the Sponsor of that Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Amendment. She is in order."

Stuffle: "Under what rule since the Amendment was adopted in Committee, was offered by me. Does it now become a Floor Amendment? Are you a Member of the Committee, Representative Currie? Representative Currie."

Currie: "Mr. Speaker, but I would think if we are reconsidering the vote to table an Amendment that was already on the Bill that in fact the issue as to who was the Sponsor and what its status is is already beyond... not relevant right now. We have an Amendment. It was on the Bill. We moved to table. We are now reconsidering that decision. I think the Amendment is there. It's printed. It's part of the Bill, and I don't think the question as to who is the Sponsor is



especially relevant. I am a Member of the Committee, however; and if the Parliamentarian rules..."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that the question now is the motion to adopt Amendment #2 which is a Committee Amendment. And under our rules, it requires a Member of the Committee to offer a Committee Amendment. Now, if you are a Member of the Committee..."

Currie: "I am a Member of the Committee and I offer the House Amendment #2 as it was originally..."

Speaker Redmond: "So the question.. the question... Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's rather obvious that Representative Currie or someone has some insincerity here has been... First of all put Amendment #2 on to take Cook County out then table the Amendment and now they want to put it back on. Now they're arguing for the Amendment. I'm a little perplexed as to what to do here. It's rather obvious that they're trying to kill this Bill and they don't give a damn how they do it or what method they do it. And some of the people who have come forth today obviously weren't very sincere about their positions on this thing. I personally don't care whether Cook County's in this Bill or not. I would urge, however; that since they shifted their position that we stick with their tabling and vote no on the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone further? Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm sorry to hear that Representative Stuffle doesn't care one way or another about Cook County. I did care. I thought this Bill would be improved if Cook County were included. However, other Amendments which are coming along down the line are also critical to the means of the importance of the substance of this piece of legislation and even though it is not appropriate now



to include Cook County in the legislation, I think that we have a better chance of making this into a really good Bill that will help a lot of people in the State of Illinois if the House decides to reinstate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3173."

Speaker Redmond: "Just to remind the Members that the red light is on that permission to take pictures has been granted. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when the previous speaker spoke about the fact that Representative Stuffle did not have any concern for Cook County it appears that the case is more true in her situation as first she wants the Amendment in then out, then in, then out. I think we ought to go with Representative Stuffle's intent. He has a good Bill here and let's try to move on."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question... Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Let the record so show. The question is on the... the... The question's on the Lady's motion to adopt Amendment #2. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if you vote no on this Bill, on this Amendment, what you're saying is you do not want any tax relief for homeowners this year. That will be the affect of the vote. Let that be very clear."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote I also support the position of my colleague from Coles County, Representative Ropp. I've been a little confused this morning too to the exact status of what the Representative and the Sponsor of Amendment #2 is trying to do."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 71 aye and 76 no. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I feel so strongly that homeowners



should have some tax relief as well as farmers that I want to verify the negative."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested a verification..."

Skinner: "But I'd be willing to have the absentees called first."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Balanoff. Davis. Dyer. Gaines. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Kelly."

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

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded on this Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's the Lady recorded?"

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

Dyer: "I'd like to vote aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Lady as aye. Representative Jones, aye. Representative Jones. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees.

Kelly. Klosak. Laurino. Leverenz. Pierce.

Preston. Reed. Sandquist. Schneider. Stanley.

Stearney. Swanstrom. Taylor. Totten. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wikoff. Williamson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed, for what purpose do you rise?" Representative Reed desires to be recorded as no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees.

Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "... aye. Representative Sandquist, aye.

Got to have a Roll Call for attendance now. Oh, pardon me. You're right. Now, what's the count? 75 ayes and 78 nos. Representative Schlickman."

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting no!"



Schlickman: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye. Gaines, aye. Representative Balanoff, aye. Representative Alexander. Representative Huff and McGrew, will you please sit down? Representative Alexander. Alexander, aye. Please be in your seats. It's pretty hard to... Anyone else? Representative... What's the count now? 79 ayes and 77 nos. is the count right now. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise again the question that when the Bill was... the Amendment was tabled being a Committee Amendment it had been adopted and under our rules was part of that Bill. When the motion to reconsider the tabling of Amendment #2 prevailed, I would respectfully suggest to the Chair that it put the Amendment 2 back in its posture as it was before and that is that it is part of that Bill and that this attempt to re-adopt it is anullity. That it is now on the Bill by reason of our prevailing on the motion to reconsider. And I would as that the Chair look at that and consider its ruling. And I would cite 34-A of the rules in regard to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "I'd like to change from a no to yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from no to yes!":

It's the... on reconsideration of the ruling, House Bill 3173, when it came from the Committee to the floor, had Amendments #1 and 2. And it required no affirmative action on the floor in order that those Amendments be adopted. Now that was pursuant to a rule change. It used to be the practice in the House that we had to move on the floor for the adoption of the Committee Amendment. That requirement was deleted and the rules provide that the Committee Amendments are deemed adopted unless a motion to tabled has been filed and that the motion prevails. Now in this case, a



motion to table was filed. The motion to table carried and a motion to reconsider that action by this Body carried. So, in my judgement, that would return House Bill 3173 to the posture that it had before the motion to reconsider. In other words, that it would have ... that Amendment #1 and 2 automatically were on the Bill and were adopted. And I'm sorry that I made the previous ruling, but... upon sober reflection, this is the first time that this has arisen since we had that rule changed. So, this is without precedence. So, the ruling is that Amendments 1 and 2 are on the Bill. Dump this one. Roll Call for attendance. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Given the precedence of this action, I rise to make an inquiry. We adopted Amendment #2 offered by me to the Revenue Committee. Representative Currie in turn moved to table Amendment #2, then moved to reconsider Amendment #2 and now you tell us it's back in the posture that it's on the Bill. Is it now in order to again move to table Amendment #2?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat your inquiry?"

Stuffle: "Is it now in order to again move to table Amendment #2 since the effect of what you have done is to adopt it twice? Can we move a second time to table it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for purposes of an introduction."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Stiehl: "In the Speaker's gallery we're very fortunate to have the cadette Girl Scouts from the Wolfbranch School who are represented by Representative Younge, Flinn, and myself. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I can make an announcement. As everyone knows, the German-American dinner has been



rescheduled for June 17 and how this Irishman got on the committee is a mystery to even myself, but I do have tickets for sale at my desk and there's also a table set up in the rotunda for the sale of tickets. This is the best party of the year and I urge everybody to participate. June 17th is the date."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber, a real German."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I don't know how he got on there either and I don't know how the tickets came out green."

Speaker Redmond: "That's because of our in-laws.

Parliamentarian advises me that, in his judgement, the motion is not proper on the same day. So now we have the Bill... put it back up on the board will you. 3173, it's back on the floor with Amendments 1 and 2. Now where are we, Mr. Clerk? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley. Withdrawn.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 mandates that identical limit on assessment growth for the real property on which an operating automobile or truck manufacturing plant is situated gets the same treatment as farmland I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now that this Amendment's in order but number 2 is back on, using the logic of those that took #2 off and put it back on, I would point out that the Amendment does not apply to Cook County, first of all, it applies to the rest of the state. Secondly, if you read the Amendment and I don't know who drafted it. It's rather ridiculous. It compares assessments of real property on which an operating automobile or truck manufacturing plant exists to assessments for farm-



land. It puts an 8% limit on it and relates the two things together. It doesn't relate it to itself or comparable assessments, but it relates the assessment of these automobile and truck manufacturing plants to the assessment of farmland. I don't think it was drawn that way intentionally but that's exactly what it does if you read the Amendment. I don't think it belongs in this Bill. Representative Giorgi's made attempts to help out that certain corporation in his district that some of us voted for and, in fact, some of us in return for some help on this which he promised. This does not belong in this Bill. It is a Bill dealing with farm assessments. Drawn only to deal with farm assessments, and I would oppose the Amendment and oppose its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question? Representative Giorgi, I tried... I was trying to pay attention. There was some commotion here. and I didn't hear your explanation. I heard an explanation of the Sponsor of the Bill. Could you run that by us once more what this Amendment #3 does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. Give the Gentleman order."

Giorgi: "The Bill is talking..."

Speaker Redmond: "Decibel level at 75.: On working compensation that's definite."

Giorgi: "The Bill is talking about adding a Section to the farm assessment law and then it poses a limit or cap of 8% on increases in farm assessments for 1980 only. What I'm trying to do, and there are going to be more Amendment placed on this Bill, to contain the assessment practices of a lot of other units in Illinois. So, Amendment #4 mandates the identical limit on assessment growth for real property in which an operating automobile or truck manufacturing plant is situated. We're asking



for the same treatment you're giving farmers, homeowners, and everybody else. For one year only."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "How many of these automobile manufacturing plants in Illinois would be covered by this proposed Amendment?"

Giorgi: "How many in Illinois... compared to how many farms are in Illinois. Why is that important. Why is that question important?"

Leinenweber: "Well, it certainly would have some impact presumably on units of local government such as Winnebago or..."

Giorgi: "No, no. There's now laws.. You're saying that ... you're saying that if assessments won't be allowed to grow beyond 8% that's all you're saying."

Leinenweber: "In spite of what possibly the market may do."

Giorgi: "But..."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, briefly on the Amendment. I think the Sponsor is ... of the Bill is right in opposing this Amendment. We... last... or a couple weeks ago did throw a little largesse towards Chrysler and I don't see why it would be incumbent upon us to give them anything else. This... as the Gentleman, Sponsor, pointed out, this is a farm-land assessment Act rather than an automobile manufacturing Act or defunct automobile manufacturing Act. So, I think we probably should oppose the Amendment also."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to respectfully disagree with Representative Stuffle. He has argued against this Amendment by saying that there is no relationship between a proposed freeze on assessments on automobile and truck plants and a proposed freeze on farmland." It is that argument that I wish to disagree with. When Mr. Stuffle and proponents of this Bill appeared before the



Revenue Committee they argued that the economic condition of the farm industry in this state compelled that there be a legislative remedy in the form of a farm freeze on assessments. The argument offered by Representative Giorgi is that if it is true that there should be legislative help for the farm industry then at the same time we should provide legislative help for other ailing industries in this state. He has singled out the automobile industry and certainly all of you who are investors of automobile companies in this country know because you're not going to receive your dividends that the automobile industry is in trouble. And that they deserve help just as the farm industry deserves help. And for those reasons I would recommend an aye vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further. Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Amendment. I think this is a rather blatant attempt to kill the Bill and also it's a very single issue oriented Amendment to one business. So, for that reason, I oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any further discussion? Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Majority Leader on the other side of the aisle was incorrect in this analysis. Actually, this is like comparing apples with oranges. The Bill originally deals with farmland assessments. There was no intent originally or ever to get involved in automobile factories or other unrelated types of business in the State of Illinois. I urge a strong no on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you 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 say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose 'no'. The ayes



have it. Motion carried. Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support in the adoption of Amendment #4 which attempts to put a limit on the assessment growth for some of our manufacturing plants that want to be able to analyze what kind of growth they can anticipate. And I urge support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 4. Those in favor say... vote aye and oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 41 aye and 89 no and the motion fails. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Currie. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #5 would extend the fine principle embodied in House Bill 3173 to assessments for real property on which operating steel mills are situated. We heard from the other side of the aisle that this Bill was intended to affect farm assessments only. Critical to our work in this House of Representatives is to see to it that the provisions that are helpful to one group should also be extended to others in need of help. That it is a good idea for farmers who are in economic trouble is in no way to say that we shouldn't extend it even if that wasn't the Sponsors original intention to other groups who also are suffering economic consequences. Steel made this state great. Steel is now in serious economic trouble. United States Steel, for example, in the last twelve years... about six years, has lost approximately 12 million dollars a year. The United States Steel Company did a study of all those states, eight states in which they do a major amount of business. They compared the property tax load burden from one state



to another. Among those eight states, Illinois was the highest. Higher than California, Indiana, Ohio, Texas, Utah, Pennsylvania, and Alabama. One could argue that those of us who are sponsoring these additional Amendments might have introduced legislation specifically to address these problems on our own. I see no reason why we should have. It seems to me that Representative Stuffle and his Cosponsors have devised a very fine scheme to help those that are in economic trouble, those whose property tax burdens are excessive given the income producing nature of their current activity. The soil under the steel mills is arid and dry. It is appropriate for this House to give our steel companies the basis of Illinois industry the same kind of protection against an onerous unfair property tax burden that House Bill 3173 would offer to our basic agricultural industry. I urge adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Stuffle: "Representative Currie, where is United States Steel located in Illinois?"

Currie: "United States Steel 'Southworks' is in the 24th Legislative District, County of Cook. Of course, Representative Stuffle, I would have preferred that this Bill include the County of Cook. However, there is Granite City Steel in downstate in Illinois so my Amendment still has some value, some meaning for that, and McLean Steel.

Stuffle: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Representative Currie presents this almost with a straight face, not quite. She's already acted to take Cook County out. She argued for United States Steel which is in Cook County. She now admits they're not in the Bill. Then she's trying to protect Representative McPike which I know he



can protect himself in Granite City. The same arguments apply to this Amendment. It's an attempt to kill the Bill. It hasn't got a thing to do with the Bill at all. It hasn't got a thing to do with the original intent of the Sponsors of the Bill. It, as the previous Amendment, compares the assessment of steel mills as that Amendment did auto plants to farmland. There's no relationship between the two. The Sponsor knows that, and I think this House knows what this attempt is and wrought to kill the Amendment. I urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, am I to judge from Representative Stuffle's remarks that this is a Bill to aid foreign nations? Is this State of Illinois answer to aid foreign nations? Is this aid for the foreign nations that own farmland in Illinois? The Iraq and the Iranians, and the Sadi Arabians. Is this what you call Illinois answer to foreign aid?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I'm not the Sponsor of the Amendment, but no, it's to aid Illinois farmers who happen to have assessments here in this state. Does your Amendment help the Japanese cars that Chrysler happens to import and sell in this country?"

Giorgi: "No, but... how about the studies that you've made and found out that a lot of foreign ownership..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we've gone pretty far afield on this. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I simply think that whole discussion's out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last night Representative Madigan said wait until tomorrow in discussion with another Amendment designed to confer a tax benefit on business. I noticed today he's voting in favor of these tax Amendments



designed to confer benefits on business. I just hope that he will do that later today or later in this week when we get to House Bill 3200. So, I say to him; later this week, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Ewing, Livingston County."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the second best in Livingston County. I am indeed suspect of this Amendment when the Sponsor starts worrying about big business. I think we should have started worrying about it a long time ago. It's obvious just an attempt to kill this Bill, and I would hope that we would get to a vote and vote this Amendment down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Anyone else?"

Representative Currie, to close."

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

I take umbrage at the suggestion that I'm only playing games with this Bill. I am concerned about the business climate in Illinois. I ran on that kind of platform when I first came to this House and I would not bow to anyone in the sense that I am not concerned about what happens to the economic climate here. I do offer this Amendment with a straight face, a very straight face. The problems of steel are serious ones. They are substantial ones. Representative Stuffle has offered us an opportunity to address those areas in our state. And there's no reason to limit that address to farmers alone when those individual groups and industries are suffering from an onerous property tax burden. This Bill has to do with assessments. I've explained to you some evidence in which it's quite clear that steel companies in the State of Illinois are suffering under a particularly burdensome property tax load. We have an opportunity through this Bill to address that problem. That Representative Stuffle, does not come from an industrial district is no reason for us to limit his



efforts only to his constituents. The Bill... the Amendment that I'm offering in fact is not, as Representative Stuffle so lightly pointed out, going to aid the steel mills in my own particular district, but there are other steel mills in Illinois that need this kind of help. This assembly has a responsibility to do what it can to improve the business climate along with the agricultural climate, and I would urge adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins to explain his vote. One minute."

Collins: "Just a matter of curiosity. I was wondering if my light is broken up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Collins: "It is? Would you have it fixed please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please."

Collins: "Sometimes I wonder."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you please fix the light.

And also his microphone. Whoever it was... Representative Simms. Simms here. He fixed Representative Geo-Karis' microphone once. I wonder if he'd do the same thing for you, Mr. Collins. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 aye and 95 no. The motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Balanoff. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor. Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "I wish to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Balanoff withdraws Amendment 6. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is the homeowners' Amendment.

The Sponsor of this Bill has attempted to meet the farmers problems by mandating that no farms assessment increase more than 8% from last years assessments starting next year for that one year. What Amendment 7 does is give equal treatment to homeowners. Now because the Bill only affects downstate, Cook County obviously isn't cut in that but I am hopeful that a subsequent Amendment will be filed to cut Cook County in. Now every attempt to limit taxes in the Illinois House and the Illinois Senate has been killed except this vehicle to the best of my knowledge. What I'm suggesting is equal treatment for homeowners. If you care enough to give tax relief to farmers, I think you ought to care enough to give tax relief to homeowners. And I ask the support of the General Assembly for Amendment #7 which I think will broaden the support for this Bill considerably."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Skinner has one of the more unique Amendments. It's written correctly to this Bill and it actually fits in the Bill. My concern with the Amendment is not the content and not the effort of Representative Skinner which is a genuine one to give homeowners tax relief outside of Cook County. Again, the Amendment does not apply to Cook County but only downstate. My concern is that despite his genuine effort and I know he's not trying to kill the Bill, that if this Amendment goes on this particular Bill that it may be so weighty that the Bill itself may die. I say that honestly and because of that I cannot rise in support of the Amendment. I wish it were on its own Bill. I introduced this Bill as did the other principle Hyphenated Sponsor to affect farmland not to the despairment of home owners in any way. But I am afraid as I reiterate



that putting this Bill on may indeed have the impact of killing the Bill because it will be so onerous when it reaches Third Reading in terms of what is in the Bill. So regrettably I cannot support the Amendment because of my fear of what will happen to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? You ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment 7. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 aye and 10 no. The motion prevails and Amendment 7 is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Stuffle-McMaster-Neff. Amends House Bill 3173 in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, will you step to the podium please? Hoffman. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment 8 and 9. They no longer fit in the Bill with Representative Skinner's Amendment adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the Sponsor of 8 and 9? Eight and 9 withdrawn. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, were those the Amendments that denied the assessment credits to the foreign nations?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "No, Representative Giorgi, but if you'll draft those Amendments and put one on your Chrysler Bill, I'll support them all."

Giorgi: "Okay. I'll keep your holy word to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle, I was distracted."

Stuffle: "Oh, I was only accepting his potential Amendment to take foreign nations out of my Bill and out of the Chrysler Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Accepting 9, is that correct?"

Stuffle: "No, no, we're withdrawing 9."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, 8 and 9 are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Currie. Amends House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Currie. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie." Wait till she... Maybe she's going to ask your..."

Currie: "Well, I thought about withdrawing it but I won't. We've just... We've just helped all homeowners outside of Cook County with the adoption of Amendment #7, a very good Amendment indeed. Amendment #10 does what my Amendment #5 would have done only it includes those steel mills in my very own district, steel mills in Cook County as well as those outside of the County of Cook. I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. It's true that Representative Currie is now putting Cook County back in and for the score card she's put them in twice and taken them out twice. This evens the score, but for the same reasons as I argued on the other Amendments, I would ask for a no vote."

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

Woodyard: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Amendment. It does essentially what a previous one did and I think it's a little asinine to be considering it now." I ask for a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further... Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just urge a yes vote on the grounds that this Bill, as it now stands, help a good many people outside the County of Cook. This is the only opportunity to see that some of the unfair burdens placed upon, in this case, steel mill operators in the County of Cook



are addressed in this fine piece of legislation, and I would strongly urge a yes vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further.... can't be... Question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 10. Those in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 aye and 75 no. The motion carries... the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a request for a fiscal note?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Request for a fiscal note as amended by Representative Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "I have to leave it on Second. 3196."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3196. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty. Amends House Bill 3196 on page one, line one and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty, on Amendment #1."

Beatty: "Amendment #1 is proposed by the Municipal Employees Pension Fund for the trustees. It would allow that board to loan out its securities to security dealers who use those to make delivery on stocks and other securities. In doing this they would be... they would be fully secured by cash from the brokers and if there was a change in the value of the security during the time that it was being loaned with the year limitation on any loan the collateral would be insured. So there should be no risk to the fund and this would enable brokers to make deliveries to some people who want stocks and bonds delivered and it would put the Municipal Fund in the position to make some earnings from the loaning of these securities. I don't see any risk. I think it would be beneficial to the Fund."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Beatty: "I ask for a favorable acceptance to this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted?"

All in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Beatty. Amends House Bill 3196..."

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

Beatty: "Amendment #2 would allow the downstate teachers

retirement system to allow Blue Cross to make bids on hospitalization for the retired people.

Apparently, there is some question as to whether or not they would be able to do this at present so there is some language change that would give them the right to also bid on insurance for the downstate teachers. I ask for a favorable acceptance of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. What is... there a prohibition on their ability to bid?"

Beatty: "Well, there was House Bill 1334 it passed and it's unclear whether Blue Cross and Blue Shield could now bid, but with this Amendment they would be able to bid."

Schneider: "I thought that was a pension board decision. Isn't it?"

Beatty: "They feel that the law doesn't allow them without this language in there. This is a proposal by some attorney who I... speaking for them was giving me this proposal."

Schneider: "So, actually putting in the language that says Blue Cross Blue Shield..."

Beatty: "No... but it..."

Schneider: "Give the general language. I don't have any opposition to the notion of letting them bid but I don't understand why we have to make it a statutory



decision."

Beatty: "Well, the language makes clear that organizations under the Non-Profit Health Care Service Plan Act may bid and that's all it does. This includes Blue Cross and Blue Shield. But..."

Schneider: "Terzich is going remark on that."

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

Schneider: "Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll get to you in a minute. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, what this was it that we passed a Bill to allow the teachers and so on to come into the health program. However, we didn't amend the medical practice as which covers Blue Cross and Blue Shield rather than just group insurance carriers other than Blue Cross and Blue Shield such as Travelers, John Hancock and this simply brings it in to allow them to bid on the insurance."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt. Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Beatty. Amends House Bill..."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, could I take three and four together? they're similar. Affects..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is leave granted? Hearing no objections, read Amendment #4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Amends House Bill 3196 as amended in the title and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, on Amendments 3 and 4."

Beatty: "These two Amendments intend to reverse the effect of House Bill 2012 which was passed in this Session of the Legislature and was signed by the Governor which is suppose



to take effect in January of 1981. It appears that from the actuary who governs the Cook County, many of the Cook County and Chicago funds that House Bill 2012 has problems with it and it will cause certainly confusion, and some material change in the pension plans. As examples, it says that funds should be collected by the employer relative to their withholding for federal taxes but it indicates they should not be paying in these federal taxes. Of course, this is in conflict with the federal law and it doesn't say what should be done with the funds while they're being held awaiting their use. Where the earnings would go, whether it go to the fund or to the...whose accounts they go to is one problem. There are all kinds of problems. The definition of salary has been changed and it is the opinion of the actuary that if this change remains without being changed before January fo 1981 there will be a loss of benefits to the participants of the Municipal Employees Pension Fund and to the Labor Fund because of some corrections that must be made. and that are not made due to this salary change. There are... There are a number of other problems with the Bill and the trustees wish to have the effect of House Bill 2012 reverse while the basic intent of House Bill 2012 is good. It was to give the employees a chance to get a tax deferral on their contribution to a pension plan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. Representative Beatty has been supplied with information by an actuary who last year was well informed on what 2012 did, and that actuary is well aware that 2012 is optional for the particular pension system we're dealing with here. If that system does not wish to implement the tax savings break of 2012



should it become effective in the first of next year it does not have to. And those provisions he's talking about are not operable at all. It's a bad precedent to do what he's attempting to do on Amendment #3. It's a bad precedent because if the IRS rules of the federal court rules in favor of that plan. There is adequate language in there to take care of the situation for those employees. If there are any technical Amendments needed and I mean only technical with regard to the definition of salary should this law be implemented by one of the other rulings by the court or by the IRS, we have a Bill on Third Reading which has no objections to it which the Pension Laws Commission is dealing with to change technical problems if any in the various systems. But there are only technical problems. Not with the implementation of the law itself. There's absolutely no need for this Amendment. The only thing this Amendment can do in the long run is deny a benefit and deny a tax break to the employee in the Chicago Municipal System. That is actually all it can do. The actuary is totally and completely wrong despite Representative Beatty's good intentions, and I would urge a no vote to protect the integrity of the tax shelter system that we put together, Representative Madigan and Terzich and I, with the help of some of the best pension lawyers and actuaries in this state and in this country. And I urge a no vote."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I speak against this Amendment.

We did contact all of the systems to ask if there was any technical changes. We had meetings in the City of Chicago to discuss the tax ramification of House Bill 1012. The Chicago systems are not even in the ... in the tax relief program unless they opt to come into it. All other systems in the entire state are in favor of this type of legislation. I think it's



detrimental to the employee. The actuary had over a year to make any changes and I think this is simply taking away benefits from the employees, and I would urge a no vote on the adoption of Amendment 3 and 4."

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

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's the opposition to the Amendment that I've proposed here would want the House to believe that all of this is optional. There is one thing that is optional and that is whether or not they go into this plan. But there are many other changes that are going to be effective in January of 1981 which will drastically affect the pension rights of many of the Members of this House and of their constituents and I think it's of particular interest to the Cook County and Chicago Members that they should consider that when they're voting on this. While there may have been an intent not to make changes, that is not the case. We've heard that the actuary had all kinds of time to review this proposal. I would like the House to know that the committee system is a good system now. The Sponsors of Amendments to House Bill 2012 during this Session came in with an Amendment that was about an inch and a half thick covering all the state pension systems. There was never any hearing. There was never an opportunity given to the opponent to come in and testify relative to this matter. I have been told by the actuary for Chicago who's been in business for 15 or 20 years in guiding this system that he was not aware of the effect of this until he read the print out of the new law about a month or a month and a half ago. I think that it should be of interest to the Members to inquire further because their pension and their pension rights and benefits on the state level can well be affected. There are the only two Amendments dealing with the Municipal Fund and



with the Labor Fund. I have another Amendment that is not prepared yet for the Chicago Police Fund. The firemen want changes and everyone else in Chicago is seriously concerned about this matter. Now, I don't know who's right or wrong. I know that the ... the man who's been doing this work has been in the job for a long time and it can have serious consequences. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, what purpose seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Well I would like to speak on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Terzich: "The actuary that he is talking about has been the actuary for the Pension Laws Commission. The Bill was heard before the Pension Laws Commission. The actuary knew about the Bill even before it was submitted. He had one year subsequent even to the passage of the Bill to offer any Amendments or the adjustments. This is the only actuary in the entire State of Illinois covering all of the pension systems that apparently did not have any belief of the benefits of House Bill 2012. It is not up to the actuary to determine whether or not that this tax benefit would be available to the employees, but it's up to the IRS. And if the IRS does not approve it, then the Bill does not go into effect. And in addition, the Chicago systems that were objecting to the Bill requested the option of either opting in or out of the Bill. They are not under the Bill unless they opt to come into it. But what he is simply saying is, 'Let's take this out of the Bill and then maybe next year or the year after when all of these other employees of the state have the benefits that we might consider coming into it'. I think it's absolutely ridiculous and the Bill should be defeated as well as the actuary should be, should know better than



the argument he presents."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendments 3 and 4 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed.

Nos have it. Amendments failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Beatty: "I'd like a Roll Call on those Amendments please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment 3 and 4 be adopted. All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Vote me no, please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 22 ayes, 68 nos, 3 recorded as present. The Amendments fail. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There a request for a fiscal note.

Fiscal note has not been filed. Bill remains on Second Reading. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "I've supplied an impact statement and I don't think a fiscal note applies to this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It does. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "I beleive I requested the fiscal note or impact statement and I would like to withdraw my request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws his request.

Third Reading. House Bill 2762. The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, what purpose seek recognition?"

Richmond: "Personal privilege for an introduction, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, sir."

Richmond: "In the gallery to my left I'd like for you to meet my son, Michael, from St. Louis and his lovely daughter... I mean his lovely wife, my daughter-in-law, Peggy. And with them Al 'Schrado' an exchange student from Mexico and also the real speaker of my House for the past forty years, my wife, 'Lacleta'. Stand up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. House Bill



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2762. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to public libraries. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #3. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 to House Bill 2762 was an Amendment that was arrived at, the language, with a lot of input from the Illinois Municipal League and others. It deletes everything after the enacting clause and becomes the Bill. What it does and this is in complete agreement with the Illinois Library Association, Municipal League and others who had much input in the subcommittee and what it does is provide that in case of a conversion of a public library to a district library the city is exempt from the conversion provision. It also incorporates a provision that a railroad right-of-way shall not be considered to be annexed to a library district. It increases the number of signatures required on an annexation petition and requires that the Board of Library Trustees shall be held and considered to be a special trustee of donated property. This, for those of you who recall, is the codification of the Illinois Public Library District Act of 1967. The Act that we and others have been working on for many years and we have had several Amendments put to the Bill on Second Reading, and I move to adopt Amendment #3 to House Bill 2762 so that we can get to Representative Birkinbine with other Amendments."

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



Mahar: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. In addition to what Representative Yourell has said, this is the codification of the library law. We were faced with a voluminous Amendment at the beginning of this Session, but by virtue of the fact that Representative Yourell held the Bill on Second Reading to allow a lot of people to talk about it and draft some Amendments, I think we're going to have a very fine Bill. There's a couple of things unfortunately in codification you try to bring things up to date and some of the things like library trustees being fined for non-performance and allowing library trustees to audit their own books probably can be taken out in the Senate. With the enactment of the Amendments that are going to follow by Representative Birkinbine, I think we'll have a good accomplishment here, the input of several agencies, and I support the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Birkinbine. Amends House Bill..."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Amendment 4 is withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Birkinbine."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 deletes language on page 11 that calls for a back door referendum and restores the front door referendum process that is presently within the statute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall



Amendment #5 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. Amendment #5 is adopted.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Birkinbine. Amends House Bill..."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 deals with once again restoring our present procedure whereby a municipality and an adjoining district that wish to become a library district together would have the votes on that issue considered separately so that a municipal library could not be taken over by an adjoining district against its wishes."

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

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In agreement with the Sponsor and Amendmednt #6, I too move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #6 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Birkinbine."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #7 calls for the withdrawal on page two and three of Amendment #3 by Mr. Yourell of Sections 1.7 and 1.8. It's more of a clean-up as anything else. It calls for maintaining the system of publishing... publishing copies of the rules that library boards go through. It keeps in existence the present way about going about business."

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

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with Amendment #7 and move the adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #7 be adopted?"



All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose.

Amendment #7 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar on page 12 are Senate Bills, Third Reading. These are emergency appropriation Bills. Appears Senate Bill 1641."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1641. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Peters: "Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senate Bill 1641 is a transfer Bill for the Department of Rehabilitative Services and it makes a total transfer of 500,000 dollars from various line items to other line items. There is no increase in the Bill and the transfers were mandated by some requirements by the Federal Government in terms of how the record keeping of the Department is being done. It passed out of Committee on a 22 zero, zero vote and I would request your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1641 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Tim, give me an aye over there. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 ayes, no nays, none recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1646."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1646. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation for the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you... Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1646 is also merely a



transfer Bill. It transfers 120,000 dollars within the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission's budget. I know of no opposition to this transfer. The Commission requested it to begin implementing its regional office structure. They intend to have six offices open by July 1980. As I say, there is no opposition and I would hope for a yes vote." Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1646 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Give me an aye, John. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 ayes, 1 nay, 3 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1648."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1648. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson on the floor? Mr. Johnson. Just wanted to know if he wanted to object. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1648 is a supplemental appropriation as indicated by the Clerk to the Commission on Banks and Trusts for personnel services in the amount of 108,800 dollars. And the purpose of it is to provide funds for the upgrading and the status and the salaries of bank examiners. It passed the Committee by a 13 to nothing vote, and we request your support for the appropriation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1648 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 ayes, 8 nos, 4 recorded as present."



This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1649."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1649. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1649 appropriates 12,035,000 dollars in federal funds to the ESDA. The 12 million dollars is to be used to pay the bills for snow removal and ... claims to 1979. The 35,000 dollars is for the telecommunication system. I know of no opposition and I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1649 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Marco, aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137... 138 ayes, no nays, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1656."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1656. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Military Naval Department. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1656 is a supplemental appropriation of 436,000 dollars for the Military Naval for personal services, an increased cost of fuel costs for last winter, and I urge your adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower. Your light's on. Question is, shall Senate Bill 1656 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 ayes, 12 nos, 1 recorded as present. Senate Bill 1656 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1981."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1981. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Health Finance Authority Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stanley: "Thank... Thank you. This is not a supplemental appropriation. This is simply a transfer of 101,000 dollars between operate line items in the Health Finance Authority's budget system in compliance with the law that requires them to set up hospital standardization and other budgetary procedures for the Authority."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1981 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 ayes, 8 nos, 3 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1984."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1984. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson on the floor? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1984 amends the fiscal year '80 appropriation for the CDB. It transfers 15,000 in general revenue funds from the electronic data processing personal services line item to legal services and appropriates an additional 45,000 in GRF, the new money to the legal services line. This money is used to... is needed for legal services to check on those who haven't fulfilled the terms of their



contract, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1984 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Marco, give me an aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 ayes, 2 nays, 4 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Back on the Priority of Call, House Bills, appears House Bill 3288. At the request of the Sponsor, take it out of the record. House Bill 3376. Who's handling that for Elementary and Secondary Education? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3376. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3376 is an extension of what we passed last year with setting aside a minimum salary level for teachers throughout the State of Illinois. This piece of legislation establishes a minimum salary level of 12,000 dollars for teachers of 180 semester hours or more and a Masters Degree. We also add in school nurses and we add in also an increment for a minimum salary for teachers. We've talked many times with individual groups as to whether or not we should exempt out units with collective bargaining agreements or exempt out City of Chicago and all those kinds of things, but we've pretty much decided that the Bill on its merits is something that the State (six) of Illinois should indeed have as the principle. The minimum salary levels, at least the increments, are far less than the average now being granted throughout the State of Illinois, but we do believe that it's a decent proposal as a public



policy and that the State of Illinois ought to indeed have this minimum step increase as proposed by this piece of legislation. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Pierce: "You say the minimums in the Bill are less than the average but don't you tie the annual escalator on the minimums to the average increase in future salaries in the state? If you do that, how can you say that the minimum increments are escalated, as you have in here, would be below the average?"

McClain: "Let me explain that if I can, Dan. The average increase in like in 1977-'78 would have been 4.7%. Seventy-eight- '79 would have been 7%. Seventy-nine-'80 would have been 8.4% so what our increment pattern is is an average state-wide teacher salary level. If it goes over the same period of time as the last three years, it approximates at about 7% increase each year."

Pierce: "But inflation is accelerating and so you can't talk about three years ago. You've got to talk about the next three years. So really you do tie it into the average, not less than the average. But you tie your escalator, your automatic escalator that is out of bargaining but automatically in, into the average increase of all the school teachers in the state, not just the starting school teachers. Isn't that provided right in the Bill?"

McClain: "Yeah, but, Dan, it's the previous year and that's the only handle we can use. So I mean it's still going to be far less than the... still be less than the average of the current year because we're using the previous year and it's still far below the cost of living."



Pierce: "Well, what index do you use? The average... you use... The index you use of the automatic escalator increase in here is not a cost of living increase but the average increase in salary state-wide for all teachers. Is that right? And not just beginning teachers."

McClain: "That's correct."

Pierce: "Alright. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the idea of a minimum wage is an idea I have supported in the past and believe in. The trouble is the proponents of the Bill weren't satisfied to put in a minimum wage in this Bill. They put an automatic escalator in the Bill where each and every year without returning to the Legislature or without collective bargaining in the districts, and I favor collective bargaining for all local government units including the school districts whether they be in Cook County or outside Cook County. I favor that, but what the Bill does is take the minimum out of collective bargaining and automatically escalates that minimum each and every year. When you escalate the minimum automatically without bargaining, you escalate the whole wage scale all the way up and try to avoid collective bargaining, at least you start off with certain minimums that are dictated not by the school board but by us here in Springfield who like to dictate things in school Bills. Now last year there was a sneaker on a House Bill, innocuous House Bill, and an Amendment in the Senate that dictated a seniority reductions in force and allowed teachers who hadn't taught a subject for ten years but had a certificate in it to bump out a teacher that may be hired six months after them who'd been teaching that subject and doing a good job for ten years. That was kind of a hidden sneaker on a House Bill that was amended in the Senate and



we concurred in it in the closing days of the Session. Now with this Bill, minimum wage is alright. I favor the concept of a minimum wage, but the sneaker in this Bill is there's an automatic escalation clause. Each and every year that minimum goes up regardless of collective bargaining, regardless of what we do here in Springfield and imposes on school districts an escalation of the whole pay scale. If you escalate the minimum, you escalate everything else. I favor collective bargaining very strongly but I wonder when we get through whether there's going to be anything left to bargain about because the school board of this state will be the Illinois General Assembly in concurrence with the IEA and they will be the master school board of the state and all the other school boards will have no say in it. And we'll be bargaining between the IEA on one side as represented by the Illinois House of Representatives and by the IEA on the other side representing the teachers. And pretty soon... pretty soon collective bargaining will be a farce and there'll be no need for it if we continue with Bills like this."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I apologize for interrupting in the middle of a Bill, but as the grammar schools come and go we'd like to welcome to Springfield the St. George Grammar School from the 30th District represented by Collins, Dawson, and Balanoff. They're up in the gallery."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hoxsey: "Representative, why are you proposing this proposal? What is the need for it?"



McClain: "Well, until... thank you Mrs. Hoxsey. Until last year the previous time that we had ever done anything with minimum teachers salaries in the State of Illinois was I believe the late 1960's and so last year a piece of legislation was to develop a reasonable level of salary hikes and that year, last year, on that Bill initially as we introduced it had a increment plan significantly higher than this piece of legislation. In an effort to get a minimum salary Bill passed last year we deleted all the increments and passed the minimums."

Hoxsey: "But..."

McClain: "So, to me, it's just a basic.... absent a state-wide collective bargaining Act. To me..."

Hoxsey: "Representative, how many teachers in the State of Illinois are working for under 12,000 dollars? Do you know?"

McClain: "Yeah,...initially we believe there were somewhere around 3,000 teachers..."

Hoxsey: "That are working full time..."

McClain: "Yes, one of the problems is that trying to get all that data, there's really no composite group of getting all that data so through the... our sources we..."

Hoxsey: "But you realize that you're making a mandate to the local school boards and I wonder if the State of Illinois is prepared to pick up the cost of this mandate. Because that's what you're doing with this Bill. The local school boards have the prerogative of hiring their teachers and set their salaries. You may just put the people out of work with this Bill."

McClain: "Well, frankly, I don't think that's true. With 3114 being passed and what we're going to do with the budget along with the corporal personal property tax the significant impact really is not the case. What we're trying to do here is have a group



of teachers that are being paid really pauper's wages to be at least equal to a minimum of 12,000 dollars."

Hoxsey: "I suggest to you, Representative, that that is between the teachers and their school boards and not for the State of Illinois to interfere with. I would suggest that we take a good look at this mandate..."

McClain: "Well, would you support collective bargaining Act then state-wide so that that would be so for all teachers in the State of Illinois?"

Hoxsey: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

McClain: "Would you support a collective bargaining Act for the State of Illinois state-wide."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please address yourself to 3376. Do you have any more questions, Mrs. Hoxsey?"

Hoxsey: "No, that's all."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to close."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of you have been contacted by different groups on this Bill, 3376. This piece of legislation is setting off a minimum salary category for teachers throughout the State of Illinois. It's a basic one of let's say 12,000 for an MA plus 30 hours. It seems to me that those are basic absent a collective bargaining Act in the State of Illinois. It's a state-wide policy. You know, school systems in the State of Illinois are a product of the State of Illinois by charter. It's not something that, I know we all think of it as a local right and a local authority, but the State of Illinois is the one that created



the school systems. We have the constitutional mandate providing an average income, average education for everybody throughout the State of Illinois. We have here before us a piece of legislation that will give teachers a minimum salary, 12,000 dollars a year. How can any of us be against 12,000 dollars a year? And when you talk about the increment levels you're talking percentage of increase. Seventy-five-'76 would have been 6.6. Seventy-six-'77 would have been 5.3. Seventy-seven-'78, 8.6. Seventy-eight-'79 3.5 and seventy-nine-'80 would have been 7.5. Far below any kind of cost of living. We're way below any kind of cost of living. We're not mandating on the school systems to the State of Illinois that are basically ... by charter. We're not mandating on them cost of living. What we're suggesting is a minimum salary increase for those teachers that I think deserve it. I think it's a piece of legislation as a public policy we ought to be supportive as a public policy we ought to be in favor of and as interested in the school children in the State of Illinois. Those are our kids. I'd ask you to support this piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3376 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The bargaining representative..... would lead you to believe that the State of Illinois has not been involved in these kind of issues before. But because we've been unable to deal with collective bargaining, we've had to have some opportunity to redress grievances relating to salary and other issues. Now this legislative Body has also addressed itself to issues that are financial. If you follow the logic that school boards are



going to make those kind of decisions, then you have the problem of dealing with the notions of the transportation tax which we increased substantially a few years ago, the hold-harmless which we introduced, the Brummer Amendment a few years ago, the weighted increases for Title 1 for urban districts downstate. All of those are ways to adjust problems that we face as the legislative Body regarding schools. This is no different, in my judgement, in this regard. So what I would suggest to you is that this is one of the easier Amendments to vote for because we're talking about..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "On this legislation I filed an Amendment and I would renew my request that the Sponsor return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading at some time. The Amendment simply says since we are laying on this mandate that the...that the increment would only increase the burden of paying the teachers more in accordance with the percentage of the increase in state aid. My schools have contacted me and wondered where the money is coming from for this and I think that would be reasonable. I'm voting no and also I must say for the record I have a conflict of interest because my wife is a school teacher and normally I would vote present with a conflict, but in this case I'm voting no."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, again, I think we've come across a bad idea. Not the part about minimum wage. That might be fine, but once you mandate an increase in the salaries every year, we are telling the local school board to provide the money. As the local school boards run out of the money, they're coming back to the state and you're getting closer and closer to the day that the state will be obligated to finance the entire situation. I think it's



a bad idea to approach it from this point of view. If you're not going to give the school boards the money, if the state's not going to pay approximately a hundred percent, then why put this type of mandate on them?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp. to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I might say, too, that my wife is a teacher and certainly no other profession needs an increase in money as does the profession of teaching. It certainly is a notable one and I would urge that those people in that profession should be given adequate compensation. The problem with this particular Bill is that on the one hand we the state are providing certain numbers of dollars to school districts and on the other hand we're telling them how to spend it. I don't think this is right and I think it's a bad precedent to begin."

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

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, absolute power destroys and what we're doing here is we're taking away all the powers of all the local school districts of the neighbors of the parents of the children, the people that run the schools throughout the state in giving it to the power of the state for which will in turn destroy it. Illinois is a long state. It has many, many different living conditions from the Wisconsin line to the Kentucky line and these averages and these figures mean absolutely nothing. You can take those kind of average figures down to Karo, Illinois and they're all together different from the figures up at Waukegan, and certainly the local school boards know their conditions and they're certainly fair to their teachers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, it's just inconceivable to me that we can ask people to spend seven hours a day with our children and also expect them not to be paid less than



12,000 dollars a year. I think education is the most important factor that the State Government has. I think it's extremely important that we give our children those Johnnies that can't read an opportunity to read. We need to retain teachers and we certainly can't do it on salaries less than 12,000 and I rise in support of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, many of the Members received opposition to this not only on the limited issue of local control but because they claim the people who really didn't need certification would be covered. That's no longer true by House Amendment #1 which I put in the Bill which reduced the cost of this Bill dramatically and applies to very few districts and I submit that many of those districts are not the poor and downtrodden but exactly the ones that can afford this particular Bill. Representative Polk is exactly right in what he said. We should arise and support this Bill to be fair and equitable to teachers. It is not as everyone has contested something to put a burden on little school districts. It is a fair and equitable piece of legislation to give a decent salary to the people that we keep talking about are our priority in education. I urge a yes vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the little districts that they talk about a large majority exist in my legislative district. I feel like that if we are going to keep doing this in setting their salaries that the thing that we should do is introduce a Bill to do away with the boards of education and let the state run the districts totally and then do away with the property tax which is being leveled and just let the state set the property tax totally. They pretty well do it now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape. Timer's on."



Slape: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I find it hard to believe that I am the only Legislator in this House that has received letters from teachers across the state who tell me that they entered the profession out of love and out of a dedication, only to find years later they have to leave the profession because the salary is not there to support them and their family. All this says is that a teacher, someone who you would trust your child with for the greatest part of his daylight hours, should have a minimum wage and should be a qualified person. And I'd urge a yes vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 ayes, 62 nos. Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees, please. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel, what purpose seek recognition?"

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. If this reaches 89 I'd like to verify please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Garmisa as aye, Mr. VonBoeckman as aye. Proceed to poll the absentees. Mr. Hallock, what purpose seek recognitin?"

Hallock: "Aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Hallock as aye. Mr. Swanstrom as aye. Mr. Richmond as aye. Mr. Bower as aye. We're starting out with 90 ayes. Mr. Margulas as aye. Did you poll the absentees yet, Tony? Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Bullock. Dawson. Farley. Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley as aye."

Clerk Leone: "Flinn. Gaines. Keane. Laurino. Meyer. Satterthwaite. Schoeberlein. Stearney. Telcser. Totten. Williams. Williamson. Younge. And Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. McAuliffe, you're voting already. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Leave for Mr. VonBoeckman to be recorded as aye. And also Mr. Pechous! Leave is granted. VonBoeckman and Pechous. Mr. Piel, what purpose seek recognition?"

Piel: "Where is the ... we're starting with, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "92, I think. 92 ayes. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Balanoff. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Burnidge. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mrs. Younge as aye." Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Epton. Farley. Dwight Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Margulas. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Bullock as aye."

Clerk Leone: "McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Rigney. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Steczo. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Swanstrom. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duynes. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Younge and Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schisler, what purpose seek recognition?"

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted. Any questions of the affirmative vote? Kindly record Mr. Dawson as aye."



Mr. Piel, any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Piel: "What are we starting out with now, Mr. Speaker, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "95 aye."

Piel: "Representative Breslin. She's here. Representative Darrow."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is back there."

Piel: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa is here."

Piel: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi. Giorgi. How is the Gentleman recorded? Mr. Giorgi." He's back there."

Piel: "Representative Greiman."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him and put Mr. Darrow back on."

Piel: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan is here."

Piel: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Piel: "Representative Jaffe."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Johnson. Put Jaffe back on. Johnson. How is Mr. Johnson recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Katz."

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

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Mr. Dawson, what purpose seek recognition? Leave to be verified. Leave is granted."

Piel: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leverenz is here."

Piel: "Representative Marovitz."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove his. Put Mr. Williamson... Mr. Williamson as aye."

Piel: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew. How is McGrew recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "O'Brien. How is O'Brien recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rea is here."

Piel: "Representative White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Was that White? He's here."

Piel: "I see him. Representative Willer."

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

Clerk Leone: "Lady is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove her."

Piel: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Representative Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He has leave to be verified. And put Mrs. Willer back on."

Piel: "No further questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney, what purpose seek recognition?"

Kindly record Mr. Stearney as no. Put Mr. Greiman back on. On this question there are 91 ayes, 63 nos. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby



declared passed. House Bill 2861."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2861."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor.
House Bill 3377."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3377. A Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's handling the Bill? Who?
Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1602,
Mr. Terzich. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1602. A Bill for an Act to repeal
the Downstate Policemans Pension Fund Article of the
Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to
hear House Bill 1602 and 1603 together."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, Clerk will
read 1603."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1603. A Bill for an Act to repeal
the Downstate Firemans Pension Fund Article of the Pension
Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich on
1602 and 1603. Please refrain from any type of noises
within the chamber."

Terzich: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. These two Bills will provide
for the creation of one pension fund for downstate police
and one for all of the downstate firemen. The Bill will
not affect the current ... structure available to police
and firemen. They will streamline the current downstate
pension system which presently contains 274 police
pension funds and 200 fire pension funds by creating
a downstate police fund and also a downstate firemen fund.
I introduced these Bills for the protection and the
benefit of all the participants and also after the urging
of the Public Employees Pension Laws Commission and
following the trend in the United States. Presently,
Illinois has more public employee pension funds, nearly



500, than any state in the union. The downstate police and fire represent only 4% of all public employees in the state yet their pension fund represents 97% of the total number of public employee funds in the state. There can be, according to the Public Employees Pension Laws Commission in their report to the General Assembly since 1945, that there can be no orderly operation of the retirement system or any permanent improvement in the public employees pension problem in Illinois unless consolidation is effected in this area in which the need has been so urgently demonstrated. All too often the case of the small retirement system, the personnel of the administrative agency, the well intentioned and sincere does not possess the technical knowledge or the ability or the personnel to properly administer the system in accordance with the specific provisions of the governing statute. Consolidation of all of the small membership systems would make it possible to apply the law of averages, the use of standard mortality tables or similar scientific techniques and the utilization of skill, technical, and clerical assistance. In contrast to the situation that now exists when many different and inconsistent interpretation of law are made locally, consolidation would insure the uniform interpretation of the applicable pension statutes on a consistent and basis for all participants. Now, the existing problem is not likely to be resolved as long as autonomous identity and exclusive status exist for these small groups. There can be no real solution of the problem through patchwork or piecemeal Amendments of existing laws which has been proposed from time to time. The only real and practical solution in which the long run would be decidedly beneficial to the participating policemen and firemen and result in definite advantages to them is consolidation. This is the report that has been put in by the Pension Laws Commission since 1945.



Most importantly, the creation of these two pension systems will ease the feeling of insecurity among the downstate police and firemen who feel that the current structure is too political. There is no room in politics in the pension area. The Bill will alleviate the problem and policemen and firemen will receive the security they deserve for themselves and their families. There are many advantages to the consolidation. It would not set up a special agency. It would not be a bail-out for any local municipality. It would provide affordability and many other features to the members of the system. Now I put these Bills in last year and I also made the statement that I would hold the Bill over the... in Interim Study so that we could get some input from all of the pension systems and the members of the police and fire department as to their like or dislike of consolidation. Unfortunately, all of the mail that you have been receiving, I'm sure, did not give any specific reason why they object to consolidation other than it must have been a nasty word or we should have used a word like unification or we were going to set up another state agency and many irresponsible statements that were presented to the Membership. I would think that myself that I've been working for the police and firemen over the last nine years and I can assure you that in no way would I do anything that would be detrimental to them. So with this in mind, I would like to relieve the General Assembly of all their worries and fears about consolidation that this state will not go away, that if the policemen and firemen have stressed such strong objection about a subject matter that they don't have any knowledge about, and I can assure you that the fire associations and also the police associations have not given their memberships the benefit of at least an explanation of these type... two type Bills which I firmly believe would be for the benefit of each and every participant of the police and



firemen pension system. And with this in mind, I would like to table House Bill 1602 and 1603, however... however... however; the Bill may come back next year so when all of the policemen and firemen ask you about consolidation, you'll have a better knowledge of it. So I would move, Mr. Speaker, that we table 1602 and 1603."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman tables House Bill 1602 and 1603. All in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Both Bills are tables. House Bill 2220. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, what purpose seek recognition?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have 98 members we want to welcome to Springfield from the West Central Junior High School. The sponsor is Mr. Bill Balarooga and faculty. They are represented by Representative Matijevec, Griesheimer, and Jenny Frederick. Up in this balcony. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hope you have an enjoyable day. Read the Bill, 2220."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2220. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know that most of you are familiar with House Bill 2220. The Bill that's been here before. As you know, as few months ago the Auditor General issued a report dealing with Cook County Hospital and in his report he had laid us some specific changes. Just a week ago the Illinois Investigating Commission issued its report and it too laid out some changes that felt was necessary. House Bill 2220 attempts to address some of the problems that now exist at Cook County Hospital. One of them is to raise the eligibility rate. The other one is for pre-registration and one is to correct the reimbursement procedures at Oak Forest Nursing Household and reimburse



them as a household rather than what they are doing today as a nursing home. This Bill has been discussed many times and I'm certian there's going to be some discussion today. I solicit your support for House Bill 2220."

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

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Mahar: "Representative Taylor, did you say that Oak Forest is now part of this Bill?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Mahar: "Could you tell me what the break down might be as far as funding Oak Forest versus Cook County Hospital?"
In other words, is there a percentage of support going to Oak Forest like 30% or... has that been determined?"

Taylor: "I don't have the break down of the percentage for Oak Forest, Representative Mahar. But I do know that the formula has to be changed and I think that in order for us to do it we should make a start right here in the state. And the formula will help it be done in Washington and I talked to Congressman 'Russian' Koski about that, and he thought that that was reasonable and could be acted on this year."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, sir."

Mahar: "Thank you. I rise in support of this legislation. Oak Forest is in my district and I've had several opportunities to discuss the problems they have there. Now back in 1976 and 1977 they were being reimbursed at something like 56 dollars. When the new methodology of reimbursement came in in 1978, it dropped to 26 dollars. Now Oak Forest Hospital is getting nothing more than reimbursement for a nursing home the same amount that a nursing home down the street gets. Yet Oak Forest is a



full, complete, accredited hospital. They deal with more than 1200 patients at that hospital. It's a tremendous lay out, provides a great service to the people of our area and I would urge we support this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gnetlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. This Bill would provide a fundamental improvement in the method of reimbursement for hospitals like Cook County Hospital. It would address the most difficult need that that hospital faces in providing health care services for the working poor. There is no question but that this Legislature has an obligation to come up with some formula that will prevent the repeated request for financial assistance by Cook County hospitals. This is that improvement. This Bill would restructure the reimbursement procedures so that it will be unnecessary, hopefully, for that hospital to rely on the hit and miss of occasional appropriations to bail it out. This is a fundamental change in the reimbursement procedure and will allow for the hospital to address the health care needs of the working poor competent in the knowledge that the reimbursement procedures of the Department of Public Aid will provide adequate reimbursement for the services that are actually provided. I don't have to tell anyone here I think after the last years' discussion on this matter that Cook County Hospital is essential to the health care delivery system for the entire State of Illinois. It is a public hospital that provides services. It's financial difficulties have resulted because the people who work, not people on public aid, people who work are not often able to pay their bills. This Bill would allow the Department to consider people who fall beyond the eligibility requirement for AFDC to be covered for hospital services, and I encourage,



therefore; your yes vote. We can take no more responsible action than to allow... than to provide for this kind of fundamental restructuring in the reimbursement system and I encourage an aye vote."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't help but understand the hypocrisy of this General Assembly. We keep hearing day after day after day the blizzards of Bills that are introduced here for bail-out programs. This is another bail-out program for the Cook County Hospital and I see some of the Amendments that are also included other Sections of the statutes. I don't know how we can have this side of the aisle keep complaining about tax relief and how the Governor's not doing anything about tax relief and we keep building up that budget of his of 14 billion dollars with these bail-out programs. If we pass everything that they are asking us to pass or that we are introducing this Session, the 14 billion dollars will be well over 18 billion dollars and it's another fraud perpetrated on the people of the State of Illinois telling them we're going to give them..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Conti. Only on... Only authorized people on the floor, please. Please proceed."

Conti: "Telling them we're going to give them relief on the ... with the left hand and grabbing money on the right hand. I don't know where we're going to stop or how we can stop this nonsense. I can't see how we could possibly vote for any more bail-out programs and still retain our budget at 14 billion dollars."

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

Pullen: "For all those of you who voted against Chrysler of 75 million and getting ready to vote against Wisconsin Steel at 20 million, I ask you all to look in the Digest on page 996 where you will find a fiscal note for this little Bill which will tell you that the fiscal impact of



this little Bill is 313 and a half million dollars every year only it'll probably increase after this year. So before we all leap up and say how much we like this Bill and how much Cook County Hospital really needs this bail-out, let's realize that the taxpayers may need a bail out now and then too to get us bailing out of their pockets, to get our hands out of their pockets so that they can keep their money in them. 313 and a half million dollars. Don't forget that when you decide how you're going to vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative Taylor, on Amendment #1 to House Bill 2220 on page two I wonder if you could explain the new language there in Section 4, what that means?"

Taylor: "Amendment #1 only had one page, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Looks to me like it has six."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You got the right Bill, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "2220."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's it. House Bill 2220."

Vinson: "2220."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your next question. There seems to be a discrepancy between the Amendments."

Vinson: "Well, I wonder if we could take the Bill out of the record to clear up that discrepancy."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Bill should come out of the record. I've heard all kinds of erroneous statements made about this Bill. The past person who just spoke spoke about the overall cost for the entire state including total reimbursement. This program will only call 25 to 30 million the first year. This program applies for the entire State of Illinois. The only portion that will be given directly to Cook



County would be reimbursement to Oak Forest Hospital."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we've got the improper Amendment distributed that we ought to take it out of the record until we get the proper Amendment distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's on Third Reading, sir. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed sir."

Vinson: "He insists on going ahead with it in improper form I'll address the Bill as it stands. What the Bill does and I think the Sponsors of the Bill ought to think about this a little bit. What the Bill does is it only authorizes assistance to somebody who has no property, no property. Under the previous law, assistance was authorized to people not having sufficient property to pay for their medical care. So, what the Bill will do, if it's passed in this form, it would invalidate assistance to people the Sponsors are attempting to provide assistance to. The Bill is actually not in the form you want it in and you're engaging in an act of futility. Now to take the concept a step further, people who might be inclined to think about the Bill I think ought to address two facts. Number one, one of the problems with Cook County Hospital and its funding has been a problem in relating to the Illinois Department of Public Aid which has, on occasion, I believe adopted unnecessarily restrictive and difficult... created difficult problems in getting people who are entitled to Medic-Aid assistance certified for the Medic-Aid assistance. I think that's deplorable that the Illinois Department has done that and created the problem for Cook County as the result of doing that. But when they do that what we ought to do is correct that problem and insure that everybody entitled to Medic-Aid



gets Medic-Aid as a way of taking care of the hospital and the individuals involved, because when we create this program what we insure is that the state has to pay for the program a hundred percent where if we just made sure the people entitled to Medic-Aid got Medic-Aid the state would only have to pay for 50% of the program and the feds would pay for 50%. So not only will a vote for this Bill do the opposite of what the Sponsors want it to do, but in addition to that it's going to unnecessarily cost the state 50% of the cost of this program. We could correct the problem directly by insuring that the people entitled to Medic-Aid got Medic-Aid. I would urge a no vote on the Bill."

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

Borchers: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. To me, it's... I have been informed that most of the people are those on welfare that are going to this hospital and that means that it's just another large group of those who do not produce, never do produce except reproduce who are going to putting their cost of all sorts of ailments, many of them very minor onto the people of all the State of Illinois forcing this additional cost on those who do produce and do provide the funds necessary for it. I think it's high time we were thinking about something to the best interest of the tax-paying citizens and the hard-working people of this state instead of always yielding and always borrowing to the mostly unnecessary needs of people who expect everything to be handed to them on a silver platter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we had the Department of Public Aid, the Director and some of his staff before us and there really has been a problem and Cook County Hospital has been deprived of money because of people got the service and then didn't... and then never



went back and qualified. However, the Director assured us and after persistence on our part, on the part of the Auditor General that they would move some Public Aid staff over to the Cook County Hospital to intercept these people before they were admitted to be sure that the proper forms are filled out, that they were qualified and so on. Frankly, I think this will solve the problem of the patients of the Cook County Hospital and without necessitating all the cost of the things that Representative Taylor's trying to do. He's certainly justified in trying to see that the... that Public Aid does take care of their cases at the hospital, but the fact has been that Public Aid didn't have an office anywhere near the hospital and now they're going to have. And I think that I would like to see that tried before we go into a mass certification of all the low-income people in the City of Chicago. I think we better concentrate on those who are going to need the services of the hospitals and hopefully, if the commitment of the Director stands, that should no longer be a problem."

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

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

I rise in support of this legislation. As Representative Mahar pointed out, it is extremely important because it helps Oak Forest Hospital which is part of the Cook County Hospital chain of help providers in Cook County. The next Bill coming up, 2793, in my opinion rounds out the picture of what we ought to do but this one deals quite specifically with Oak Forest Hospital which is now being reimbursed as a nursing home. It is not just a nursing home. Anyone who's ever been there or who knows anything about it understands that what it provides is very high-level intensive care and the Department can say all it wants to about its good intentions and how it plans to help out but if we don't specifically direct it to reimburse Oak Forest Hospital for what it is,



which is a high-level intensive care provider, the Department is not going to do it. This legislation is essential to achieve that."

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

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

I've listened to the arguments of two or three of the persons that said that this was not for the working poor. It is definitely so to help the working poor, especially those that are in that area that do not qualify for public aid and yet they're in a position to not be able to get insurance benefits and so forth. That particular group is that very poor that need some kind of help. I think this legislation will attempt to correct many of the ills that we have today. I solicit your support for House Bill 2220."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2220 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Roman, come here. Have all voted who wish? Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Objections have been raised. You spoke in debate, ma'am."

Braun: "I was... I was going to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Yes."

Have all voted who wish? Kindly record Ewell as aye. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I don't see any problem with the Bill and I think the thing that Representative Vinson was speaking about if there is a problem would like to get the Bill to the Senate. I will assure you that that problem would be corrected. We know that we're in the late stages of the Session and Friday is the deadline date. I would certainly like to have an opportunity in the Senate and you and I know that if this Bill is in bad shape once it gets over to the House of Lords it's not going any place. I need your support to get House Bill 2220 out of here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? Clerk will take the record. Poll the absentees. Not yet, Mr. Conti. Your request will be granted, sir. Poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Darrow. Ebbesen. Ewing. Flinn. Hallstrom. Hoxsey. Kane. Laurino. McGrew. Rea. Richmond. Stuffle. Telcser. Totten. Van Duynes and J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vinson, what purpose seek recognition?"

Vinson: "For purposes of a verification if it gets to 89."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 85 ayes, 70 nos. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you place this on postponed consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed consideration. House Bill 2793."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2793. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2793 addresses the problems being faced by the public hospitals now in the State of Illinois. It would require that all people who are likely to be eligible for care at the public hospitals be registered so that when they are hospitalized the hospitals could have the care reimbursed quickly and efficiently. Right now, a major problem is that people come in in labor, people come in dying and once they are dead the relatives don't come forward and fill out the papers. Pre-registration is absolutely essential as a first step to help the public hospitals survive. It would also say that people would be registered at 25% above the current Medic-Aid eligibility levels. This is an across-the-board 25% increase in that eligibility and it would provide for impact payments to those hospitals that have spent over 20% of their patient care



days on care for the indigent in the past three years. There is a companion appropriation Bill, House Bill 2922, to appropriate funds for the impact payments that will be available for vote next week. I want to point out that in the Auditor General's report he said that it is extremely important that these people be found and pre-registered for care because right now a major problem with funding, especially at Cook County Hospital which would be the principal beneficiary of this legislation, is that people simply cannot be registered and have their applications completed in time to meet the federal guidelines if they are permitted to come into the hospital and then start the process. The only efficient way to handle this is by registering them ahead of time. There's fifty-fifty federal matching money available for the pre-registration money and for the Medic-Aid eligibility increase. For the impact funding there is not currently federal funding officially available. However, I want to point out that the New York City Hospital have received what was called a demonstration grant from APW and I have details on that if anyone's interested so that the precedent certainly is there to help hospitals like the public hospitals in Illinois that are having financial problems. And I just want to read from the fact sheet about the New York funding project. It says, 'funds will be provided to participating hospitals and clinics for the cost of providing services for which they currently do not receive funding'. I ask for your support for this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

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

I think you'll recall that on the last Bill I pointed out that it was fatally flawed and counter-productive to its purpose. It, in fact, would have had the result



of not registering and of causing to be ineligible to people that the Sponsor seeks to make eligible for this assistance. Representative Catania's Bill, on the other hand, does not have the flaw. Its eligibility terms to address adequately the problem of making available for assistance to people that the Sponsor care about making available for assistance. And so in that sense it is clearly superior to the previous Bill. It does not suffer from the flaws of the previous Bill and cannot be criticized on that basis."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, reluctantly I have to oppose this Bill on the same grounds I did the one previously. The Auditor General did point out that part of the problems of the Cook County Hospital in getting reimbursed from Public Aid was the failure of the people to register before they got the service. Public Aid had in the past refused or was unwilling to put staff people at the hospital and at the other units operated by the Cook County Hospital to intercept those people when they came for treatment. We have the assurance now that they will be there. We believe that this will ^{alleviate} the problem of people getting the service without getting... without the hospital getting Public Aid reimbursement. I think that registering masses of people who may never need public aid is an unnecessary expenditure of public funds. I do think it is important that they be registered at the time they come for the service and that will now be possible."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation. It is different than the previous Bill. It does not affect some of the changes that are needed, I think, in the Public Aid Code. However, it does provide a system for providing impactation grants. A system that



will help alleviate some of the financial difficulties that hospitals like Cook County run into. Without going into great discussion because I believe this matter has been discussed, this Bill has merit to it.

I wish you would take a close look at it. It is certainly deserving of your support and I encourage an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to close."

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

I ask for your support for this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2793 pass?

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Kindly record Pechous as aye.

On this question there are 94 ayes, 52 nos. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...

Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, what purpose seek recognition?"

Peters: "A verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady asks for a poll of the absentees.

Kindly record Dr. Capuzi as aye. What are we starting off with, 95? Mr. Peters."

Peters: "I am now informed, Mr. Speaker, that we don't intend to do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws the verification request. On this question there 95 ayes, 52 nos.

This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3204."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3204. A Bill for an Act to revise the requirements for circuit-breaker grants foreign to provide fuel cost relief grants for senior citizens and disabled persons. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a tri-fold tax relief Bill. It's sponsored by Kornowicz, by Sharp and Bowman. I'll call on my lead-off man, Mr. Sharp on the fuel cost."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp."

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 3204 is legislation that was put together in an attempt to provide meaningful tax relief for the senior citizens for the coming fiscal year. Representative Kornowicz, as you know, has worked diligently to increase the income level and the benefits under the circuit-breaker program. Representative Bowman worked to eliminate a problem where certain public aid recipients were denied complete benefits or total benefits under the circuit breaker which was never intended under the original Bill. And myself and Representative Madigan worked on the few adjustment grants. Under that part of the Bill which is the new part, the feelings by many Members in the House was that we had addressed the problems of senior citizens and the unfair burdens placed on them by the property tax and by the sales tax, and one problem that was becoming more and more apparent was that that dealt with the increasing cost of utilities. Last year we put together legislation that dealt with this problem. It's incorporated in this Bill and it calls for a fuel grant which is based upon the average annual increase in the cost of utilities per household in the state. The grant will be up to 75% of the increase with a minimum grant of 40 dollars per household. We incorporated it into..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Jim."

Sharp: "We incorporated it into this Bill, into the circuit-breaker program to cut down on the administrative cost of the program to make sure that the fuel grant relief that is provided goes to the households that need it most and that basically the total amount of dollars appropriated for the program goes for its intended purpose and that's to relieve those costs. The cost of this program is in the neighborhood of 20 million dollars based upon an average annual increase in the cost of



utilities of a hundred dollars per household. The question I'm sure will come up is how do you plan to fund this. Well, if you look at the utility tax receipts during the past few years, you'll note that they have gone up dramatically. For the first ten months of this year alone, the increase utility tax receipts is in the neighborhood of 39 million dollars. We want to use about half of that to help households that need the help the most. So we ask for your support. This is the utility user refund part of the Bill, and I would turn it back over to Representative Kornowicz."

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

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to address myself to one particular feature of the Bill which is a problem that I've been working on for awhile with Representative Giorgi. It turns out that when the original circuit-breaker legislation was enacted into law, at that time the Federal Government did provide grants to senior citizens which were funneled through the Department of Public Aid to help with rent payments and the mood of the House or the feeling of the House and Senate at that time was, of course, we did not want to pay persons twice for essentially the same thing. In the meantime, that program has been dropped. Senior citizens are not now getting any money from Public Aid for the purpose of providing for housing expenses. They do, in some cases, get shopping allowances. If they get any money at all, they are totally disqualified from the circuit-breaker program. I had one particularly tragic case of a person coming into my office who was receiving four dollars a month, just four dollars a month as a supplemental shopping allowance. That computes out to 48 dollars a year and because she was receiving 48 dollars a year from the Department of Public Aid, she was totally ineligible to receive any circuit-breaker grants at all and she



forfeited over 300 dollars of circuit-breaker relief because she had accepted 48 dollars from the Department of Public Aid. That is a very tragic situation which we should not allow to occur. This Bill addresses that problem. The cost of that part of the Bill to the best that we can estimate it is around 4.4 million dollars. I think that it is a good addition to a comprehensive senior citizen tax relief package. I just would like to stress that this is the only Bill alive on our Calendar right now which provides for senior citizen tax relief and that, I think, is a good reason that everyone should vote for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kornowicz, to close."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3204 is the people's Bill. It's the most important Bill in this Session. It's for our senior citizens. Yes, these people need help and that's the reason we're asking you to support House Bill 3204. They are on fixed incomes. This Bill complies with the Governor's message. If you recall, the Governor's message of March the fifth, it stated in regards to give tax relief to the senior citizens in regard to the circuit-breaker. This Bill increases the circuit breaker from 10,000 to 12,000. It's very important that you vote on this Bill. I have an editorial dated Friday, February the 15, it says 'Two Hits and a Miss on Tax Relief'. And he is expanding the circuit-breaker. I'm talking about our Governor stating that he'll expand the circuit-breaker program of property tax relief for the elderly, disabled by 12 million. His plan will provide up to 150 of additional annual tax relief in those who need most. These are the people that need most, our senior citizens. This is your last chance to vote for tax relief and we ask you to get aboard and we ask you for a favorable vote. House Bill 3204."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3204 pass?"



All in favor vote 'aye', all-oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 ayes, 19 nos, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3214. Mrs. Chapman?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3214. Mrs. Chapman?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3214, a Bill for an Act to establish a state program for the planning, development and administration of support services for adolescent parents. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's welcome from the 9th District the 144 Junior High School in the balcony represented by Getty, Grossi, and Piel."
Unknown: "Tell them to get their story straight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on House Bill 3214."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3214 is the first of a series of five Bills which are before us at this point. They represent the recommendation of women Legislators who have been studying the issue of adolescent motherhood and teenage pregnancy over the last year and a half. During the Session last year we met on almost a weekly basis with state agencies to learn about the programs they presently have in place that will help adolescents with day care for babies, with getting an education in order to support their babies and in the area of health. We learned during our study that one out of five babies born in this state is born to a teenager. The maternal death risk is 60% higher for a younger teenager than for women in their twenties. But seven in ten teen mothers get no prenatal care in the first trimester. Babies of teenagers are two to three times more likely to die in their first year. And that pregnancy is the most common cause of school drop out among young women. We took the issue back to our district, to the grass-roots to learn the views of our constituents on this problem. We talked with mothers, with daughters, with



the professionals. We held hearings in our Legislative Districts. The Bill you have before you which is proposed by Representative Jenny Frederick and me designates the Illinois Department of Public Health as the single state agency for planning and coordinating adolescent parent support services and establishes a 15 minute... member state-wide task force to advise regarding this activity. The members represent the various agencies of State Government plus nonpublic members and it would be involved in determining what the resources are and what the need..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Chapman: "I'd urge you to support this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3214 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did want to get your attention. We are voting on one Bill? We're not voting on a series of Bills?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Just on this one, 3214."

Kelly: "Okay. Well, my question to the Sponsor, you know it's not too late. I want to find out whether or not the Amendment Representative Piel has talked to me about that said that in effect that this would not be used for abortion counseling, if that is incorporated in this Bill, Representative Chapman?"

Chapman: "If it's appropriate for me to respond, I'd like to."

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

Chapman: "This Bill deals with adolescent motherhood.

It doesn't deal with abortion at all. So even though I really felt that the Amendment offered by Mr. Piel was not appropriate to the Bill, since there was concern I accepted his Amendment. And part of the Bill right now is a prohibition in regard to grants and aid



for abortion performance, counseling and referral. Mr. Piel's Amendment is part of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill transfers responsibility for unwed mothers if they are teenage to the Department of Public Health. It sets up vocational training for them. It goes much farther than the Nutritional Act that the Sponsors say they are concerned about in this package of Bills. I ask you to look very carefully at this legislation and to ask whether this is really a problem that the State Government ought to be getting itself involved. You know, there are a lot of problems out there in the populace that we have no business being in and I think this is a perfect example of that. I think it's going to end up costing a lot of money, not solving the problem at all. It addresses symptoms rather than causes."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, unlike what the previous speaker has just said, this does not provide new services. It really says that the Department of Public Health will have the coordinating responsibility. The kinds of things that the previous Representative seems to object to are already portions of our law, but they have been inactive in a piecemeal fashion. If this Bill passes as it certainly deserves to, what we will be doing for the first time is having one state agency responsible for the coordination of those services which I think will lead to a more efficient delivery of those services. It's not providing new things. It is simply coordinating what we already do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Frederick, to



explain her vote. Timer's on."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of House Bill 3214, which is a combination of a year long effort in trying to assess and provide assistance to teenage mothers. And the hearing that Mr. Matijevich, Representative Matijevich and I, convened in Waukegan, Illinois, one of the problems we found that there are services in several agencies, but the teenagers don't know where to go for them. This is why we're recommending that they all be located in the Department of Public Health. I really hope that you'll consider this matter seriously and that you will vote affirmatively on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye's, 36 'no's, four recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3216."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 to House Bill 3216 actually has become the Bill. And before I go into the explanation of the Amendment, I'd like to give you a little background of the Bill. After the dramatic and extensive hearings that we've talked about that were held by various Members of the Conference of Women Legislators, it has certainly been revealed that Illinois along with the other states of the nation has a serious social problem relating to an ever increasing number of teenage pregnancies. There were 29,885 girls 19 years old and younger who gave birth to children in Illinois in 1977. This accounts for 16.8% of the total births in the state of that year.



There were 29,283 between fifteen to nineteen years old of the age who gave birth to children in 1977 and 52.1% of these births were premarital. As you have heard, these births are of the highest infant mortality as well as birth defect risks and are of the utmost concerns to doctors and hospitals throughout this state. The Department of Health has also recognized the severity of the problem and has been working cooperatively with us to at least try to minimize the problems associated with teenage pregnancies and teenage parents. House Bill 3216 originally was developed due to my visit and personal observation of a remarkable center serving teen parents in 'Valview,' Washington. This center was providing the opportunity for teen mothers to finish their education and also learn how to be good parents, through understanding and being taught both the nutritional and psychological needs of their children. They also were instructed in household budgeting and consumer comparative shopping. An advisory committee from the community which consisted of doctors, clergymen, teachers, lawyers, and other valuable resource people were available to help with special problems and advice to these teenage mothers. The mothers brought their children to the school center where one professional nursery school worker was assisted by half of the teen moth.. the teenage mothers in the morning hours in caring for the babies while the other half were in their academic classes. In the afternoon it was reversed and the mothers who had taken care of the children in the morning were then sent to academic classes in the afternoon. The program worked beautifully and it was my hope that we would be able to develop a pilot project or projects that would be similarly helpful in Illinois. House Bill 3216 as originally drafted would have delivered eleven services



to the centers that we were planning. Frankly, we discovered that there simply was not enough money in the Department of Health at this point to fund such programs. And so we therefore have introduced Amendment #5 which is merely a feasibility study that will allow for an in-depth, in-depth study of the problem and report back to this General Assembly with recommendations for action by April 3rd, 1981. Representative Darrow who had originally asked for a fiscal note has withdrawn that request and also Representative Piel has withdrawn his Amendment to the Bill for the Right To Life Amendment. There is no need for that in this feasibility study at this point. I think it is extremely necessary for us to find out what the scope of help and possibility is to develop some kind of organized help for these young teenage mothers and I would urge your support of this feasibility study which is found in House Bill 3216.

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuynes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes. As Representative Macdonald said and I understand that the Amendment that was finally adopted would provide the feasibility study and I certainly intend to support her on the House Bill."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Birkinbine: "Jenny, what's this feasibility study going to cost?"

Macdonald: "Even though Representative Darrow did withdraw his request for a fiscal note, it is felt that there are enough people in place to do the feasibility study. But by cutting out the hours that it would cost, there probably would have to be \$19,000... \$19,600 in terms of salaries that are contributed to the study. There will



be need for a clerk or a clerk typist which will probably be \$12,000 and then for travel and supplies there's another 15 so it would probably be somewhere around \$46,000."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Ropp: "Could you tell me how many service centers there are in the state that this might be a part of?"

Macdonald: "I don't.. I don't know how many service centers there are. There are some teen mothers that are being served in the Chicago area and there are other numbers that are being served in the suburban area by public school systems. But what the actual number are in the state I am not exactly sure and I think that is one of the facts that will be revealed after this feasibility study is completed."

Ropp: "I'm well aware of the large number of young women who become mothers in this situation and I'm wondering by this study, does this in any way endorse or support or encourage young adolescent people to become involved in early family living as this ultimately may do? Oftentimes many of these end up in bad situations and I'm wondering whether or not there is any encouragement to maybe hold off to begin one's family until they are maybe in a financial situation to either do that or maybe add a few years of aging and maturity and extra wisdom that might not, not always help, but certainly would not harm."

Macdonald: "I'm sorry. The noise level is so great over here I didn't hear the impact of your whole statement."

Ropp: "All right. My.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doc. Doc Capuzi. Dr. Capuzi, step away from the Lady. It's her Bill."

Ropp: "My question was, in any way does this particular Bill encourage or endorse or support adolescent young people



to start a family or to get married at maybe an earlier age than quote, 'our normal history of society as accepted,' maybe 30, 40, or 50 years ago?"

Macdonald: "Not at all, Representative Ropp. The statistics are what they are today without any effort on our part to try to do anything to help these young people. The high risk level of these pregnancies are .. is really the greatest concern of the Health Department and those others who are trying to at least delve into the depths of what the problem is. I don't think it's an encouragement at all. The statistics are growing every year and I think that we are going to have to address ourselves to this social problem and this is merely a feasibility study to investigate the depths of the problem and to see what indeed can be done both medically and psychologically and educationally to insist that these people get their education and to try to help in any way we can to alleviate the problem."

Ropp: "All right. In the form of education there have been some pros and cons on further sex education in schools. Would you support that kind of a move as an attempt to...?"

Macdonald: "As far as I'm concerned this Bill- I deleted in the earlier Bill- I deleted any part of sex education. I don't think that we are addressing ourselves. I think that sex education is a problem with the local School Districts and with the local people in the areas. I don't intend at all for the Department of Health to get into that aspect through this feasibility study."

Ropp: "You don't think that sex being a part of this particular problem, learning either at an earlier age would help alleviate the situation prior to this study?"

Macdonald: "Oh, I certainly think that sex education is a very important part of the entire educational process. But it is a highly controversial subject as any School Board



Member in any area of this state can tell you. And I have no intention of getting involved in that particular area through this Bill."

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

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement. In the back inside the gallery to the House chamber are a group of students from Prairie Hills Junior High School, School District 144 in Markham represented by Representative Kelly, Mahar and myself. Want to stand up?"

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this happens to be Students Day. There's 100 students, 100 students from Carlton, Wauhburn Schools from Winnetka, Illinois, represented by Hallstrom, Birkinbine and Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, on House Bill 3216."

Brummer: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Brummer: "For the purpose of clarifying the legislative intent with regard to this, Representative Chapman (sic), I realize..."

Macdonald: "That's Macdonald. Macdonald. I'm the Sponsor."

Brummer: "I'm sorry. I've been taking to Representative Chapman over here. Representative Macdonald, part of the Bill is for a study of . . . a feasibility study for the establishment of service centers concerning one family planning, two preventative health services. With regard to each of those items, there are individuals who would indicate that.. that abortion is a legitimate portion of family planning, that abortion is a legitimate portion of preventative health services. Is it your intent as the Sponsor that abortion as an alternative method of family planning be included as part of the study?"



Macdonald: "No, Mr. . . No, Representative Brummer. It is not my intention and as Representative Chapman explained I would have been perfectly willing to accept Representative Piel's Amendment and that is not a part of the intent of this particular Bill."

Brummer: "Okay. And likewise, I take it that it is not your intent that this feasibility study deal with the question of abortion as a legitimate method of preventative health services?"

Macdonald: "That is correct."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vinson? Mr. Winson. Mr. Vinson. The Lady has got the floor. Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, am concerned about the pregnant teen and her well being. But just how much responsibility is government going to take over and how much is the taxpayer supposed to pay? If the family and the girls themselves don't start to accept some responsibility and have a little self-respect about what she's doing and where she's been, what can we expect next? And just how much and what part of your life do you want government to take over? Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, to close."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. While we would have hoped to have set up at least one pilot project center with this Bill, we realize the restrictions of the Department in terms of their fiscal ability to fund such a department. We feel that this is a reasonable and very necessary part of the total answers to the problem that is ever



growing, not only in Illinois, but throughout this country. I wish that we did not have the problem. I wish I had some simple solution. I wish that we did not have to use taxpayers money. But this indeed is a problem in our schools. It is a problem for the families themselves who need help and many of them cannot help their own teenage children who are children having children. And I urge your support so that we may at least get on the way. We'll see what can be done through both private and public sector with this problem. Please vote 'yes' on this important Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3216 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Mike. Give me an 'aye'. Give Vitek his 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'aye's, 23 'no's, three recorded as 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3217."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3217, a Bill for an Act in relation to provision of child day care assistance in case of adolescent parents. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Children and Family Services at this time provides day care services in the amount of about 100... 850,000 dollars. This will not change. There's no additional money here. The only change in the Bill is that we give priority to teenage mothers so that they can return to school or to get occupational training in order to complete their education and support their family."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3217 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this



question there are 124 'aye's, 11 'no', seven recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3218."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3218, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is an extension of another good Bill. It was passed by Representative Kempiners in 1979, House Bill 1686. At that time it provided for a medical assistance only for teenage pregnancies. I.. Representative Currie and myself met with Director Miller and we accepted an Amendment of his which transferred this program from general assistance to aid to families with dependent children. We had a fiscal note filed and because of the Director's Amendment we actually are...aren't going to help more children statewide because that's all they are, is mere children, these teenage pregnant women, and we're going to be able to do it at a 1.7 million savings just by transferring this from one group to another. I think one of the most unique things about this teenage pregnancy package of Bills is that the Conference of Women Legislators meets once a week. Even though we have many, many differences of opinion, we do not agree on all things, but we can sit down and we can work on common problems that are good for the State of Illinois. And I am very pleased and proud to be a Member of the Conference of Women Legislators. This is an agreed Bill with the Director of the Department of Public Aid and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

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



House, I note that this Bill makes reference to unwed mothers and unwed expectant mothers. And this is the only piece of legislation in this package that discriminates on sexual basis. Many a time we've heard Jeannie Chapman get to the floor of this House and talk about sexual discrimination and neutering different laws such as workmen's compensation to worker's compensation. And here, what do the women Legislators do? They try to get us to vote for a Bill that provides services only to unwed mothers. And it's blatantly discriminating. Why shouldn't unwed fathers have counseling services? You know, it takes... There are.. It's not just a situation with the unwed mothers, there has to be a man involved in situations such as this and that man ought to have a little counseling too. We should recognize his rights and his responsibilities. And I just don't understand why the Sponsor of this legislation insisted on calling unwed mothers whereas the other Bills spoke of unwed parents and I would hope that she would amend it if it passes and gets over to the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sure he'd get the counseling from the girl's mother and dad. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Just in response to the last Gentleman. I'm assured there are enough unwed fathers in the Senate that they can be careful to put that Amendment on. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Run that tape to the Senate. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to the Gentleman who suggested that there ought to be counseling for both parents. I agree with that. However, this Bill really is in regard to additional health risks to the mother. I don't think that we can predict the health risks to the unwed fathers. If we



were able to do that, we might look for some way of reimbursing him too. But I think this is an example where it's clear that we are not just attempting to make sex neuter laws. We are attempting to address the issue on the basis of sex... where sex is pertinent, but only making neuter the laws that really do not have to be specific to one sex or the other. A mother is definitely a female and that reference I think is appropriate."

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

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just rise to support Representative Barnes' Bill. It certainly seems to me that you know we should admit that there are problems with teenagers and that this legislation would provide this type of assistance and as far as I know, the... the Pro-Life groups have reviewed this legislation and have found the package as it is right now to be acceptable. So I join it and I think it's a credit to Representative Barnes and to the women's group here sponsoring this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this will provide for more nutritional services. It will give us healthier babies. It will give help to a teenage unwed mother when she needs the assistance the most. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3218 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye's, 21 'no's, six recorded as 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3219."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3219, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain material services. Third Reading of the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien : "Maternal services.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a concrete Bill. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Braun and I are hyphenated Co-Sponsors on this Bill. She is not able to be on the floor at the moment, so I would ask leave please to give the Bill to the General Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson gives you leave."

Hallstrom: "Thank you. House Bill 3219 actually takes the program title 'Unwed Mothers Program' from the Department of Children and Family Services and puts it into the Department of Public Health. There is complete agreement from both departments. I have spoken directly to the Director of DCFS and to the Director of D H. I must tell you that I had a reason for picking up this Bill. As many of you know I have a great concern for handicapped youngsters. And it has come to my attention that young people who have babies have the same risk of having a handieapped child as a person who is older than should be for delivering a baby. The Department of Children and Family Services Director did tell me at this point there is no real state program underneath.. under DCFS. And he was in agreement that this should go into DPH. Director Kempiners agreed with that. The only problem that we had was that they felt they needed a longer time to unite the two programs so that one could go into the new department. So we put an Amendment that says this Bill does not go into effect until January 1st, 1982."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3219 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk will takethe record. On this question there's 138 'aye's, 7 'nay's, six recorded as 'present'. This



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3246."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3246. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the management operation and control of maintenance of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane. Excuse me, Doug. Please proceed."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what House Bill 3246 does is to give statutory authority to a medical service and research plan that has been instituted by the medical school at Southern Illinois University. It's a plan that has been in effect for several years but in the last audit, the Auditor General suggested that there should be statutory authority for that program. This Bill follows the statute that governs the University of Illinois and the language has been worked out between the Auditor General and the Audit Commission and the Southern Illinois University. I'd urge an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3246 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 ayes, 1 nay, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3395."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3395. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's handling the Bill? Who? Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3395 is a product of the House Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources



Committee. The Committee piece of legislation passed out of our Committee 11 to zero. The purpose of the Bill is in response to Chicago Tribune series of articles on Illinois wasteland in the making. This Bill was proposed to us by the Illinois Environmental Council. This Bill would indeed encourage land owners through out the City (sic) of Illinois to place their property under a nature preserve and that indeed it would be incentive to those owners to keep those beautiful nature preserves nature preserves. Approximately 2,000 acres in... 2, 071 acres in the State of Illinois. It would provide that those acres would be assessed at one dollar per acre . We surveyed those acreage and approximately right now only 10% are interested in using this tax incentive for nature preserves. This Bill has the full support of Governor Thompson and his administration and also passed out of Revenue Committee by 24 to zero. I'd ask for an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Golf courses won't qualify will they? Thank you."

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

Walsh: "Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Walsh: "Does any part of this Bill provide that there shall be free access to the public of these acres?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain, please."

McClain: "No, we talked about mandating that Bill. It doesn't preclude it but the purpose of the piece of legislation is for specific beautiful areas that are indeed identified by the Nature Preserves Commission as nature preserves that indeed they would be maintained and retained as nature preserves and not eaten up. So we didn't mandate public access. We did not discourage it either. That was not the intent of the legislation. It's only about 2,000 acres throughout the entire state."

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



we're talking here of granting a tax benefit to private land owners for land that they happen to own and presumably enjoy and all they have to do is keep the land in the... in the condition that it is already in. Now it seems to me that that's a beautiful position for a speculator or a beautiful position for someone who wants to enjoy the land in its condition as a nature preserve. Now, if the land owner would grant access, even any kind of reasonable access to the public for the enjoyment of this nature preserve, then I could see some justification, but I certainly can't see any justification for granting a tax benefit to people for keeping land as they would have kept it anyway probably and for their own private enjoyment. So, I would urge, I think that we've gone a little overboard on granting tax benefits anyway. This sure looks to me like a place we ought to stop it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "...yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "If I heard your explanation, Mike, this only applies to land which has been designated as beautiful or something by the Nature Preserve Commission and you say that amounts to 2,000 acres."

McClain: "2,071 and that's..."

Vinson: "Can that Nature Preserves Commission increase the amount of land in that category?"

McClain: "Not unless it meets the specific criteria but these are all the lands are so designated throughout the entire state and they don't see any increase in the acreage."

Vinson: "They don't expect to increase the acreage, you say."

McClain: "No. That's correct."

Vinson: "What is the Nature Preserves Commission?"

McClain: "Well, the Commission designated under the Department of Conservation that is interested in preserving so designated



lands or nature preserves."

Vinson: "Could you talk more directly into your microphone?
I can't..."

McClain: "Sorry. The Commission underneath the Department of Conservation interested in and so designated by the Department of Conservation for delineating and specifying what lands throughout the State of Illinois are considered nature preserves."

Vinson: "There's one Commission state-wide?"

McClain: "That's correct."

Vinson: "And how are members of the Commission selected?"

McClain: "I would imagine appointed by the Governor but I couldn't answer that directly."

Vinson: "Thank you."

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

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, this issue's so important to me personally, I'd like to move the previous question."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to Mr. Walsh's point, this is nothing different than a historical site that is on a persons land. This is... the important piece of legislation is that what we're trying to do is encourage the preservation of certain Illinois nature land which are approved by the Nature Preserve Commission. It's a mere 2,071 acres but they're an important 2,071 acres. Like I said, it passed Illinois... the House Environment and Energy, Natural Resources Committee by 11 to nothing, passed the Revenue Committee 24 to nothing. It is endorsed by the Illinois Environmental Council and the Governor of the State of Illinois and I'd ask for an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3395 pass?"



All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Winchester: "Well, I was going to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman would just nod and it could make me... help me decide which way I want to vote on this issue. How is this going to affect southern Illinois counties and the Shawnee National Forest area in which there a lot of lands already off the tax roads? Is there going to be a large sum of land that's going to be set aside under this program in that area?"

McClain: "Polk County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about Union?"

McClain: "It really doesn't make any difference, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll have to move the road and the rest stops. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "I'd like to point out in my opinion this is a very good Bill. These acres, though their taken off the tax rows in certain counties will encourage migratory birds and wildlife the propagation of deer and other animals for hunting areas in the future. And I think anything along this line should be encouraged. I'm sure that there are many acres that will be added to, you might say, the quality of life in our state. So I would certainly advise voting yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 aye, 17 no, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3404."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3404. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Vermilion , Mr. Campbell."

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



House Bill 3404 as originally introduced did two things. It required that the assessment of the sales ratio study be based on the three years preceding the year prior to the assessment year. It also removed vacant lots from the sales ratio study. This Bill passed Committee 20 to 1 and we did have a problem after we got it on the floor with the removing the vacant lots because of Cook County and also the Department had some problems with it. So Amendment #2 put the vacant lots back into the study. Now I know of no opposition to the Bill and would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3404 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 ayes, 2 nos, 3 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Rea, Mr. Franklin, (sic) what purpose seek recognition? Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. We were very privileged last week to have former Representative Dale McCormick here and of course former Representative Clyde Sholte and today I would like to introduce another former Representative of the 59th District, Representative and Senator William Grendle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hello Bill. Good to see you House Bill 342



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3425. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3425, with Representative Taylor as a hyphenated Chief Sponsor, is the result of some studies that have gone on since the...you'll remember the rather exhausting debate over Senate Bill 1377. There have been a variety of problems with that, the drafting and so on, that were pointed out; some by business groups, some by civil rights groups, some by the agency or the people in the current agency who will presumably be implementing the Act. This tries to clear up the problems that have been brought to our attention. And so that this agency that goes into effect on July 1st can operate properly. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 3425 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2788."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2788. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to prohibit sale, offering, exposing for sale fireworks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2788 is a result of a study run by Channel 5 News NBC in Chicago relating to the possession of fireworks. Illinois law presently provides that possession of fireworks is not illegal. What this Bill does is it makes the knowing possession of fireworks illegal. We have set forth categories that... penalizing for the possession of fireworks depending upon the volume of the possession of the drams of the fireworks. This Bill has been through the Committee on Judiciary II and I know of no opposition to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, we currently have and I think we did last summer have sales of fireworks here in Springfield. Are you indicating that the sale of those fireworks were illegal? I thought individual municipalities could license the sale of fireworks."

Daniels: "The sale of fireworks is illegal. Municipalities may..."

Brummer: "Excuse me, I didn't hear that."

Daniels: "The sale of fireworks is illegal."

Brummer: "All classes of fireworks?"

Daniels: "All classes. The demonstration of them is not illegal. Municipalities may shoot off fireworks. This Bill does not affect that law at all."

Brummer: "No, we had various shops set up here during the end of the Session last year that were openly advertising in Springfield sale of fireworks. Specifically here in Springfield. I was wondering if as a result of this being a... presumably a home rule unit they had the authority to license for the sale of fireworks."



Daniels: "The Illinois law presently provides that it's illegal."

Brummer: "So they were doing so despite the fact that it is illegal?"

Daniels: "Well, some people back here are telling me that those specific instances were not fireworks. Now, I don't know specifically what you're referring to, but this legislation that we are talking about right now makes the possession of fireworks, possession of those fireworks dated in the present Illinois law to be illegal. We have not changed the law as it relates to what's classified as fireworks."

Brummer: "What is classified as fireworks then under the existing law?"

Daniels: "There's a whole long list of them. Let me pull the Amendment and refer to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "While he's looking that up, Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, what purpose seek recognition?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we're honored today with people from the Southwest Cooperative for Special Education in the back gallery. The parents of students are in the gallery and they're represented by Kelly, Mahar, and Steczo. They're up here in the back of the gallery."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Daniels."
Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I can read it to you. It's rather lengthy.
'The term fireworks shall mean and include any explosive composition are any substance or combination of substances or article prepared for the purpose of producing a visable or audible effect of a temporary exhibitional nature by explosion, combustion, or deterioration and shall include the cartridges, toy cannons in which explosives are used, the type of balloons which require fire underneath to propel the same, firecrackers, torpedoes, sky rockets, roman candles, sparklers, bombs, or other fireworks of



like construction and any fireworks containing any explosive compound or any tablets or other device containing any explosive substance or containing combustible substances producing visual effects.' That is the current Illinois law. We did not change that. We are only, by this Bill, making it illegal to possess fireworks which knowingly possess which current Illinois law does not provide. What happened in the study of NBC News, Channel 5 was that they found that people in Illinois could order out of state substantial amounts of fireworks and in fact they did just that, several pounds of fireworks which literally could blow houses apart, and throughout their study on TV they found a home that was engaged in the actual possession of fireworks that had some four or five cases of what they call cherry bombs that eventually caught on fire and blew the home up in the neighborhood."

Brummer: "Okay, question. Do you... Is there some minimum level in here below which the possession would not be criminal? For example, if I possess three small firecrackers. Would that suddenly become illegal under this legislation?"

Daniels: "That would be classified under the legislation as what's called a petty offense."

Brummer: "And what's the maximum..."

Daniels: "Five hundred dollar fine is the maximum."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

Slape: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Slape: "It appears to me that this Bill is just another attempt to punish people who in good sense and in safety use fireworks and do it in a prudent manner, to try to punish both people for the actions of some people who cannot be custodian over their own good will."



I think this is an invasion and just another act of restricting people and restricting people who are accessed to something that they can use in a safe manner and I would urge a no vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I guess Representative Daniels can respond if he wants. I don't... I don't know if people realize how extensive our definition of fireworks are under even the current law and now we're going one step farther by making possession up to a year in the penitentiary Class A misdemeanor. I asked for an opinion from the Attorney General with respect to... about the best I can do is to describe them but I don't know exactly what the name is. Kids... I suppose everybody in this House who has children has had them in their home. They're the little things... rapped in paper that you just throw on the ground and they make a little crack, cracking type of noise. Also, the party favors that you just pull a string on and it makes confetti go all over and that sort of thing. I just assume like I assume everybody in this House assumes that those are legal and not included in the definition of fireworks. There's nobody even purport that they're any danger to anybody. Three and four year old children can use them without any harm. So I submitted those devices to the Attorney General in their Billwhiling; in the opinions division and asked and the States Attorney of Moultrie County asked whether those were covered under the existing statutes, and he said that they were. He said he thought it was a ludicrous law that it was that broad but the terminology fireworks means and includes any explosive combination or any substance or any combination of substances or any article prepared for the purpose of producing a visible effect or for the purpose of



producing an audible effect are covered under the fireworks Act. This is an incredibly broad definition. Representative Slape said it very, very well..."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. I enjoy the Gentleman's comments but he's not addressing the Bill. This Bill does not change the definition of fireworks and if the Gentleman would look at the Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let the Gentleman conclude, please. You can take care of that in your closing remarks." Mr. Johnson, please."

Johnson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is this Bill makes that definition even broader in terms of it providing for penalties for possession and the definition is active whether it's as to sale and transportation or as possession. So that an individual who has a birthday party and the little devices that you use for party favors, before that would be okay and now for possession you have substantial criminal penalties attached to that. So you can't avoid the fact that the definition of fireworks certainly is relevant to this Bill that vastly extends the number of people who are going to be criminally liable. Representative Slape said it very, very well. This is another act of government to impinge on the normal activities, day to day activities, of people who aren't doing anything to harm anybody else including themselves. And so I would think in light of that, in light of the fact that we probably ought to refine the whole Act that this ought to have a no or a present vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. Mr. Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "What the previous speaker failed to tell you is



exactly what he was talking about is already barred under the current law. The example that he used about the party favor, it's already illegal to use or explode so what he's proposing is that he gives this little kid the toys but they don't explode them. Now what we're saying here and what we're addressing under this legislation is some very, very extreme example that came out as a result of the investigation on Channel 5 News on NBC that showed examples of where people are seriously harmed and injured each and every year because of the possession of large amounts of fireworks. We're not talking necessarily about a case of one firecracker. Those are only petty offenses if there is a prosecution under the law. What we're talking about is the case where Representative that spoke previously referred to a Class A misdemeanor. He didn't tell you that you have to have three pounds of fireworks, three pounds that could literally blow this Capitol apart in order to be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. We had several hearings in the Judiciary Committee. Everybody on that Committee had an opportunity for input. The matter was heard thoroughly and I think it's a good piece of legislation that's sponsored by Representative Marovitz and myself. We certainly are happy with the form that it's in and we suggest that it's a good piece of legislation to protect the harmful effects where people are ordering from out-of-state fireworks to bring them in state and we are trying to stop that trafficking by this legislation. I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2788 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Steele: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. Despite the fine sponsorship of this Bill, I find it hard to support this."



As I understand, if someone from Missouri where fireworks can be sold, if they would come to visit someone here in the neighboring state and many people do come to visit on the Fourth of July and bring a few firecrackers with them it appears to me from this Bill that we're making that illegal and they would be subject to criminal penalties. And to me that's a very, very strong step to take and because of the severity of that step, many innocent people are going to be unwittingly made in violation of the law. And because many people do visit on weekends from Kansas and from Missouri and Iowa and possibly bring a few firecrackers with them on the Forth of July, this is going to subject all of them to penalties perhaps unwittingly and innocently and I think..."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, how many times have you read in the paper or how many times have you known of a young person who was mutilated for life because of fireworks which, in this state, were illegal to sell and illegal to distribute? You know and I know of many people who are in this category. This Bill is an opportunity to eliminate that from happening and I would encourage your support."

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

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I really had a question and I hope the Sponsor can nod his head or shake his head. Sponsor Daniels..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels."

Oblinger: "In the City of Springfield and the County of Sangamon we issue permits for fireworks to clubs on the lake but also to groups of families that want to go together to have a fireworks display provided there



are responsible adults in charge of it. Would this preclude those families from doing it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "The permits could still be issued under the law. We haven't affected that Section."

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

Explain your vote? Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, how far are we going to go to say the government has to protect everybody from everything? What don't we all outlaw matches? A lot of people get burned. Why don't we outlaw trains? They wrecked a couple Panama Limited's lately and hurt a bunch of people. Why don't we outlaw automobiles? More people are being killed by automobiles everyday than are being killed by the fireworks in ten years. Let's just outlaw everything and let the government be responsible for protecting everybody from everything. I had so much fun with firecrackers when I was a kid, I think it's even wrong to outlaw firecrackers, but here we go another law on the book to protect somebody from something else. Let's just protect them from everything and let the government be responsible for every day of our lives."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz. 101 votes."

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Bill came out of the Judiciary Committee with 10 to nothing vote and this will help with getting people who have large amounts of fireworks but we cannot prove what they were going to do with them and I think this will go a long way toward solving the problem of kids getting injured. I see we have enough votes but somebody who said that we aren't doing anything to harm anybody else. As Representative Hoffman said, there's an awful lot of harm that's being done by these fireworks and I



think this Bill will go a long way towards solving that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 ayes, 45 nos. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2837."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2837. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the State Fire Marshal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Bill...

The purpose of this Bill is to give the State Fire Marshal the power to dispurse state and federal grants for fire protection purposes to units of local government. There is no opposition that I know about to this Bill. It is endorsed by the Illinois Fire Advisory Board, the Illinois fire chiefs and inspectors in the union and everyone involved, and I move for the passage of the Bill."

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

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to... in opposition, reluctantly, to this piece of legislation because of the very fine Sponsor who worked very diligently for her district. There's a couple of things I'd like to call to your attention before you cast your vote on this Bill. First of all, the State Fire Marshal is not necessarily in favor of this Bill as it might have been indicated in the past. There are a few things that are really questionable. First of all, there are about 1300 fire departments in the State of Illinois now with the fire protection districts and there are no rules and regulations established by which this money is going to be passed out to local fire departments to buy emergency equipment. There is no definition of what emergency really means, and the administrative procedures that are placed upon the



Fire Marshal 's office is something that they'd rather not have at this time. I'm also informed that there are no federal funds available which means that this Act, if it's passed, must be funded out of state funds out of the General Revenue Fund. For that reason, I think that it's probably a little bit premature and there ought to be some more work done on the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Leverenz: "Representative, does this not duplicate some programs already established in the Illinois Department of Transportation?"

Younge: "I am not aware of any programs in the Illinois Department of Transportation that would be a duplication. The United States Department of Agriculture has appropriated funds for cities under 10,000 for fire equipment and gear, and this Bill would make it possible for the Fire Marshal of Illinois to disburse funds for fire protection purposes. That's where the authority ought to be and I do not know of such a program in the Department of Transportation."

Leverenz: "Well, I understand villages can apply for funds for emergency vehicles and equipment, utilizing federal funds through the Illinois Department of Transportation. The Gentleman, I think, that heads the program is 'Carson Veig'. Do you know of that program?"

Younge: "No, I do not know of that program. I think that it is imperative that the State Fire Marshall though have the authority to work with municipalities and local fire districts in reference to funds that are available on a state and federal level. He has... the Fire Marshal originally had some objections to the way that the Bill was written. It has been re-written and the Amendment has satisfied any known objections to



me, and I move for the passage of this Bill."

Leverenz: "I guess I'm done. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2837 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On...

Kindly record Cullerton as aye and Slape as aye.

On this question there are 80 ayes. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Barnes. Bradley. Breslin. Burnidge. Casey. Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Breslin as no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels. Doyle. Ewell. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Greiman. Hoffman. Dave Jones. Kane. Katz. Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees.

Kulas. Laurino. Mautino. Molloy. Oblinger.

O'Brien. Polk. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Schlickman. Schuneman. Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Skinner no, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Telcser. Totten."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane aye. Kane aye. Please proceed.

Mr. Christensen aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees.

Totten. Van Duyne. VonBoeckman. Watson. Willer.

Williams. Woodyard. Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Younge wants to vote aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "And Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? Record Richmond as

aye. Schlickman as no. On this question there are

84 ayes, 56 nos. Lady asks leave to put the Bill

on Postponed Consideration. Postponed. House Bill

2866."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2866. A Bill for an Act in relation to the sale on motor fuel at retail. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would require the retail motor fuel establishment to accept credit cards for gasohol if they accept them for other motor fuels. Bill passed Transportation Committee 16 to 1. It would provide a petty offense for failure to obey the law. Ask for your favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Why?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He likes his Bill. Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Several of the major oil companies refuse, as a matter of policy, to accept credit cards for the sale of gasahol when they were for all other fuels, in fact, all other sales of any kind of items that they sold, and I think in a state that is the leader in gasahol research in gasahol production and promotion that it is a disgrace for us... for the oil companies not to do everything they can to encourage the sale of it, in fact, when they are trying to discourage it."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Let's hear it from D.O.T."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of House Bill 2866. In Committee it gave the appearance that the oil companies were trying to manipulate the consumers into not purchasing gasahol and I think what we are trying to encourage in the state is more purchase of gasahol. And for that reason, I think that this legislation should pass. Motor fuel companies presently



allow credit cards for use for purchase of many other types of supplies and products that did not carry their names, their brand names and I think it was just a weak excuse on their part and think this is a very important Bill and urge everyone to support Representative Bower on his attempt."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you. Would this just be gasahol or anything that they sell?"

Bower: "Gasahol."

Leverenz: "And what gasoline companies do not accept it for gasahol?"

Bower: "I cannot tell you which ones as of today do not."

Leverenz: "Which ones as of yesterday?"

Bower: "When the Bill was introduced, there were several major ones. I do not know which ones today are not. Some that weren't have now changed their policy and are. Others that were that had not stated position have now changed their policy so that they were not."

Leverenz: "If they are in the process or have already changed their policy, then this Bill would not be necessary?"

Bower: "If none of them were opposing the acceptance of credit cards for gasahol that it true. It's my understanding that..."

Leverenz: "How many gas stations in the state now presently since some or all have switched that are in the process of switching still will refuse to take a credit card?"

Bower: "It was not a basis of an individual station. It was the basis of the parent companies saying that they could not accept them."

Leverenz: "Which ones are those?"

Bower: "I cannot... which companies as of this day are not accepting that I cannot tell you, but..."

Leverenz: "Alright. You can use the real names of those.

When a person is refused credit privilege for gasahol,



or would they have to explain that they want to charge it first if they were buying gasahol or do they just get a rude awakening when they're told, 'By the way since you put the gasahol in the car you can't charge it'. Is that how it works now?"

Bower: "It was my understanding that some had it posted, others just merely said that when it came to the sale of gasahol and the credit cards were presented that they would not accept it."

Leverenz: "Then they wanted cash right then and there?"

Bower: "That is my understanding."

Leverenz: "What would the people do? It's a petty offense now?"

Bower: "Yes."

Leverenz: "How would they go about registering a complaint?"

Bower: "You would call the police, have the police come down and document the fact that the guy at the gas station won't take the credit card. A law enforcement official or a states attorney."

Leverenz: "Do you think that's a workable, feasible situation?"

Bower: "It is workable and feasible as it is enforcement of any other law."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. Mr. Bower to close."

Bower: "I think the Bill is easily understood and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2866 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the reason why I was going to ask a question was I couldn't see the difference between



this Bill and a Bill that's already passed by Representative Slape, Harris, Mautino, Birchler, and Keane. It seems to me, by looking at the Digest, the Bills are identical and I see no reason why, especially this side of the aisle we should be passing a Bill on that side of the aisle that's identical to a Bill already sponsored by Mr. Slape and Mr. Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

McClain: "They already passed 117 to 20, Mr. Slape's Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reply to Representative Leverenz's question. He wanted to know what you would do if one of these automobile gasoline retailers refused to take a credit card. Needless to say, you couldn't call the police. They'd laugh at you so what you'll do is you'll call the police and tell them that this particular retailer has fireworks down there and since we just passed Representative Daniel's Bill, he'd get right over there and while he's there checking out the fireworks, you'd mention that he didn't take the credit card and they'd arrest him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 ayes, 15 nos, 6 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2876."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2876. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Molloy: "Thank you Mr. Speak... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2876 allows state chartered credit unions the option of insuring their share accounts with insurers other than the National



Credit Union Administration provided that such insurance company is approved jointly by the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions and the Director of Insurance. Also that each approved insurance company shall be licensed in Illinois and a member of the Illinois Insurance Guaranteed Fund. Now the problem I'm... that rises and the reason that this Bill was being introduced is under Illinois law state chartered credit unions are mandated to purchase their insurance from the Nation Credit Union Administration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's break it up in the back. Please proceed sir. I'm sorry for the interruption."

Molloy: "Thank you. Unlike the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which is a separate from the Federal Reserve the insurance is purchased for the credit unions from the National Credit Union Administration. This Administration has been issuing directives to state chartered credit unions who do have the insurance that run contradictory to the directives issued by the Department of Financial Institutions. So if we are to have viable dual ^{licensing} li and regulations in Illinois, it's essential that this Bill be passed. This Bill was strongly supported by the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions and I'd ask your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2876 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Record me as aye please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 ayes, no nays, none recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2914."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2914. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize the Department of Public Works and Buildings to acquire by donation the



hydro-electric generating station. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a number of years ago a power dam was built on the Rock River outside of Rock Island. This later was donated to Augustana College who in turn passed it onto the State of Illinois. It was somewhat of a white elephant. Since 1965, the Department of Transportation has been trying to figure out what to do with the Sears Power Dam. They now have a couple individuals who wish to rehabilitate it and use it to generate electricity. It's estimated that they'll be able to generate enough electricity to replace 11,500 barrels of crude oil per year. The State of Illinois will receive rent anywhere from \$17,200 to \$20,000 a year based on an escalating clause in the contract. The Department of Transportation wishes authorization to lease the Sears power dam for a period of 20 years and at the present time they cannot enter a lease of that duration. It's for this reason that this legislation was introduced. It will mean an increase in revenues to the State of Illinois, lessening of our dependency on foreign oil, and the utilization of a power dam that now is standing idle. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Calendar shows, this is a non-partisan... bi-partisan Bill. It's a Bill that we feel in the Committees need very much. Representative Bell wants to speak on it as well. Something that would be very helpful to our community. We'd all appreciate an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2914 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Marco."



Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Clerk will take the record. On this question there's
 155 ayes, 1 nay, none recorded as present. This Bill
 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby
 declared passed. House Bill 2926."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2926. A Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

House Bill 2926 which was amended twice on the House
 floor to make it... to make it conform to what we
 thought was the constitutionality of the requirements
 of this particular area provides that a county board
 may, by ordinance or by resolution, allow a homestead
 exemption in addition to the states homestead exemption.
 This additional exemption is limited to individual
 home owners who are 65 years of age or older and that
 have a gross annual of less than 10,000 dollars a year.
 There are a number of qualifications as far as these
 people are concerned. As I said, they have to
 be 65 years of age or older. They have to have paid
 their real estate property tax, occupy the dwelling
 for more than six months and did not rent or lease
 any portion of the dwelling or real property to another
 person. Again, this is strictly permissive. It allows
 county boards to initiate this action. There's nothing
 mandated about it and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall
 House Bill 2926 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose
 vote no. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this
 question there's 130 ayes, 11 nays, 4 recorded as present.
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority
 is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2935."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2935. A Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedures. Third



Reading of the Bill."

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

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

2935 is a Bill which would permit the trial court to approve of payment of fees for specially appointed council where the public defender cannot be the council representing a defendant. Currently, outside of Cook County, the trial court approves it. In Cook County a provision was made that the chief judge must thereafter approve the amount of payment. This is costly and duplicative, causes delay in settlement of the cases and is no longer desirable in our county. We would, therefore, request that this be deleted. That's what this Bill would do and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2935 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 ayes, 17 nos, 6 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, what purpose seek recognition?"

Preston: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the Speaker's Gallery we have Mrs. Anderson and the outstanding students from the East Prairie School in Skokie, Illinois from the 15th Legislative District represented by Representative Allen Greiman, Representative Pete Peters, and Representative Bill Laurino. I'd ask them to stand and welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2947."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2947. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the investigation and prevention of fires. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



I ask leave to consider House Bill 2947, 2948, 2949, and 2950 together since they all deal with the subject of arson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, Clerk, read the Bills."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2948. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Property Fire Loss Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2949. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Property Fire Loss Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2950. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Property Fire Loss Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Miss Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2947 provides that money paid by insurance companies into the fire prevention fund would stay in that fund so that it could be used for arson prevention and to pay for fire protection and arson prevention programs around the state as well as for the expenses of the Illinois State Fire Marshal's Office. House Bills 2948, '49, and '50 provide for enhanced communication between the authorized agencies investigating arson and insurance companies. They would relieve from ... responsibility for malicious action insurance companies reporting information to authorized agencies provided that it was factual information. The Department of Insurance and the State Fire Marshal's Office support 2948, '49, and '50. They take no position on 2947 which is the Bill to provide for leaving the money in the fund. I ask for your support for all four of these Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bills 2947, '48, '49, and '50 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Marco aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 ayes, no



nays, 2 recorded as present. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 2975."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2975. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2975, I think... 2975 would provide for a three year phase in of reimbursement for special education private tuition programs and would provide beginning this year with currently imbursement schedules for that program. Two weeks ago this House passed out House Bill 3456 which would provide the same for other aspects of the special education programs. The private education part of the special education program is especially vulnerable to fiscal deficits and this Bill would go a long way towards improving the capacity of those institutions to continue serving special education children of the State of Illinois. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2975 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Marco, give me an aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 ayes, 7 nays, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2987."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2987. A Bill for an Act in relation to reserve mortgage loans. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know if Mr. Cullerton's on the floor. He was going to close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, but Robbins is."

Oblinger: "Alright. This is a reverse mortgage where people may borrow money in the equity of their homes, people



65 and older, for their immediate needs and if the sale of their house or upon their death the money then will be repaid. The reverse mortgage of annuittance allows the people to get so much money per month so that they could remain in their homes. We passed this Bill last year but we only allowed the money to be used to pay property taxes and we've expanded it now to include insurance premiums, medical expenses, and repair and maintenance of the homes. If there are any questions, I'd like to try to answer them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 2987 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 aye, 1 nay, 2 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wikoff, what purpose seek recognition?"

Wikoff: "I had a question but I...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. You'll have an answer, I'm sure. House Bill 3018. Lady asks that the Bill be recommitted to the Interim Study Calendar from the Committee in which it was heard? All in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Bill is in the Interim Study Committee. House Bill 3071."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3071. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3071 was introduced... was introduced at the request of the Office of Education that dealt with two expansions of the School Code. One dealing with the school calendar providing for five emergency days additional. That part of it was amended out of the Bill. So what the Bill does now is expand the School Code in terms of an act of



God where during the present School Code provides that an act of God that the state aid need not be reduced as a result of the closing of school. What 3071 does now is provide that anything other than an act of God if the school has to be closed because of the health and safety that would be jeopardizing the students as long as they provided one hour of classroom instruction that the regional superintendent could certify and therefore the state aid would not be reduced. I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Anderson: "Fred, where does this one hour come from?"

You mean that a student would just have to attend class for one hour a day and they would get the full state aid?"

Tuerk: "Right. That's what the Bill provides. As long as they attended school and were in school for at least one hour and for some reason had to close school because of some dangerous situation that existed, then they would be getting the state aid."

Anderson: "Well, would a coming snow storm be something that was..."

Tuerk: "Yes. That would... That would qualify."

So.....if it were provided that it would be, you know, if it jeopardized the health and safety of the school children and that they needed to excuse school because the kids had to get back home before the big snow storm etc... etc...

Anderson: "Would someone have to make the determination other than the particular superintendent that there is jeopardy?"

Tuerk: "Well, eventually what would happen if they decided to close school that would have to be submitted



to the Regional Superintendent and he would have to certify just as he does now on an act of God or any of those situations."

Anderson: "You're saying then if there was a coming snow storm that they would have to call the superintendent up... the Regional Superintendent and you say certify and say, 'Is this alright?'"

Tuerk: "No, they wouldn't have to call him up. They could make an individual judgement based on what their feeling was but eventually it would have to be certified by the Regional Superintendent that that situation did exist and, therefore; they should qualify."

Anderson: "Therefore, maybe if one school closed and the other nine didn't in that particular district, why then he may not certify. Is that right?"

Tuerk: "He may or may not. That's correct."

Anderson: "Well, I don't know. I don't think this is such a good idea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not bad. Question is, shall House Bill 3071 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 ayes, 7 noes, 5 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3114."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3114. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

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

3114 is the school problem commission Bill that deals with the school aid formula. Yesterday we distributed some material to all of you indicating your broad support from throughout the state. I think that was built upon the hearings that were held by the Committee on the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Glen. We have a equivalent malfunction here. The printer didn't print the last



Roll Call. We may have to take the other one then. I don't know. Why don't you proceed to explain your Bill in case we have to get back to the other one. It'll be unlisted by the Membership. Please proceed to explain."

Schneider: "Alright. As I said, that was then the result of the commission hearings led to the changes that were enumerated on the sheet that we distributed. Subsequent to that we've had a number of individuals join the Chairman of the commission, Representative Hoffman and myself as chief Sponsor of the proposal. The proposal includes, as I think you understand, number one; the elimination of the proration factor which, I think, had been kind of a problem throughout the years because we've been impacted by declining revenues in schools and as a consequence we've had to prorate. The value to the elimination of the proration is that it very simply would have damaged those districts that are less successful, that is the poorer districts and so the proration elimination in effect, is a benefit to all the schools throughout the state. Also we have asked to include in the proposal or having eliminated the Strayer-Haig formula and substituted an alternative method which guarantees that a district will not receive less than 87% of the guarantee of that particular kind of district. Further, we have provided for an adjustment of the equalized assessed valuation. That came a result about, rather, as a result of the change in the corporate personal property tax so that there is not a windfall in regard to that matter. By dealing with that issue and addressing it, we have allowed the formula to reflect a way of preventing a district from benefiting doubly for it because there were replacement revenues for the corporate personal property tax. Other changes were made that were made to the obsolete provisions. The final point is the Amendment that I added on Second



Reading which raised the guarantee to 1477 per pupil. That is an increase from the original Bill 1463 per student and from last years factor of 1363. That is a quick synopsis of the proposal. If you have questions, I'm sure I or Representative Hoffman or others would be glad to respond to those."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne. This is on House Bill 3114."

Van Duyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please pro... the Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Van Duyne: "Glen, my brother always says, 'Don't make no small plans' and from the fiscal note filed in my Digest it looks like your plans are pretty large. Is this... Are they correct? Is this going to cost us one and a half billion more dollars?"

Schneider: "No, I don't think it's going to cost you one half billion dollars. I think that..."

Van Duyne: "I'm not... I don't care what you think. It..."

Schneider: "These are dollars that are... the Governor recommended 110 million dollars more above last years total. The total in the synopsis which I haven't looked at actually probably is reflecting the actual cost of ... yeah. So I don't think that's reflecting the changes in the sense that it's not reflecting new money. It's reflecting just simply the total of the..."

Van Duyne: "Why don't you open up your Digest and look at the fiscal note. It's on page 1284 and it says..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman wants to respond to that question is he may Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Hoffman please."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. I think that figure you're looking at is a total figure for the General Distributive Fund. That is a 110 million dollars higher than the appropriation for last year. So we're talking about a difference between what we appropriated last year and this year of 110 million dollars. That's the total cost



for the coming year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Further questions?" The Gentleman from Coles
Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, on that same point.
as one of the hyphenated Sponsors, I think even that
that figure is too high I think the actual figure is
104 million. We appropriated a billion 419 last
year. I think the Bill that put on the floor the other
day is a billion 523. So I think it's only 104 million
dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you again Mr. Speaker. As I indicated
in the earlier remarks it's got.. the proposal
has broad base support. It is, I think, important the
kinds of changes the formula this year when teamed up with
last years changes will be the kind of formula that
is more easily understood and better reflective of the
immediate needs of the school district. I would solicit
an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3114 pass?
All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will
take the record. On this question there's 151 ayes,
no nays, 1 recorded as present. Kindly record Slape
as aye. This Bill having received the Constitutional
Majority is hereby declared passed. And DiPrima as aye.
House Bill 3120."

Clerk O'Brien: House Bill 3120. A Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. House Bill 3120 was introduced to assist a
problem with the industry which leases property to
individuals which has had a difficult time in
proceeding against those person who fail to return
leased property. With regard to automobiles the law is



that there is an applicable time period of 72 hours after which upon written demand there is prima facie evidence of theft. With regard to property other than motor vehicles the waiting period is 30 days. Because there are many cases of transients who lease property, this has made it difficult to pursue against those who do not return leased property."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, John. Would the Gentleman standing to Mr. Matijevich's left please sit down."

Matijevich: "By Committee Amendment the 30 day applicable period has been changed to 50 days. It's a compromise and we believe that that will make it easier to pursue against those people. The other portion of the Bill is House Amendment #1 which is introduced by Rich Mautino and changes from 150 to 500 dollars the cut-off in dollar amounts with regards to a Class 4 felony in criminal damage to property and the cut-off of 500 dollars also in theft with regard to a Class A misdemeanor. In today's time it doesn't take much in property to have a valuation of 150 and this is a consensus by many that this should be changed to 500 dollars. It was unanimous in Committee and the Bill was unanimous also in Committee, and I appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3120 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 ayes, no nays, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as aye. 3127."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3127. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3127 amends the School Code to encourage the



consolidation of single elementary districts and secondary districts having boundaries that are coterminous to form into a community unit district. With declining enrollments in schools, educators are seeking ways to cut administrative costs. In Evanston our grade school presently is seeking a new superintendent. It would be laudible to consolidate our high school and grammar school district in to one unit district. Under the present School Code, the dual school district such as Evanston would lose over a million and a half dollars of tax revenue if they formed into a unit district. This Bill would reserve the existing tax levy authorization that these coterminous school districts have as dual districts if they should consolidate by referendum into a unit district, and I solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn." Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson." Did you have a question on that, John? Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I just had my light on to slow things down long enough to check the Digest and analysis, that's all."

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

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "In this Bill you say it keeps the tax rates the same so that there wouldn't be any loss to consolidation of unit districts into a consolidated district? Is that right?"

McCourt: "Yes, at the present time, dual districts, like our elementary districts have a tax levy for education of three dollars and the high school districts has a tax levy for education of three dollars, so combined they've got a tax levy of six dollars for educational purposes. Whereas, unit districts have a top tax put of



four dollars. This would give the coterminous dual district if they should consolidate the same maximum tax levy as they now have as a dual district."

Ewing: "Would the two districts to achieve this have to have the same boundaries?"

McCourt: "They would."

Ewing: "And is there anything in this Bill which would encourage or discourage consolidation? Are you holding out any carrots to certain high school districts to come and gobble up parts of grade school districts?"

McCourt: "It would only apply to school districts that are coterminous as of the time of the effective date of this legislation so in effect it would only apply to Evanston."

Ewing: "So, here we have a lot of districts downstate where the high school district is not coterminous and a grade school district may be in one or two high school districts. They couldn't go out and take part of that grade school district to take advantage of this."

McCourt: "No, this came up in Committee and so we specifically included that in Amendment #4 so that would not happen."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Anderson: "Jim, how many coterminous districts do you know of in the state?"

McCourt: "To my knowledge, there's only one."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3127 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 ayes, 5 nos, 2 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 3147."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3147. A Bill for an Act in relation to damage to streets and roads caused by public or private utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the better Bills of the year. House Bill 3147 amends the Municipal Code and the Highway Code to provide that a public or private utility may be built for the cost of repairing damage to streets or roads caused by such utility if the utility does not repair the damage within 21 days of notification to the municipality of such damage. Many of you are aware of all of the ruts and problems we're having with barricades on utilities that have broken down and are in need of repair and we wind up getting tossed from one municipality or one utility to another. The Bill is simply that if the utility does not repair the damage that was caused that the local unit of government can make the repairs and build the utility and I would urge your support of this fine Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3147 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote nay. Vote me aye over there, Don. Aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 ayes, 9 nos, 2 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3160."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3160. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Regional Transportation Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3160 would authorize the Regional Transportation Authority to create and operate a working cash fund. The Bill also amends the RTA Act to enhance the salability of bonds and notes that are issued by the RTA."



The RTA cash flow problems reached their peak in January of 1980 when the agency found itself with a cash shortfall of 60 to 65 millions of dollars. This particular crisis was solved when the 73 million dollar federal subsidy check that was due in October arrived on January 23 of 1980. Now this was approximately four months late. In addition to untimely federal receipts, another problem this Bill addresses through the creation of the working cash fund is the time lags that exist between RTA regional sales tax selections and the actual receipt of these funds by the Authority. And this is usually for over a period of three months or longer. The resulting RTA cash flow problems caused the Authority to make late payments to transit carriers and other vendors they do business with. And as we all know, late payments cost more than timely payments because of the interest involved. This Bill, as it's been amended, authorizes the sale of 100 million dollars in working cash fund bonds or notes to derive funding to operate the working cash fund. The term of these bonds is limited to a period of ten years or less, and the dollars from the working cash fund can be used to pay RTA operations including the payment of funds owed to transportation carriers holding purchase of service agreements with the RTA. This working cash fund will ensure timely payments to these agencies who rely on the RTA for a substantial portion of their operating funds. This Bill would provide a sensible approach to handling cash flow problems which many times are out of the hands of the RTA. And the operation of the a working cash fund would allow timely payments to transportation carriers who will in turn be able to meet their obligations in an efficient manner. This Bill is extremely important to the smooth operation of public transportation in northeastern Illinois and I ask for your favorable consideration."



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

Bluthardt: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "Could you tell me how the bonds, working cash bonds are to be repaid?"

Garmisa: "They are to be repaid and any incomes that are derived through the RTA."

Bluthardt: "Where will the income come from to repay the bond?"

Garmisa: "Well, we have the sales tax. We have federal assistance and the... whatever..."

Bluthardt: "I think my question is this. Does this authorize the levying of an addition tax upon the RTA area..."

Garmisa: "No, it does not."

Bluthardt: "... for the repayment of the bonds?"

Garmisa: "No, it does not."

Bluthardt: "There is not tax involved whatsoever."

Garmisa: "NO taxing power involved here."

Bluthardt: "The bonds are paid off from whatever revenues they..."

Garmisa: "Current revenues."

Bluthardt: "Current revenues. Alright. Thank you."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Bill for three reasons. Number one, there has been absolutely no concession whatsoever to the suburbs who have raped by the Thompson-Byrne transportation program since it was passed. Suburban Cook County is being treated especially unfairly. The sales tax was raised 20 percent. Approximately 90 million dollars a year is being transferred from suburban Cook County taxpayers to CTA, the riders, and I don't think that's fair. I think it would be appropriate for some change in the basic



legislation to guarantee expenditures in suburban Cook County. The collar counties are also, in my opinion, not being treated fairly. The RTA has made the all ^egations that the suburban collar counties are not paying their fair share of RTA, and if that is the case, I would suggest as an alternative you could just let my people go and we'll be happy to operate on our own with the amount of money that is available. The other two reasons are that this will take RTA off a pay as you go basis. We know what has happened to the Chicago school system as it has gone further and further into debt. This allows the RTA to go into debt 100 million dollars in short term bonds which will never be totally repaid. In fact I suspect there will be virtually 100 million dollar outstanding debt for the RTA's... for the length of the RTA's history. I think that's not a good idea. I think that if the RTA's short of money it should either raise fares or raise taxes. That is what one would suggest if one were running one's own household or one's own local government. So, let's see if any other suburbanites agree with me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Van Duyne: "Sparky, you gave some sort of vague discription as to where this money was going to be spent.

Am I to understand that there is no prorated spending on this? You're going to make it 100 million dollars in bonds? You say there's no... These bonds are going to be paid off through current... current revenues the way we raise current revenues and yet you say that there is no proration as far as where the money is going to be spent. In other words, I... the scenario I'm creating here is that the CTA is always in trouble and



Representative Skinner eluded to that that they either stay the way they are or... without this or else they have to raise fares, and I kind of get the idea that this is in difference to raising fares that you are creating this cash work fund. Am I close?"

Or if you don't want to answer that, at least is there any prorated shares for the suburbs? Are the suburbs being protected or are we going to be at the mercy of the CTA?"

Garmisa: "The.. when you're talking about being at the mercy of the CTA, we'll expand that a little bit, Van, and make it the...we're talking about the RTA here. And in regards to the RTA being in a bind with their working cash problems in the past, it's been beyond their control. You must bear in mind the three month time lag that I had mentioned in regards to their collecting of the sales tax and they also have no control over whatever federal financing that the RTA will receive. This... This Bill is designed to offset those working cash fund problems that the RTA has now and it'll then be able to operate much more effeciently in the future with this cash fund than it has in the past."

Van Duÿne: "Alright, but that's exactly what I'm saying though. The discretion of spending this money is strictly lies within the RTA of which the CTA is a part. And if they make the decision to spend it, say on State Madison, they still have that discretion. Is that not correct?"

Garmisa: "In answer to your last remarks, House Bill 3889 that passed out of here not too long ago addresses itself to that problem and what that does is it calls for the prorationing of moneys due to the carriers and to the vendors on a percentage basis. The... This Bill was well received in this House and is now over in the Senate and that will take care of the problem that



you were addressing yourself to."

Van Duyne: "Alright. Okay, then I take it that this is subject to the same rule."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, to close.'

Garmisa: "Well, the... one thing we want to keep in mind here, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is the... how we'd be able to enhance the salability of the RTA Bill. The...Mr. Speaker, the... we do need a further Amendment, I understand, to this Bill and I would ask it to be taken out of the record at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. We'll take the Bill out of the record. 3206."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3206. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. May I...I ask leave to return to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, Bill's' on Second Reading." Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Younge. Amends House Bill 3206 on page one, line one..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony, correct the board. Second Reading. Amendment #2, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment would broaden the scope of operation of the Minority Resource Center to serve the East ST. Louis metropolitan area and change the definition of minority to include black Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, etc..., and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Herr Totten."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Totten: "Mrs. Younge, there has been a fiscal note filed on this Bill. How would your Amendment affect that fiscal note?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Amendment?"

Totten: "On this Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're discussinng Amendment #2."

Totten: "I want to know how the Amendment would affect the fiscal note that has been filed. Would it be more expensive?"

Younge: "The answer's no."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. The Department of Transportation had some objections to the Bill but now the Amendment makes the Bill acceptable to D.O.T. and I would urge that the Members go along and adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? Any further discussion? All in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Oppose. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, I asked for immediate consideration of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objection."

Younge: "I move for immediate consideration of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Takes 107 votes."

Younge: "I move for the immediate consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Lady moves for the immediate consideration of House Bill 3206. All in favor vote aye,



all oppose vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 ayes, 55 nos, none recorded as present. The Lady's motion does not prevail. You want to move the Bill back to Third Reading? Third Reading. House Bill 3209."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3209. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to create a commission to survey and study the problems pertaining to public schools in the state. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Reilly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3209 simply directs the Department of Revenue and the Office of Education to provide some data to the school problems commission so that they can study some suggested changes in the school aid formula. I'd be glad to answer any questions, otherwise; I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House ^{Bill} 3209 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote any. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was just going to ask him what the need for this was. After all, the school problems commission already exists and I think they have the authority he's asking and I..."

Reilly: "They do. The problem is the Department of Revenue."

Van Duyne: "Along with that I was going to ask him if there was any extra cost."

Reilly: "No. They do have the authority. The Department of Revenue is the problem."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 ayes, 9 nos, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3236."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3236. A Bill for an Act to provide



for the reimbursement of mass-transportation carriers which provide reduced transit fares for the elderly.
Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask your leave..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, sir."

Garmisa: "I'd ask for leave to consider House Bill 3236 and 3237 at the same time. They deal with the same subject matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and..."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3237. A Bill for an Act to provide for the reimbursement of mass-transportation carriers which provide reduced transit fares for students.
Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, House Bill 3236 creates the half fare reimbursement program for the elderly. Under this program, those transit agencies who offer half fares to persons age 65 and over are eligible for reimbursement equaling one half of the regular adult fare or 25 cents per elderly person transported at the reduced fare whichever would be less. I have filed Amendment #15 to House Bill 3038 that would be D.O.T.'s fiscal year '81 appropriation request which requests 13 and a half millions of dollars from the general revenue fund to finance this program. This figure represents the estimated funding requirements for transit carriers throughout the entire state offering reduced fares to the elderly. In the event that funds appropriated for the program fall short of covering all claims for reimbursement filed, the Bill provides for a prorated distribution of available funds. The Department of Transportation



would administer this program. Despite the fact that the 1970 Illinois Constitution states that public transportation is an essential public purpose for which public funds may be expended the state coffers are providing very little funding for public transportation operations throughout the state. Although this program was terminated during our Special Session on transportation, transportation carriers continue to offer one-half fares to the elderly. The Federal Government requires one-half elderly fares as a condition for receiving federal mass transit funds. The... in regards to House Bill 3237, this would create the half fare reimbursement program for elementary and high school students. This Bill has the same reimbursement level and prorata provisions as in 3236. And the eligible for reimbursement under this legislation is the amount of fares reduced for rides to or from school on regular school days. Non-reimbursable rides include fares reduced for students attending evening classes or classes on Saturday, Sundays, or holidays. D.O.T. is also charged with the administration of this program. This Bill and its companion appropriation create and provide funding for state-wide students half fare program, and House Amendment #15 to D.O.T.'s appropriation Bill also provides 12 and a half million dollars from the general revenue fund for this program. As I pointed out on the elderly program, many transit carriers continue to offer reduced fares for students in spite of the fact that state reimbursement was discontinued. Again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, what purpose seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just briefly if I could introduce the Gale Middle School from Galesburg. John DeLatter is in the balcony on the Democrat side. Like to welcome him."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from... Mr. Slape... Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape, what purpose seek recognition?"

Slape: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for a purpose of an introduction. I'd like to introduce Mr. Kevin Jardo who is here in Springfield today to receive award as one of the young historians of Illinois. Kevin is from the 55st District represented by Representative Frank Watson, Dwight Friedrich, and myself."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Congratulations. Now is there any discussion on House Bill 3236 and 3237? Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that you were listening when the Sponsor said that this program was terminated during our Special Session last Fall, because, as a matter of fact, the repeal of the legislation that's always been on the books for mass-transportation carriers to get reimbursed for half fares for students and elderly was part of the RTA transportation deal and now that promise is evidently being broken. I would like to point out to downstaters that this is one more Bill for the RTA to get a subsidy out of the State Treasury so that you guys will be supporting our mass-transportation and not just the other way around. Think about it."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Why was this program removed in the last program that we passed in... what?... last August?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It was in error."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Garmisa, please."

Garmisa: "When you say why it was removed I was against its removal. I think the program is a good program and I believe that it should be reinstated."



Kane: "But wasn't that program presented to us as a package that was suppose to, because of all of the provisions of it, remove the RTA from state subsidies and put the RTA on its own. Wasn't that the whole provision or the whole purpose behind that legislation?"

Garmisa: "I can recall no such provision or no such package, Representative Kane."

Kane: "I thought that's what we had the Special Session last August for."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Kane. Give the Gentleman some attention. Please proceed, sir."

Garmisa: "The Special Session was not specifically called to take the half fare student reimbursements away nor the reimbursement program for the elderly."

Kane: "No, but wasn't that part of the overall program that was sold to us as an overall package that has to do with not only mass-transportation but highways and everything else?"

Garmisa: "At the time that they removed the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Kosinski. Please come over here. Please proceed, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "I had opposed that program and I think that the General Assembly was off base when they instituted that program."

Kane: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can understand why the Gentleman who's sponsoring these Bills thought that it was a mistake to remove those programs at that time. I think, however; as I recall what happened, is that that whole program was presented to us as a means of long-range solving of the problems of the RTA, a long-range solving of the highway programs of this state and complete transportation package. I think that this was part of that, and I think until we have some better explanation other than it was a mistake and shouldn't have been done I think that we ought to vote present at this time or no."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition both in my personal feelings and at the request of the Department of Transportation. These Bills would require reinstating a special transit funded program that was eliminated by the Legislature last year. The transportation package of 1979 provided for the repeal of both half fare programs because new funding methods for the RTA and the downstate carriers generated enough revenue for those carriers to dissolve and to reduce fares on their own. Passage of these Bills will result in double assistance being provided for the fare reduction programs. Also, the authorization for the RTA sales tax totally eliminated state subsidies to the RTA. These Bills will again provide state financial support to the RTA since the majority of these funds will go to the RTA area, primarily to the CTA. In FY '79 carriers in the RTA area received 11 million dollars and the downstate carriers received only 422 thousand for services for the elderly, and also carriers in the RTA region received 10 million dollars while downstate carriers received only 461 thousand for student services and I would ask that we vote against this piece of legislation."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, concurring with what others have said in objection to this Bill, I would simply add the point that we are being asked to appropriate unbudgeted money from the general revenue fund in the approximate amount of 24 million dollars of which approximately half, under one Bill, would go directly and exclusively to the RTA. I urge a nay vote."

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

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First off, I feel compelled to chide Representative Kane a little bit for expecting the Sponsor



of this Bill to remember events that took place as long ago as last October. However, I hope you were listening to the rest of his remarks and to the remarks that have already been expressed upon this floor. I think that we are witnessing in these Bills one of the most callous, breaches of faith that we've seen on our legislative history and certainly in the time that I've been down here. Now last year when this so-called transportation package was put together, part of the deal that was forced down our throats was that there would be a sales tax in the RTA area in fare increases and then the state would be relieved of this burden of the reduced fares for the elderly and students. It didn't take them a whole year to forget this so-called deal and go right back to shoving things down your throat again and they'll probably shove another sales tax down your throat when they get the next chance. This Bill was borne in fraud. The RTA was borne in fraud. This is the most voracious tax eater that we've created and it's going to get worse and worse. The thing is about to collapse under its own weight like the Chicago Board of Education, and what are we doing? We're pouring more money down a rat hole that gets wider and wider and deeper and deeper. Turn these Bills down. The only thing to do is go back and if we can't abolish the RTA, reshape it in some reasonable form, but certainly let's start today and beat these very bad Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Collins, for an RTA member. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele. Dino loves you."

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this measure. We're talking here about 24 million dollars, 24 million dollars that's going to come out of Sangamon County. It's going to come from Morgan County. This 24 million is coming from all other parts of the state and 85 to 90 percent of this 24 million is going to be in the



Chicago area. It's going to come out of Bond County, Washington County, Johnson County, Henry County, all over the state, 24 million dollars, and I say as responsible Legislators as supposed guardians of the Treasury let's vote this down. It's been pointed out already credits have been given to the RTA region. Credit given for elderly and for student fares. Already that area is getting more than they got before. They're already getting more than before. This is an attempt to have your cake and to eat it too, and I say it's irresponsible. I say it's going to come from money that could otherwise be used for public aid or for fixing potholes in the roads of this state or for Child and Family Services. I say it's a bad raid on the Treasury coming from every county of this state to benefit 90 percent, only one region, and I urge your no vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Previous question's been moved. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, many senior citizens do not own or do they operate their automobiles. They have no alternative to ^{mass} mass-transit to go shopping, visiting, or go to the doctor. They're fares are allowed to rise and they can't get on the bus for half fare they will become burdensome to seniors on a fixed income. And if the senior citizen cannot afford the bus fares, the trips simply will not be made. And this means that a transit system in place, ready for use, is not used by the people who really need it the most. And I also believe that encouraging the youngsters, the students, to use mass-transit carriers or establishes a pattern of mass-transit usage



which, later on, will likely result in more adults using buses. And this is a bonus for future generations who will be faced with increasing energy and economic problems. This is... These are sorely needed Bills, Mr. Speaker. I urge each and every Member of this General Assembly to support these good Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3236 and '37 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I listened very intently while others berate the City of Chicago and talk about the transit district, but I'd like to point out that the City of Chicago does not receive reimbursement for transportation for students as does the downstate districts when they figure the formula. Now, we don't cry and say to you it's unfair to take that out of the budget because we don't get it. Be reasonable, be fair. Remember, you get your transportation figured into your school transportation formula. We do not. Now we're talking about the students of the City of Chicago. Fair is fair. Gentlemen, we cannot have, what do you call it, southern Illinois day, two days a week. Middle Illinois one day a week. The rest of the state one day a week and when we come to Chicago not even once a month. Think about it. Be fair."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not real fond of the company I'm in particularly, especially those downstaters who talk about this being a rip-off for one section of the state. Seems to me though, Mr. Speaker, that those people ought to keep in mind that we are the only section of the state that is not subsidized by the state for public transportation and the entire burden is borne by the people of Cook County and the surrounding counties. Now, however; Mr. Speaker, it seems to me also that before"



we enter into something like this, a scant eight or ten months after we've provided a broad new program wherein we substituted local funding for state funding and as a part of that consideration did away with student transportation subsidies and elderly transportation subsidies, it seems to me that we ought to give the people of the RTA region..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "That's the proper time, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a verification of the affirmative vote."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, there is a red gefilte fish that's been thrown across the path of this Bill. A smoke screen if you will. Senior citizens are going to have half fares regardless of whether or not this Bill passes because the federal law which authorizes subsidized public transportation system mandates that half fares be given to seniors. So, if you're voting for this Bill because you're afraid senior citizens are going to have their fares doubled, that is an incorrect reason for voting for the Bill. If you're from the suburban Cook County area, the collar counties and you're voting for the Bill, I think you ought to stand up and tell us why you're voting for the Bill. You may have a good reason. Maybe it's because the Governor promised us roads for the higher sales taxes and haven't delivered on those roads. But I think it ought to be put on the record whatever that reason is."

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

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I didn't hear the Sponsor indicate whether the Governor of the State or the Mayor of the City of Chicago favored this legislation. I can only presume that



they do not since they were responsible for the original legislation which cancelled both of these reimbursement programs. But I, for one, who opposed that legislation am supporting this and urge the others who opposed that legislation not to yield to the same kind of heavy handed political pressure which forced the first Bill through to continue to support the position and the Governor and the Mayor. I urge them to support this good legislation and to reinstate these programs which we should neve^r have cancelled in the first place."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On... On this question there's 103 ayes, 58 nos and Mr. Winchester requests a verification. And Mr. Garmisa asks for a poll of the absentees. She counts twice in by book, Cal. I didn't see no light. Why don't you have a can of pop? Come here."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Barnes. Ralph Dunn. Hannig. Laurino. Neff. Reilly. Robbins. Ropp. Telcser."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Reilly as no." Leave right now."

Clerk Leone: "J.J. Wolf. And Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell. Kindly record Mr. Yourell as aye. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote. What are we starting off with? 104? 104, Mr. Winchester. 104 we're starting with. Please proceed, Tony. Wait a minute. Would the Membership kindly be in your own respective seats. All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor now. All unauthorized personnel. Doorkeeper, enforce the rules of the House. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. J.J. Wolf as aye."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative.



Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Burnidge.
 Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Cullerton.
 Currie. Daniels. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima.
 Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn.
 Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty.
 Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hallstrom. Hanahan.
 Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe.
 Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Karpiel. Katz. Kane.
 Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas.
 Lechowicz. Leon. McDonald. Madigan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Huskey, what purpose seek recognition?"
 Mr. Huskey, please."

Huskey: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave. No objections. Gentleman is
 verified. Please proceed, Tony."

Clerk Leone: "Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. McAuliffe.
 McCourt. McGrew. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian.
 Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous.
 Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reed.
 Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler.
 Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo.
 Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek. VonBoeckman.
 White. Williams. Williamson. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf.
 Younge. Yourell. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the 104 aye votes?
 Mr. Winchester?"

Winchester: "Bianco. Representative Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back there."

Winchester: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien? You better stand up because
 I... somebody's waving their hands back there. He's
 there."

Winchester: "Burnidge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Burnidge. He's in the back."

Winchester: "Cullerton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clyde, stand up. Cullerton. John



Cullerton. How is Mr. Cullerton recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Cullerton."

Winchester: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Winchester: "Representative Deuster. Representative Deuster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deuster. How is Mr. Deuster recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deuster is here."

Winchester: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vitek requests leave to be verified.

Leave is granted. Mr. Farley is in the chamber.

And Mr. Stuffle requests leave to be verified, and

Mr. Henry. Leave is granted. Farley was in the back
of the chamber, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Grossi is here."

Winchester: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan? How is Mr. Hanahan recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Winchester: "Representative Huskey. Did he ask for a
verification?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He asked leave and he received it.

Huskey did."

Winchester: "Representative Dave Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Winchester: "Representat..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Mr. Jones now wants to be
changed from aye to no. And Mrs. Oblinger same request,
aye to no."

Winchester: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Richmond wants to have leave to
be verified. Leave is granted. Who was that?"

Winchester: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Emil Jones? How is Emil Jones recorded?"



Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."
Winchester: "Representative Katz."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz is here."
Winchester: "Representative Kucharski."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Where? Mr. Kucharski is here."
Winchester: "Representative Macdonald."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Macdonald? How is the Lady recorded?"
Clerk Leone: "Lady is recorded as voting aye."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mrs. Macdonald."
Winchester: "Representative Marovitz."
Speaker Lechowicz: "He is in the chamber."
Winchester: "Representative McAuliffe."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McAuliffe? How is Mr. McAuliffe recorded?"
Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Put Representative Emil Jones back on the Roll Call."
Winchester: "Representative O'Brien."
Speaker Lechowicz: "You already called for him sir. He was verified."
Winchester: "Alright. Thank you. Representative Piel."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Piel is here."
Winchester: "Representative Preston."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Preston? Mr. Preston? How is Mr. Preston recorded?"
Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Please remove him."
Winchester: "Representative Pouncey."
Speaker Lechowicz: "You know he's here."
Winchester: "Can't see him."
Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."
Winchester: "I'll take your word if you say he's here."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you see him now?"
Winchester: "I see him now. Jimmy, Representative Schisler. Representative Schisler."



Speaker Lechowicz: "What about Representative Schisler?"

Winchester: "Well, is he gone or is he here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Schisler recorded? Sam,
I can't see through you. Is Gale back there?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Schisler."

Winchester: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just seen him. Mr. Slape? He has
the young fellow, the historian, with him. Mr. Slape?
How is Mr. Slape recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman in the chamber? Remove Mr.
Slape."

Winchester: "Representative Stanley. Representative Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Stanley in the chamber? Mr.
Stanley? Remove Mr. Stanley. Gentleman from Wayne,
Mr. Robbins, what purpose seek recognition? Mr.
Robbins wants to be recorded as no."

Winchester: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Stearney is on the floor."

Winchester: "Okay. Representative Wolf. J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "J.J. Wolf? I thought he came on the floor
and asked for leave. Mr. Wolf? How is Mr. Wolf recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Winchester: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sam Wolf is here."

Winchester: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Balanoff? The Lady is here. And
put Slape back on the Roll Call."

Winchester: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's recorded as no."

Winchester: "Representative..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Van Duyne in the chamber? Maybe
he wants to change it. I don't know."

Winchester: "Representative Meyer."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mahar? Meyer. Ted Meyer. How is Ted Meyer recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Meyer in the chamber? Please remove Mr. Meyer."

Winchester: "That's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 93 ayes, 60 nos. This Bill... These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. It's House Bills 3236 and 3237. House Bill 3262."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3262. A Bill for an Act to codify the Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill for all the lawyers in the General Assembly who practice law. The passage of the Code of Civil Procedures in the 84th Gener... 81st General Assembly will mean the reorganization and printing of this information in time to be included in 1981 revised statutes. The early adoption of the Code will greatly reduce the number of chapters and eliminate many statutory provision which now overlap in the three volume statutes. I've received numerous letters from lawyers, judges, and bar associations in support of quick passage of this Bill, and that it... stated that it is long overdue. I've discussed the Bill with the different bar associations since this is a great change and improvement in the statutes that the Senate Judiciary will be reviewing the Bill with the Bar Association and also the staff and they assure that everything is in proper order for passage in the Fall. As I mentioned before, this simply consolidates the Civil Procedure Code and there are no substantive changes in the Bill simply codifying the Civil Procedures Act, and I would urge your support of House Bill 3262."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."



Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this legislation does make substantive changes and I would hope that you would consider these carefully. For example, in all cases of change of the clerk of the court from which the change is granted shall immediately prepare a full transcript of the record. Now, I would hope that you would go back and talk to your county clerks and see what they think of that piece of legislation. Whether they're going to have the staff and the time to immediately prepare the full transcript. When we look at another provision of this, we have the coroners medical records and criminal prosecutions being received as competent evidence in any court of this state. If you recall, a number of times down here we've had debates on whether the coroner should be abolished, whether he's competent and whether we should go to a medical examiner system, and yet in this legislation we're saying that the coroners record can be received as competent evidence. Furthermore, when we look at provisions concerning land and equitable future interests, we have provisions in there concerning trusts and we've had discussion down here about secret land trusts. This legislation is substantive legislation. It should not be passed. It should be recommitted to committee for further study. The Illinois Bar Association has not yet reviewed this legislation. It's my understanding they are not necessarily opposed to it, they just have not had a chance to review it nor has the committee. When the legislation was presented in Judiciary Committee, it was presented as it was today, not containing any substantive issues. That is far from the truth. We should not pass this. We should recommit it to committee. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber on House Bill 3262."

Leinenweber: "I hope the Members are paying attention to the



last Gentleman who spoke because he's absolutely right. There's no emergency why we have to rush this Bill through to get it over to the Senate where it can really be studied. That's the job of this House. It ought to be recommitted as the Gentleman pointed out and studied to see whether or not there are substantive changes. Representative Darrow pointed out three or four of the ones that he found. This is a massive Bill. It's some hundreds of pages long. It's very difficult to wade through. There has been, to my knowledge, no crying demands for this revision, for this consolidation. Most of the letters in the state are very aware of where the various Civil Procedure Acts are now located. And would probably be more difficult to have to learn where they are within this consolidated Act. I think that if there ever was a Bill that ought to be committed for Interim Study, this is it. Again, it may be desirable, it may be good. The bar associations have not had a chance to go over it. I don't think we ought to pass it over to the Senate so that they can study it. I think the thing to do is to study this thing: and if it's worth passing then perhaps we can come back in the Fall or reintroduce it in the next Session of the Legislature and pass it then. So I would urge all of you to consider very carefully before you vote for this Bill. Either vote against or vote present, and keep the Bill here so that it can be committed to the Judiciary Committee for in depth study and input by the parties who are affected."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz on House Bill 3262."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. ... the distinguished Gentleman from Rock Island has raised some questions that do not exist with regard to the Bill. He has said, for example, what about the abolition of coroners or what about secret land trusts. All that I would tell you is that this Bill has



nothing to do with abolition of the Coroner's Office or secret land trusts and while one may argue about the procedure to be followed in connection with this kind of Bill, it is unfair to Mr. Terzich to suggest that in this Bill he is doing any of those things. Those are just totally inflammatory. Now that raises the next question as to what he is trying to do here. Over the years we have lots of different bits and pieces relating to Civil Procedure and all this Bill seeks to do and you know that Mr. Terzich is Chairman of the Law Review Commission and has been interested in the subject; all this Bill seeks to do is to put and take all of the different parts that are scattered through the statute books relating to Civil Procedure and put them in one place where anybody can find them. That's a laudible objective and a very good objective. The next question is how to go about doing it and to be fair and give everybody a chance to study it. Well what the Sponsor has done here is that the Bill has been reported out by the Judiciary I Committee of the House. He has had discussions with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate. They proposed to have hearings that will permit all the bar associations and everyone else in the coming months to go over the bits and little pieces because that's all that's involved. It does not make any significant changes but they're bits and pieces that ought to be studied. He has proposed a way of doing it, to have those hearings and give everybody a chance to do it. I think that his proposal is a reasonable one. I don't think that this Bill is seeking anything through. I believe that it ought to be done and it would not be done until the Fall under the proposal that the Gentleman from Cook has made. I think it's a reasonable proposal and that this General Assembly ought to cooperate with the Sponsor in combining all the bits and pieces of Civil Procedure into a single Code of Civil Procedure."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman on 3262."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have, in House Bill 3262, a Bill of over some 300 pages affecting innumerable chapters of the revised statute and concerning itself with the procedural rights of citizens of this state with respect to securing remedies or advancing rights. A Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that was introduced only a month and a half ago, did not receive a hearing in Committee but was discharged. A Bill which the Sponsor, himself, or the principle author, Harry Fend, a non-Legislator, admits contains substantive changes. It's passage today is opposed by the bar associations who have not had an opportunity of reviewing it. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this Bill should not be passed. It should be committed back to Committee so that it can get thorough consideration and then come back to the floor with all people satisfied that it is appropriate. I would urge a nay vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's really great to hear a lawyer speak on the Bill because I know that my firehouse lawyer knowledge is really great on the subject matter. I have here approximately 80 letters. I got them from the Appellate Court. I got them from the Circuit Court. I have them from lawyers. They say, 'Congratulations. Your endeavor to bring fruition to an idea whose time was ten years ago was sorely needed. For years the members of the legal profession positive and perennial question, there must be an easier way. The commonplace of explanation of codifying the procedures



means the reduction of the Code. This Bill took over a year of study and hard work that makes no substantive changes and I knew that the lawyers especially who this Bill is for would argue this case like they were before the Supreme Court. I talked to the Bar Association. The Members of the General Assembly, number one, are not going to go through this voluminous Bill and take the time out because they never had and the lawyers never will. So the bar associations and the staff and everything will have a whole summer to listen to any changes. The Bill is not suppose to make any substantive changed other than the codifying it, and if there are any substantive changes, and that's not agreeable, then certainly I would table the Bill, but there's a year effort that's long overdue. I have substantial support here from the judges, the clerks, the lawyers and many, many people of the profession, law profession, and I certainly would want to see this Bill hang up in the House then go have it studied for another year in the Senate than go through the same malarkey that you're going through here today. It's a good piece of legislation. It will be reviewed over the summer months by the staff of both the House and the Senate, by the Chicago Bar, the Illinois Bar, and I would urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3262 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Gentlemen from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, be careful Right here is the legislation you're voting on. This legislation the Judiciary Committee has not had an opportunity to review. We agreed to a discharge of committee based upon a representation that there were no substantive changes. That is not the case. There are substantive changes in here and I think we ought to be awful careful before we vote on any. I suggest that



we defeat this legislation and be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee for further study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Timer's on."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would hope that the Gentleman would not get sufficient votes and that he would move to recommit this Bill to the Judiciary Committee where in proper fashion as a bi-cameral Legislature should it could be studied first by the House of origin and then passed over to the Senate. This is a monumental work. You've done a great job. Unfortunately, the fact that it was studied by his commission does not mean that this House has studied the very important subject matter here. We want to work with him. I'm sure we can work with him, and I would ask him to have it recommitted to the Judiciary Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson. Timer's on."

Johnson: "It's obvious that anybody that speaks to this Bill now is swimming upstream. Just to reiterate what Representative Terzich said. The Law Revision Commission with the assistance of their council and input from judges, bar associations, lawyers, and people involved in the process studied this for over a year. The fact that it's 362 pages really doesn't affect the fact that it was well studied by the Commission and they came out with the ... recommendation to the Commission. There was an article in the Illinois Bar Journal not long ago, I think two or three months ago, specifically recommending this revision. It's not all that complicated and I would certainly urge Representative Daniels and others who think we haven't had enough time to study it to form your own subcommittee and undertake the 362 pages the Law Revision Commission undertook for the last year. I would suggest that very few Members of the Judiciary



Committee are going to be willing to do that. It's easy to stand up and criticize it here on the floor. It's another thing to do what Representative Terzich and the other Members of the Commission have done for the last year. If we think the Commission serves any purpose at all, and apparently we did or we wouldn't have extended its life, this is the way to make it viable. And I urge you to vote... at least give Representative Terzich enough votes to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wanted to indicate to the Members that as a Member both of the Law Revision Commission and the Judiciary I Commission (sic), I think the Speaker who suggested this Bill be recommitted are right on point. It's just not ready yet, and in spite of the fact that I am a Sponsor of this legislation as a Member of the Law Revision Commission, I cannot support it at the present time. And those who say we don't have time to review if you just take note of the fact that this Bill is only 350 or 60 pages long. That's only a page a day and in a year we can have this whole Bill reviewed So I think that's what we need to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

On this question there are 52 ayes, 90 nos, 14 recorded as present. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Yourell..."

Terzich: "... let the lawyers put the Bill in. They seem to know it all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost.

House Bill 3272."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3272. A Bill for an Act... A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill which we amended yesterday and which provides for access to files for information and minimum standards of insurability so that a good piece of property will not summarily get shuffled off to the fare plan if, in fact, it is a good piece of property and meets minimum standards as promulgated by the Director of Insurance. It's appraised to the County of Cook only and hopefully would keep... retain stability of communities and properties which people are trying to upgrade and maintain, and unfortunately, are shuffled off to the fare plan where they're coverage is more expensive and less extensive. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield? This Bill deals with the fare plan?"

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Stearney: "Tell me what it does to the fare plan."

Marovitz: "Well, what it does, it will keep excellent pieces of property from being shuffled off to the fare plan where the..."

Stearney: "How would it do that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let the Gentleman complete his answer, please. Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "What it would do, it would have the Director of Insurance establish minimum standards of insurability and any piece of property which met those minimum standards would then be insured on the voluntary market rather than summarily shuffled off to the fare plan. So that factors such as age or geographical location could



not be the criteria wherein properties were determined to go to the fare plan."

Stearney: "Well, tell me, has the Director of Insurance set forth the criteria in this Bill itself, 3272?"

Marovitz: "The Director of Insurance and I just spoke to some individuals from the Department of Insurance just a few moments ago are in favor of this legislation, as I believe Representative Epton mentioned yesterday on the floor of the House when the Amendment came up, and it is up to the Director to determine what those standards should be so that a good piece of property would be able to be assured of a voluntary market rather than by the fare plan where they're coverage is, as I said, more expensive and less comprehensive."

Stearney: "Well, you haven't answered the question. Is the criteria set forth in the Bill?"

Marovitz: "No, it's not."

Stearney: "So, we're allowing the Director of Insurance to come up with criteria at a later date."

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Stearney: "And is that to make it easier or more difficult to get into the fare plan?"

Marovitz: "That is to make it easier for good pieces of property to be insured on the voluntary market rather than summarily shuffled off to the fare plan where good pieces of property today, in some neighborhoods, are shuffled off to the fare plan and this goes a long way toward aiding the decay of neighborhoods."

Stearney: "Has this Bill been amended?"

Marovitz: "Yes, it was amended yesterday. I'm not sure if you were on the floor. It was amended yesterday by Representative Telcser and Representative Epton, I believe, spoke to that Amendment."

Stearney: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some questions of the



Sponsor. Representative Marovitz, were you on the floor yesterday when Amendment #2 was offered to this Bill?"

Marovitz: "Yes, I was."

Schuneman: "Do you recall at that time Representative Telcser in response to a question said that this plan only affected... this Amendment only affected the fare plan?"

Marovitz: "Yes, I remember that."

Schuneman: "Are you aware that the Section in the particular Amendment that goes under the title of Section 143.26 has nothing at all to do with the fare plan?"

Marovitz: "I'm aware of that."

Schuneman: "And in fact amends the Insurance Code that deals with the cancellation of automobile insurance in the State of Illinois?"

Marovitz: "I am aware of the Sections referred to. I spoke to the Department of Insurance about ten minutes ago regarding those Sections. They said that they thought that perhaps a clarifying Amendment was needed. They were willing to prepare that clarifying Amendment with my commitment that that clarifying Amendment would be put on in the Senate, and if it was not put on in the Senate we would table the Bill."

Schuneman: "Well, could I get from you a commitment now on the House floor that this Bill will be amended so that it only affects the fare plan and does not affect any other insurance written in the voluntary market."

Marovitz: "Mr. Schuneman, if this Bill affects anything other than the fare plan, I will table the Bill and you have my commitment on the floor that unless an Amendment is put on which guarantees that it only applies to the fare plan and only Cook County and nothing else that I will table the Bill."

Schuneman: "Well, this Bill's going to be out of your control pretty soon if it passes the House."

Marovitz: "What I have committed to the Department of Insurance



is that the Sponsor in the Senate would be the Sponsor of the choosing of the Department of Insurance." So it would be in their control."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill if I may."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, sir. Very briefly."

Schuneman: "The Amendment which was attached yesterday and which the Sponsor assured the House only affected the fare plan in fact does not affect the fare plan. The fare plan is described in the Insurance Code under Section beginning with the number 1065 and in that particular part of the Act, and the Amendment actually adds... seeks to add a Section to the law which is already in the law. And so the Bill, in its present state, does not do what the House was told that it did do. I think that the proper thing to do with this Bill is to take it back now and correct it while it's still here in the House because I have a real concern about passing this Bill out the way it is. I understand in talking to the Sponsor of the Amendment that the Amendment does not do what he thought it did, and so probably it was an innocent mistake, but I think this Bill ought to be taken..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, what purpose seek recognition?"

Marovitz: "I would just ask the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle for what purpose he asked me for my commitment then? Obviously there was no point to you asking me for my commitment. I gave it to you. I gave you my word it's part of the record. I spoke to the Department of Insurance not more than ten minutes ago. They told me they agreed with the concept embodied in this Bill, were willing to write the... were willing to write the Amendment and give it to the Sponsor of their choosing. You asked me for my commitment on the floor. I gave you my word. What was the purpose of you asking me that



question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, what purpose seek recognition?"

Yourell: "Yes, point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman is talking about an Amendment to this Bill. This Bill's on Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill was... yesterday. Point's well taken."

Yourell: "The time to address that was yesterday, not today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point is well taken. Gentleman from ... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's a few other people who are standing that would like to speak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not according to the lights. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Henry."

Henry: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3272 in my community is definitely needed. Tell you why. It's very, very simple. An area that has 50% low income housing, an area that has 25% well kept housing. That area is a fare plan area that has no competition to get big insurance companies with better service to the clients. Therefore, there's no competition. You're using fare plan operation which would...left purchaseat a minimal cost. Some of these housing in my area, Mr. Speaker, is needed better and higher insurance. We can't get it. That's why 3272 is needed and that's why I'm for this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative Marovitz, could you tell me why this Bill was heard in the Judiciary Committee instead of the Insurance Committee?"

Marovitz: "All I can tell you was that I went to where the Bill was assigned. The Bill was assigned to the Judiciary Committee and that's where I took it. I have nothing



to do with where the Bill's assigned. I... As a matter of fact as you know, I'm a Member of the Insurance Committee and not of the Judiciary Committee. So if I had my choice I would rather have it in the Insurance Committee where I sit."

Wolf: "You didn't make any special request for this to be assigned to Judiciary Committee?"

Marovitz: You absolutely have my word. I made no request whatsoever of Mr. Madigan, and if he were here he would say that himself."

Wolf: "Do you feel that the Insurance Committee has sufficient legal counsel on Insurance Committee to address this Bill?"

Marovitz: "Without question. As a matter of fact, being on that Committee, it would be easier for myself to have it sent to the Insurance Committee where I sit instead of having to run back and forth with two Committees. I have total faith with the Insurance Committee. It does its job well. It passes out Bills that should be passed out is very discriminating in its questions and cross examination and I would..I see no reason why the Bill was sent to Judiciary but I abide by the Committee on Assignment of Bills."

Wolf: "Is there any feeling on your part in reference to some remarks made by Representative Giorgi yesterday that the Insurance Committee in this House is^s unduly influenced by the insurance company?"

Marovitz: "I think you'd have to ask Representative Giorgi. I certainly..."

Wolf: "Well, you're on Insurance Committee. I thought maybe you might have a comment on that."

Marovitz: "My comment is that I have always found the Insurance Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of order is being made and the points well taken. Kindly address yourself to 3272 and the contents of the Bill."



Wolf: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think my questions have been answered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would hope the people would take a look at this legislation and vote on it on the merits of the legislation. We want to prevent good parcels of property from arbitrarily being shuffled off to the fare plan where the coverage is more expensive and less extensive. We want each piece of property to be evaluated on an objective set of criteria so that communities who are trying to pick themselves up by their bootstraps can be stabilized and revitalized. We've heard from... We've heard no objections about the concept of the legislation. I talked to the Department of Insurance about fifteen minutes ago. They were totally in favor of the concept of this legislation as you heard from Representative Epton yesterday. I.. in closing, I would like to say that as a Member of the Insurance Committee, I think they do an excellent job. They are very discriminating in their evaluation of legislation. I think they could have done an excellent job in this legislation and in all the arson legislation. The decision was made to send it to Judiciary and that's an excellent decision also. I have no qualms with that decision...in and of itself. I think this legislation deserves passage on its merits. It's a good piece of legislation. It will greatly enhance the neighborhoods in many communities across the State of Illinois, at least in Cook County and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3272 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Vitek, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

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



we have here a very important Bill for Cook County, but, as Bernie Epton always says, the conflict of interest here but I'll vote my conscience with the stipulation that Billy Marovitz will keep his promise and get this corrected over in the Senate. And if not that he'll table the Bill. I'll vote aye."

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote and I don't think it's necessary now. The Bill has the Constitutional required number. But briefly, Representative Marovitz should be commended for his approach. It is sound. It's rational and I think it will go an awful long way to improving the urban blight in the City of Chicago and in most urban areas. And I certainly take him at his word that he will work with the Illinois Department of Insurance and that they will make this good Bill an even better Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 ayes, 25 nos, 7 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, what purpose seek recognition?"

Leinenweber: "To make a motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Motion's in order. What's your motion?"

Leinenweber: "I would move... having voted on the prevailing side by which House Bill 3262 lost, I would move to reconsider the vote by which that Bill lost. My intention is then to make a motion and ask that, if necessary, that the appropriate rules be waived to commit the Bill to House Judiciary I Committee, Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for the Gentleman's motion? No objections. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Gentleman's motion prevails, and House Bill 3262



will be place in the Interim Study Calendar to be studied by Judiciary I?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, Judiciary I Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "... during the course of the summer.

Motion prevails. Saves a lot of money and cost for printing of the Bill. House Bill 3281."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3281. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

This is a bi-partisan Bill supported by, I think, over 50 Cosponsors here. The Hyphenated Sponsor is Representative John Hallock who I would like to have close. This was introduced at the request of the Taxpayers Federation of Illinois. I believe it is an important Bill to all local property taxpayers that are encompassed in this Bill. It provides for a tax rate limit roll back if requested by petition and passed by referendum of the voters within the specific district affected. It applies to all units of local government except home rule units and units of government with a population of one million or more. It is an alternative to state-wide imposed limits which have been much discussed here and in the Senate during the last two years. It is an item of local control by the taxpayers with regard to the rate limits. This legislation currently is on the books with regard to many units of government. This creates uniformity with regard to all local units of government except those that are excluded and is probably our last chance to support possible relief for the local taxpayer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Mr. Hallock, to close."

Excuse me. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."



Hoffman: "Under this legislation, what additional taxing body have we added to this Section of the law?"

Brummer: "We have specifically included schools, certain recreational funds, and some county that I wasn't able to determine. That was apparently excluded as a result of a combination of population and tax rate that was in effect in 1960."

Hoffman: "Alright. Now, you've included school districts which were not included under this previously."

Brummer: "Correct."

Hoffman: "What is the procedure... let me put it this way. Have you, in any way, changed the procedure by which this could be placed on the ballot from the existing law?"

Brummer: "Yes, we increased the number of petition requirement signatures on the percentage portion from five percent to ten percent."

Hoffman: "I'm sorry. That is the only change that you've made. In other words, under present law they would need five percent of the..."

Brummer: "Five percent or one thousand. Whichever is less. We've changed that to ten percent or one thousand, whichever is less so that there are not repeated petitions with regard to this. So there is a major effort so the issues do not go on the ballot for referendum in a willy-nilly fashion. We felt that the ten percent figure was a more responsible approach."

Hoffman: "Now, in a district which has 58,000 voters, they would need a thousand signatures to get it on the ballot as opposed to 5800. Is that correct?"

Brummer: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "Alright, thank you very much, Representative. I think that we have a situation here, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, which we need to look at very closely. In the State of Ohio, for example, we hear frequently a number of times or we've heard a



number of times about the failure of millage rate referendums in Ohio and Michigan and other states where this has to be voted on for a school district time after time. Hopefully we would not find ourself in the same position. We must remember that these districts have either been given statutory authority by the Legislature or they have, infact at some point in time, had a referendum and passed a rate increase. And each of these local governmental units are providing service to those communities on the basis of those rate increases. I think also we must remember that the money is raised locally is spent locally. I fear that we may jeopardize some very important local services if we begin to establish situations or establish in the law fairly reasonably liberal, I think, a thousand signatures is not that many signatures to get an issue on the ballot where you can roll back the taxes. I don't want to see us get into the same position that California and some other states have been in. And, for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "I have a couple of questions for the Sponsor if he'll yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Dunn: "In its present form, does this Bill provide that local tax rates can be rolled back by referendum everywhere except for home rule units and taxing districts of more than one million in population?"

Brummer: "Right."

Dunn: "And how many signatures are needed to put something like this on the ballot?"

Brummer: "Ten percent or one thousand signatures."

Dunn: "And what is the purpose of this legislation?"

Brummer: "To grant to the local property taxpayer the right to adjust the maximum rate limit on a district by



district basis as opposed to a state-wide imposed mandate."

Dunn: "Do you think that a local board which had a chance to lower taxes would refuse to do so?"

Brummer: "Well, generally no. But there are some instances where some of the taxpayers feel that the taxes may be excessive. We have provisions that authorizes the taxpayers by referendum to increase the maximum rate. I have repeatedly supported those, so when they provided for front door referendum I think that same referendum provision ought to be there for the taxpayer in the event they feel that the property tax rates ought to be decreased subsequently."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, if I may to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, sir."

Dunn: "I'm reluctant to rise in opposition to the Bill because I understand the purpose and intent of the Sponsor and the thrust of the legislation and that is to promote economy in government at the local level. But I don't see any need to clutter the statute books, to take another large step towards government by referenda, particularly in this situation. There are many people right in this chamber who either are now or have been elected officials in one or more units of local government, and I don't think there's an elected official in charge of any unit of local government who wouldn't like anything more than to be able to go back to his or her constituents and say as a result of our operations on your behalf, we are now able to lower your tax rates. I feel certain that anytime a tax rate can be lowered, an elected official is going to jump at the chance to do that. I don't think we need a referendum to lower tax rates. We need to have ceilings maybe as has been indicated to keep them from going up too high. But anytime that we lower tax rates when we really shouldn't, what



we're going to do to local government is make them more and more dependent upon State Government and Federal Government for aid assistance and financial help. Those of us who believe that local control is best should put our confidence in those who serve at the local level and trust them to lower the taxes if they should be lowered and not do things which make us more and more dependent upon Springfield and Washington. I think this is something... a concept that while well meaning is something that we ought to take another look at and we should not pass this Bill at this time."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Several speakers got up and said they reluctantly hesitate to get up and speak against this Bill. Let me tell you as I said time and time again before. This will not affect me in my community. I am home rule. But those local officials are not annointed. These people run for election every election, every two years they ask for the support of the citizens in that community to lead, as their public official, and then they turn right around and said, 'Yes, we can give, by referendum, control your tax rates'. Well who wouldn't sign a petition? Who wouldn't sign a petition to lower the tax rates? I'll give you a good example. We have home rule and there are seven or thirteen communities this year that will be voting because people said, 'Do you want tax relief in your community.. Sign this petition'. They have these people sign these petitions and each and every incident where they sign the home rule petitions, the people turned it down almost four and five and six to one. Now, that's fine. The elected showed some intelligence, but it cost us seven thousand dollars for that particular election just to open the precincts without the arguments that it had to be proposed



or advertised in the local paper. Now what I'm trying to say here today to you, that if we continue along these paths, the Jarvis propositions, the Proposition 13, the Proposition 9. Why don't we all just stay at home. Turn the government back to the people and have... and have government by the people by mass-steria as I said here many, many a time? This is really a bad Bill and those of you who are not in home rule communities; if you think that you can't get people to sign a petition just ten percent of the voters to sign a petition for tax relief, you got another guess coming. We had a million dollar introduction of an indoor tennis and racket club in Elmwood Park. Seven hundred people signed that petition that they wanted this one million dollar racket court and tennis court. Out of the seven hundred people that signed that petition, 350 of them signed the petition for tax relief. They don't know what they're doing. Unless they hold public office, they don't know what they're doing and they hope that when they elect someone to public office that they will lead and they will do exactly like the last speaker said if they have a record they can go on to higher and better things. Local officials aren't annointed. They're elected by the general public. Now if you're going to turn the workings of government over to the general citizens with legislation like this, not only are you going to cost some more money, but the many, many referendums that will be held throughout the state is an additional cost to the taxpayers. And again we're trying to help those same people. What we're doing, we're actually hurting them. Don't throw the system out. Throw the rascals out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

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



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

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there have been many charges made in the last few minutes about what this Bill may or may not do. But to me it comes down to one basic question. In the last year each has from time to time spoken of the need for tax cuts and tax limitations. At this point and time here today there is about one tax limitation Bill left before the House or the Senate. And that is House Bill 3281. This Bill. I would say to you that this Bill is very important. First of all, it is not a state mandate on what the tax rates should be. And because of that I believe it probably the best Bill available. What it is is only a suggestion to the local units of government that they themselves will have the power if they deem to take that power to decide locally what the tax rate should be. I submit to you that that is the best form of tax limitation we could give the people of our state. I would urge all of you to support this very important Bill. Put the tax cuts back where they should be. At the local level where the local taxpayers can decide what their tax rates should be. They have the power to raise those rates. They should have the power to reduce those rates and I submit to you that this important Bill which is sponsored and supported by the Illinois Taxpayers Federation is also deserving of your support. And I would ask for a yes vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3281 pass? All in favor vote aye, all opposed vote no. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Katz: "Mr. Conti has pointed out the fact that local officials



go back and have a referendum and must be re-elected. But there's also another factor that's operating here and that is inflation and also the kind of legislation we're passing. We are making it so that school districts, for example, must continuously go back and get increases in order simply to stand still. The effect of inflation and the effect of the homestead kinds of laws we passed are in fact that school districts are being reduced without this kind of legislation. I think it would be a mistake to impose this additionally, and for that reason I am voting aye. I'm voting no, pardon me."

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

Skinner: "I plead with you to allow the door to swing both ways. The tax-eaters can initiate a referendum anytime they want to. All they have to do is pass a Resolution. Taxpayers, on the other hand, can't initiate a referendum in a school district ever, not ever. Every six weeks the school districts can come forth with a referendum and one time the taxpayers let down their guard and the tax rate goes up and never again is there a possibility for a vote to lower that tax rate. I think it's time to give one to the taxpayers at least one for the Session. Don't you think?"

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

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. If this reaches the Constitutional Majority, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote. Timer's on." Ewing. Did you want to speak on this? Your light was on."

Ewing: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know why we should ever be afraid to let the citizens and the taxpayer make his own decision. This is a good Bill. All of us have campaigned on tax relief, tax limitations. Let's do what we said now. Let's put our votes where our mouth was. Let's vote yes."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 ayes, 26 nos, 7 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3314."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3314. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill dealing with the definition of a fetus for purpose of the murder statute. Previously, I had promised Representative Kelly that I'd give him an opportunity to present an Amendment to the Bill so I'd ask leave of the House to drop this back to Second for purpose of hearing Representative Kelly's Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any objections? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I have a question of the Chair. If this comes back to Second and is amended today, does that mean that we cannot vote on it today?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct sir."

Cullerton: "And it goes back to the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Unless the Gentleman gets 107 votes."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there leave? Hearing no objections, bring the Bill back to Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Kelly. Amends House Bill 3314 as amended."

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

Kelly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Certainly Representative Daniels. Amendment #4 would change the intent of Representative Daniels' initial Bill by removing the language of the Bill and replacing it with a pro-life definition of an individual which includes any human being from fertilization until death. The language in this Amendment is necessary and is very similar to a California statute which is currently the law of the land in that state. Contrary to what the opponents of this legislation might say that this Bill



is unconstitutional you will find that it is well within the guidelines of the United States Supreme Court decisions throughout the years dealing with this subject. And I move the adoption of Amendment #4."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this particular Amendment. Contrary to what the Sponsor says, the Amendment is clearly unconstitutional. In the United States case of 'Roe' versus 'Wade', the United States Supreme Court has held that the unborn, whether, if not viable, are not persons under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. Therefore, an attempt by the Legislature to... as to include a fetus within the protection of the Criminal Code remains unconstitutional in the light of 'Roe' versus 'Wade'. I might say that in addition we've had an Illinois Supreme Court case, 'People versus Grear', which this Bill is trying to address which it really can't address because the court has said, 'No court of last resort in this country has held that the killing of a fetus is murder unless the fetus is born alive and then expired'. So let me say to you that if we adopt this Amendment, we're just doing a foolish thing because it's unconstitutional anyway. If you want to feel good and think that you've done something, you can vote aye on the Amendment but it's unconstitutional, and we, as a Body, should not do those things."

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

Willer: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Willer: "Representative Kelly, I think you said this...

Did I misunderstand you or understand you when you said California has this law now in the books?"

Kelly: "California presently has a law very similar to this



Amendment... language in this Amendment."

Willer: "What do you mean, very similar? Is it addressed...

Let's not talk about abortion. Is it talking about what Representative Daniels was trying to do?"

Kelly: "It defines an individual and it points out some of the same areas as this Bill does."

Willer: "But does it address itself to murder as Representative Daniels did in the Bill viable fetus? Is it a similar Bill dealing with the murder of a viable fetus?"

Kelly: "It would place the definition of individual into the murder statute and it would be applicable."

Willer: "Well I'm not, still not."

Kelly: "In other words, an unborn child."

Willer: "...clear to what you're saying to me. Is the Bill in California the same as Representative Daniels' original Bill and does it say in California that you can be guilty of a murder if you kill a human being, fertilized egg one hour old all the way through nine months of pregnancy? Is this what it's saying in California?"

Kelly: "Okay. In answer to your question, first of all, California, at least to my knowledge, does not have a law which reflects what Representative Daniels' initial proposal did. I stated that the language in this Amendment was very similar to a California statute dealing with this same subject. So it hasn't, in my opinion, any direct relationship to Representative Daniels' first proposal."

Willer: "Well, I think then really what you're talking about is not really relevant to what we're trying to do with Representative Daniels' Bill. May I speak to this Amendment Mr. Speaker?"

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

Willer: "I supported Representative Daniels in Committee. I intended to support the Bill on the House floor fully realizing it will probably be challenged. I happen to



believe that a viable fetus is a human being and I think that this Bill before, unless this Amendment goes on of course, but unamended has a good chance of standing a court test. With this Amendment of course, I think it's going nowhere. And watch the pro-choice people, if they have any sense at all, they're going to be voting for this Amendment. No two ways about it. I urge you not to adopt this Amendment. For heaven sakes, let's wait and see where we're going with Representative Daniels' Bill unamended. We are then speaking about a viable fetus, and let's see what the courts say about that. If the courts say it's okay, then we have established a precedent in Illinois that recognizes, for the first time under the law, that the fetus in some stage or development is truly a human being. I believe it is in viability, but if this Amendment goes on, there goes the whole concept, and if you rather see the whole thing go down rather than get your way and lose everything instead of saving, perhaps, an unborn child of eight months age. You know, as I said before it's cutting off your nose to spite your face. I think it's typical of the unthinking, 'knee-jerk' reaction of many of the pro-life movement who say we want everything our way and to heck with just half a loaf. Please don't adopt this Amendment. Let the Bill go as it is and see what happens to it."

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

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment and let me preface my remarks by saying that I do vote pro-life and I believe I have three or four stars, whatever the most is given. But nevertheless, ... nevertheless, there are serious problems. If this Amendment were adopted, this Bill were to be enacted into law. Remember the prosecution has the obligation of proving life and death. Now, with this here Amendment if it were to become part of the law,



the prosecution could never prove life. Just because you have fertilization no doctor is ever going to get on the stand and say, 'Yes we have life. Life independent of the mother itself.' This here would just seriously throw into turmoil so much of the question of life and the fetus. If we're going to do anything in this area, I think Representative Daniels' Bill has the best approach. I wasn't for it in the beginning, but we did amend it and tried to make it somewhat workable. But if you attach this Amendment, no prosecutor will ever prosecute on this basis. It's an exercise in futility, and all we're doing is just creating more and more problems for the prosecution. And I suggest that this Amendment itself should be utterly defeated because it has not basis and logic or rash and reason. I urge a no vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Bell.
Mr. Bell please."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question.
All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed.
Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, on the Amendment."

Daniels: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "Mr. Sponsor, I'd like to just ask you a few questions dealing with this Amendment. It's my understanding that what you propose by this Amendment is to amend the Criminal Code in its entirety for the definition of an individual. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "That would be what would be taking place under this Amendment."

Daniels: "So, what I said is correct. You want to amend the Criminal Code for the definition of an individual."

Kelly: "An individual to include a human being from fertilization until death."

Daniels: "Which is different from the Bill as originally presented which would have amended only the murder statute



Isn't that correct?"

Kelly: "That's true."

Daniels: "Now, let me take this idea that you have a little bit further. What you're saying then by this Amendment if this were to pass and become law is that under the Criminal Code an individual would include an embryo at the moment of fertilization or, in other words, at the moment that the sperm joins the egg. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "That would be a moment of fertilization and I would say from that moment on, it would be protectable under the particular statute. Yes."

Daniels: "Now, referring specifically then to the criminal code specifically Section 10-4 which is forceable detention. A woman has sexual intercourse on the evening of May 20 and on the day of May 21, after she has been impregnated and the egg has been fertilized, she is held in forceable detention by an individual. Has that individual held two people hostage or one?"

Kelly: "At that particular point, if in fact someone is an authority on that subject that there was fertilization and there was a embryo at that point, there would be a second life considered. But there aren't too many people at that point that would be that familiar, particularly that person who is perpetrating the crime."

Daniels: "So in other words, you really can't answer the question because we couldn't prove whether or not she was pregnant at that moment. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "I couldn't prove that any more than it would underneath your initial Bill when you talk about viability and it's the same type of a concept. The proof is very difficult."

Daniels: "That's very interesting. Now, let's take what you just said then and follow through on viability. The initial Bill had the definition of viability as an unborn child, one that could live independent of the mother. Is that correct? With or without life



support systems."

Kelly: "That's true."

Daniels: "And then that would be a matter of proof. Isn't that correct?"

Kelly: "Not necessarily so because it's very difficult to determine that particular point in viability."

Daniels: "It would be a matter of proof though."

Kelly: "Every physician has a different and every judge has a different opinion and I suppose Legislators too, on when life is viable and when it is not. I don't think the Supreme Court really knows."

Daniels: "I understand that you're not a lawyer sir, and I'm just asking you a question so that I understand the purpose of your Amendment. What you're saying is that viability then is a matter of proof just as under your Amendment one would have to prove that the woman was pregnant. Isn't that correct?"

Kelly: "True."

Daniels: "So, the question then on viability if an unborn child is murdered after what we heard the Medical Society testify would have to be a minimum of 22 weeks for purposes of viability. No child has survived under 22 weeks. We had more or less an arbitrary cut off at that time in term of the woman's pregnancy. Isn't that correct?"

Kelly: "That is correct up and to the point that if a baby is before the 22 or 24 weeks that you're pointing out deserves protection also under the laws of Illinois and under laws of this country."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels, would you bring your remarks to a close? Address yourself to the Amendment please."

Daniels: "Well, we have one other question here on the area of reckless conduct. Is it your understanding that a pregnant woman could be held guilty of a Class A misdemeanor which would provide up to six months in jail or a thousand dollar fine in the event that she were



to go out and conduct herself in a reckless manner, could she be guilty of reckless conduct as to her two month old embryo?"

Kelly: "If, in fact, she was intentionally doing so I would say that she would be guilty of a crime."

Daniels: "One other question I would have. Is it your intent by this Amendment to allow a pregnant women the right to terminate her own pregnancy?"

Kelly: "Under.... with this Amendment included, a woman could terminate a pregnancy, but I will say this, that if she did she would then be performing an illegal abortion and be subject to the penalties under the Illinois Abortion Statute of 1975."

Daniels: "What is the penalty under the Illinois Abortion Statute?"

Kelly: "I recall it's a felony 2 conviction. I'm not sure."

Daniels: "Class 2 felony. Using this as a circumstance, a woman intentionally stabs herself in the abdomen killing her eight month old, unborn child, murdering that child you're saying that that would not be murder because your Amendment, the pro-life Amendment, says that a women may terminate her own pregnancy but instead it would be an illegal abortion of an eight month old child, unborn child, and she would only be guilty of a Class 2 felony. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "Has that ever happened?"

Daniels: "Well it happened under People versus 'Gear' where an unborn child was murdered and released for that offense by the Illinois Supreme Court and in the case of State versus 'Whethers' in the Rock Island area where Judge Hanson told the Judiciary Committee that he had to follow stare decisis and release an accused because he killed an eight and a half month old unborn child. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am a pro-life candidate and have voted pro-life one hundred percent of the time in the six years that I've been a Member of



the Legislature. But I look at the Amendment that we have before us right now, an Amendment that clearly and statutorily says that a woman may terminate her own pregnancy. May, factually may, stab herself in the abdomen, killing her eight month old child, terminating that pregnancy and killing this child. You say, 'Has it happened?'. As sure as you sitting here and standing here right now. It can happen tomorrow. We're talking about the lives of an unborn child. The original Bill that was submitted to you recognized the question of viability. This Amendment I ask you to think carefully. Think carefully before you accept it. Make sure you know what you're doing."

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

Ronan: "Having thought carefully, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'."

Aye. Oppose. Previous question's been moved. Mr. Kelly to close."

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

I just wanted to conclude my remarks by saying that life is sacred from the moment of conception and it's certainly within our legislative prerogative to provide that protection to the unborn, and if we want to define an individual to be an unborn child, we can do that in our Criminal Code or anywhere else. Representative Daniels' Bill was certainly well-intentioned. I'm sorry that his Bill didn't go as far as I, personally, felt and several other of the pro-life persuasions felt. But this particular proposal does go beyond that and does provide protection to the earlier months of development. And I ask you why not. Should a woman who is carrying a two-month old child receive the same type of protection for that child as a woman who has a nine month old baby or of a child who is recently born? Certainly they deserve the same particular protection. And in many



cases the... and in most cases, the child is wanted by the mother and by the father and, under the current law, that child would not even be protected. What I'm saying here in closing is that the pro-life organizations in Illinois have asked me to sponsor this Amendment. I happen to believe in the Amendment and I feel that an individual should be defined in the statutes and make it applicable. There wasn't any arguments made, any decision made in 1973 by the Supreme Court that said specifically that we can't provide protection to the unborn. And whether it be for murder, murdering an unborn child at any stage of development, and I would just ask that you support me and the Amendment." on Amendment #4 to House Bill 3314."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', opposed. Amendment's failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Kelly. Amends House Bill 3314 as amended."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "I want a Roll Call because there's a lot of organizations myself and I feel very strongly that we deserve a Roll Call on this issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #5."

Kelly: "And I will say one think Mr. Speaker if I may with leave of the House. There isn't going to be any Roll Call turned over to anybody that where this vote will be considered as a rated vote by any pro-life organization."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #5. Mr. Kelly, Amendment #5. Have you explained Amendment #5?"

Kelly: "Table Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Bill wasn't amended."



Do you want to proceed with the Bill? Is there objections?
 Mr. Jaffe objects. I don't know why. The Bill wasn't amended. Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes Mr. Speaker, we had one hearing on this Bill. It was heard, we had a lengthy debate on this Bill that took about two hours. We just brought it back to Second. We've heard it now for another hour. There are other Bills on the call that have not been heard and I'm going to object to it. I think that other Members of this Assembly want to have their Bills heard rather than have this pushed ahead."

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

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. That's not the issue anymore. This Bill was on Third Reading prior to moving it back to Second for consideration of Amendments. No Amendments were adopted to the Bill. The Bill is still on Third Reading and should be considered on Third Reading. And I would think that the Chair would rule that the Sponsor of this Bill would have the opportunity to proceed on Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sponsor can move this if he'd still like."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, just in reply to Mr. Yourell. We had a full hearing on it. We took a vote and this Bill was defeated if you recall. Then there was a motion to reconsider which took place later in that day. Now it's brought back to Second Reading. We've heard it on Second Reading. How many times are we going to bend over backwards for one Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, moves that the House consider House Bill 3314. He moves that we consider the Bill. All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Now this is just on the motion for consideration of the Bill. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 ayes, 22 nos, 1 recorded as present. Gentle-



man's motion prevails. According to the Parliamentarian, since the Bill was not amended, it could have been heard on Third Reading at the appropriate time anyway. Alright, now on House Bill 3314. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3314. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that, of course, this House has very patiently listened to substantial debate as to the Judiciary II Committee. By this Bill, we have attempted to address, as reasonably as possible and as constitutionally as possible, the issue created in the People versus 'Gear' decision entered by the Illinois Supreme Court in January 1980. That decision said that an unborn child in Illinois could not, could not be murdered. This Bill says as amended, that if the unborn child is capable of life, independent of the mother with or without life support systems that that child may be murdered for purposes of our murder statute. It says nothing about abortion. It does not solidify or recognize the 'Roe' versus 'Wade' decision. It's a matter of proof, yes of proof, in our courts as to being able to prove whether or not a child has been murdered. It deletes the felony murder doctrine as Representative Cullerton had requested and it deletes the application of the death penalty as Representative Kosinski had requested. The Bill, in a similar fashion, has passed the Illinois Senate by a wide majority, something of the order of 48 to 2 if I'm correct in my understanding. That Bill has come over to the House for further hearing. This Bill is a product of substantial discussion. We have attempted, as much as possible, to recognize, to recognize the right of the unborn child. To protect, in that case, that heinous case, where a person takes the life of a viable, unborn child. Yes, in the case of People versus 'Gear'



a child that was eight months unborn and in the case of State versus 'Whether's' where a child of eight and a half months old unborn. I ask you to support this legislation, to fill the gap that exists in Illinois law today and to protect the unborn child."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well I would hope to have spoken a little bit later after the opponent simply to back up what Representative Daniels has said. I'm a hyphenated chief Cosponsor of the Bill along with Representative Getty and Representative Grossi. We worked very long, very hard in Judiciary to accommodate language that we thought was constitutional that would be effective language to, yes Ladies and Gentlemen, to punish child killers. Now for those of you who voted present the last time this Bill was up, this... and voted on a pro-life basis or a pro-choice basis, worrying about how to go home and tell whatever constituents is interested about this Bill. Just simply tell them this. This Bill punishes child killers. Murderers who take the life of a human being that could have existed outside the womb of the mother with or without life supports. This is a revenge Bill. Don't make any mistake about it. That classification of human being is not now able to be avenged by society. The 'Grear' case was a shock and outrage to all of us when the majority opinion of the Supreme Court completely ignored, completely ignored the facts of the 'Grear' case. In a strong descent Justice Clark and Justice Moran also said this plug needs to be put in the law. Let me say it one more time. This is a child killer punishment Bill, and if you can't vote for the unborn viable children in this state then maybe you shouldn't be sitting in this chamber."

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

Stearney: "Will the Sponsor of this Bill yield please?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "While he walks to his mic I might add to Mr. Davis that I'm shocked and chagrined as well. Now, Mr. Daniels, my question relates to the problem of proof. In every homicide prosecution the burden is on the prosecution to prove both life and death. In every other circumstance, the problem is merely proving death because they can prove life very easily. That is the day before the person was seen. But it is very, in this instant, you're going to need medical testimony to show that the fetus could survive independent of the mother. True? And as I understand the medical testimony before Judiciary II by Mr. 'Ubson' and that was that a fetus of the age of 22 weeks that there was a 26% probability that the child, that the fetus would be born alive. Am I right? Those were the statistics."

Daniels: "It is my recollection that you are correct."

Stearney: "Now assuming we do have this situation arise again and it probably will only come about once every five years, but nevertheless, just as sheer legislative intent and to guide the prosecution what proof need the prosecutor put on to show that the fetus could be capable of living independent of the mother? Would it be on the probability basis?"

Daniels: "I believe that the testimony of the medical individual, a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches, to show that there is a extreme realistic possibility that the child would exist independent of the mother."

Stearney: "Well, assuming the mother had not seen a position, let's say for three or four months prior to the time that the incident occurred, the wrongful act, the doctor then is going to be testifying not on the basis of personal knowledge but only on the basis of probability. Am I right?"

Daniels: "I don't believe you would be. I think in a case



like that that there undoubtedly would be an autopsy,
that there would be a... there would be an unborn child.."

Stearney: "But the autopsy would not show life. The autopsy would only show death. True?"

Daniels: "In many cases the pathologists, they are able to determine the cause of death."

Stearney: "True, but my question is this. How can you prove the existence of life only on the basis of probability that there is a 26% chance of survival of a fetus of the age of 22 weeks or over."

Daniels: "Well, I think if you're referring to the 22 week old unborn child that that's probably the case. I don't suggest to you that 22 weeks be the actual time. I think that will depend upon the medical testimony. What we are trying to do here in terms of viability is to address the issue as to when an unborn child is capable of existence."

Stearney: "Well, agreed. I see what you're trying to do but I'm saying as to the problems that the prosecution might have. They're going to have to try to prove life on the basis of probability and that is speculation and guess. Now the prosecution mind you has the burden of proving beyond the reasonable doubt life. How are you going to be able to do it by speculation surmise and conjecture on a probability survival rate of 26% of a fetus of 22 weeks?"

Daniels: "I agree that there would be more difficulty at 22 weeks but certainly not at eight months."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, what purpose Mr. Yourell stand?"

Yourell: "Point of order. We've got two attorneys arguing a case in court here and I don't think that's what we're after. I think we ought to get this... if he's got a question to ask, ask a question and answer and let's vote."

Stearney: "Well, I'm sorry Mr. Yourell that the argument goes above your head but nevertheless somebody's going to have to be confronted with it sometime in the future."



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

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

I, after not having Amendment #4 adopted to House Bill 3314, feel compelled as I did a couple of days ago to vote against and speak out against this Bill. And I'll tell you why particularly those of you who have a strong pro-life conviction. Because by adoption this Bill in its present form what we're doing is giving credence to the Supreme Court's decision which was made that says that certain stages of development and the latter stages that protections can be made and that in the early stages of development a baby cannot be protected from a murder, from an abortionist, or from anyone else. Now I know that the pro-life group has taken a long, serious look at this legislation and I'm not going to compromise my position... my particular position in defending and allowing legislation to pass that would provide protection for the last three months and I would like to point this out to, not only to the Sponsor, but to the other Members of the House what we're talking about here in the whole United States at the most would be maybe three maybe five deaths. At the same time what we're doing, we have over a million abortions performed in this country every year and what we're saying is that million little babies and that are getting destroyed, their rights in those first six months of pregnancy don't mean anything but we got to help out the five. Well I feel deeply sorry and my heart goes out to that baby that was killed in Rock Island but I'll tell you one thing, don't compromise your position for those other million babies that are being destroyed not only in Illinois but across the country and a no vote would be the best vote."

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

Domico: "I move the previous question."

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



All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Oppose.
 Previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from
 DuPage, Mr. Daniels to close."

Daniels: "I don't believe for one minute that any Member
 of this House would suggest that an unborn child that
 is capable of life independent of its mother should not
 be recognized for purposes of murder in Illinois.
 I don't believe that a single Member of this House
 would even begin to suggest that an eight month old
 unborn child as the case of People versus 'Grear'
 and an eight and a half month old child in the case
 of State versus 'Whethers' should not be protected.
 Is it really the suggestion of the previous speaker
 that we shouldn't recognize their lives, that we
 should turn our backs on them? That we should say
 that an unborn child of that age cannot be protected
 by our criminal laws? I don't believe that's a
 reasonable suggestion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House, protect the unborn child. It's a tough vote
 for all of us, but make sure that we close that
 terrible gap in Illinois law. This is a good Bill
 that's been studied very carefully. We need your
 help. Vote green."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 3314
 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no.
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, to explain his vote.
 Timer's on."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain
 my aye vote. Mr. Kelly presented his position, I think,
 very clearly. As a pro-life candidate, I could very
 easily and did support his position. However, to
 say that we should not pass this very important piece
 of legislation, to say that we should not protect
 the unborn child to the extent that this Bill protects
 the unborn child is a tragedy. We should pass this.
 It's much needed to correct a very poor decision by our



Supreme Court. We should pass it and have it be the law and give protection to the unborn child."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Johnson: "With the exception of Representative Kelly, this is almost an identical Roll Call to the Roll Calls we've had on pro-life legislation in the past. And I think that really points out that as well-intentioned as Representative Kelly is what he's really saying is, since we can't have a perfect world, as most of we pro-life people including Representative Daniels' who has a hundred percent pro-life voting record himself, then we ought not even give protection to those groups that we can. We're simply trying to do the best we can in light of Supreme Court dictates to say that if you murder a seven, eight, or nine month fetus it's the same as murdering a person who's been born. I think that's a reasonable proposition and Representative Kelly, by his position, is really cutting off his nose to spite his face."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. Timer's on."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past I have sponsored some pro-life legislation and so I sympathize with Representative Kelly and Representative Daniels on how hard it is to please everyone. But I think what this Bill is is it's a step forward. It doesn't go as far as Representative Kelly and many others would like to go but it goes a lot farther than the status quo and it does protect some unborn children. It doesn't protect as many as some of us would like but I think Representative Kelly and perhaps Representative Daniels and others who are interested in going farther in December and January can introduce legislation and move us farther along the track. It's very hard to draw a precise Amendment.



I think it's a good Bill and that we ought to get more green votes on there and then vow to ourselves that in January we'll work even harder to go further if we can define that correctly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mr. Catania. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 ayes, 27 nos, 16 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3368."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3368. A Bill for an Act to amend State Occupation and Use Tax Acts with respect to percentage of revenue therefrom to be transferred to the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3368 moves half of one percent from our net revenues accumulated through the sales tax laws from the State of Illinois..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's my fault. I shut you off. I'm sorry."

McClain: "That's alright. Thank you Mr. Speaker. ... into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. The effective date is October 1, 1980. It'll approximately move over this next fiscal year 9.75 million dollars. The purpose of this and that's the fiscal note filed by the Illinois Department of Transportation for one full year to be 13 million dollars. The purpose of this Bill is to replace some of the moneys that we estimated would go to local governments throughout the State of Illinois. If indeed we do pass this legislation, we will still fall behind in four years what we would have done if there would not have been such a shortfall in the Motor Fuel Tax Fund due to 8% reduction in revenues collected this last fiscal year. So basically what this does is just tries to keep local governments in line with what we promised them or we allegedly promised them from the transportation package that we passed last year, and I ask for an aye vote."

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

Skinner: "Or even a question. I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us what the balance in the state road fund was on April 30."

Speaker Lechowicz: "April 30th, about..."



Skinner: "No, no. The Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain, about 38 million."

Skinner: "You're warm. How much?"

McClain: "35 million, 34 million."

Skinner: "Well, the comptroller says 36 million. Why don't we split the difference between the Speaker and the Sponsor. As one who did not vote for the Thompson-Byrne program and did not make all those promises which are not being delivered, I don't really feel much impunction to vote for this Bill. It seems to me that if the Sponsor really wants that four-lane highway from point A to point B, that he ought to keep the money in the state... point Q to what? That he ought to keep the money in state hands because it's going to be state money that rolls those concrete machines. I think the state road fund is very close to bankruptcy, probably as close as it's been since the Representative and I have been here. And I think somebody's going to have to ask for a tax increase. Not for a cut of the state road funds."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Skinner...."

Skinner: "May I ask you a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me..."

McClain: "I thought you did. Forgive me."

Skinner: "Was that a question?"

McClain: "I thought it was a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you please proceed, sir?"

Skinner: "I just think we ought to vote against his Bill, sir!"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Fine. Mr. McClain, to close.

I'm sorry. Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. By the way, it's good to back.

Better to be here than in the hospital."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're right."

Mugalian: "I don't want to speak long on this, but I think really the Sponsor is asking us to make a choice between human services, services for the mentally ill, for public



schools, the services and expenses of that kind, and highways. And I don't have any question in my mind as to my priorities as compared to highways and concrete and human services and public schools. I think it's a bad idea to take general revenue funds and transfer them to increasing highways."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "What is your estimate of the amount of general revenue funds that would be transferred into the road fund as a result of the Bill, Representative?"

McClain: "As a result of this Bill what would be transferred in?"

Vinson: "Yes."

McClain: "9.75 million next fiscal year and the Illinois Department of Transportation estimated 13 million if it would be a full fiscal year."

Vinson: "Thirteen million would be a full fiscal year?"

McClain: "The effective date now is October 1, 1980. So for next fiscal year, the fiscal impact is 9.75 million."

Vinson: "What is your estimate of the shortfall in the road fund. In other words, how much do we have there versus... how much less do we have there than we need to do... to perform the promises that were made?"

McClain: "Well let me answer this way. First of all, this Bill would transfer 9.75 million next fiscal year in the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. Forty percent of that then goes into the road fund. Alright. So the best way to answer you, I think, is the current Motor Fuel Tax Fund at the present level two and a half percent would be 123.2 million. The estimated Motor Fuel Tax that we estimated for everybody would be 130.9 million. There's a shortfall this year of approximately 5.5 million due to the shortfall that I mentioned in my opening



statement. So it's a shortfall into local governments of about 5.5 million."

Vinson: "Is that before or after your Bill?"

McClain: "That would be before my Bill. There's a shortfall of 5.5 million in the municipalities for instance."

Vinson: ^{And by} our Bill would fully make up the shortfall, the projected shortfall?"

McClain: "No, it doesn't quite take care of the entire shortfall but it comes substantially... I mean really close, Sam."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain, to close."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. With all due respect, I know that's the first time Dick Mugalian got up to speak. Hope there's no sympathy votes for him. I'm glad to have him back also. This issue is really not an issue for human resources versus highways. Basically, what we're doing here is about 90% of the traffic throughout the State of Illinois is on local roads and that traffic we implyingly gave people figures last fall that they would receive X amount of dollars, and we're having a drastic shortfall. This Bill would replace that shortfall almost exactly to what we had allegedly promised. Secondly, 40% of the moneys that we would now place in the Motor Fuel Tax Fund would be placed in the road fund which as Cal Skinner pointed out very ably is in dire need of some funds also. So I would ask for a favorable vote. It's not really human resources versus highway construction. If we don't have decent roads and transportation facilities to get people to work or facilities it wouldn't make any difference anyway, and I'd ask you an aye vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3368 pass?"

All in favor vote aye, all opposed vote no. Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take



the record. On this question there are 70 ayes, 45 nos, 2 recorded as present. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3426."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3426. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3426 that amended and does basically two additional things to what the original Bill provided. The original Bill provides that in private placements for handicapped students we will change the payment of room and board which now is current from paying half of that amount in December, a quarter in March and a quarter in September. We're going to move that to monthly payments beginning in October. We've also provided that a Section in the Bill by Amendment which really takes care of Senate Bill 1000 that got tied up in some machinations of the House last Session to use local school district educational facilities either on or off the premises of private schools, which means that we could use places like Allendale and Applewood and 'Hardin Shores' for public school residential placements. We then provide, by Amendment, that tuition reimbursement will be moved up from December to September, December, March, and June which means that schools will be receiving the last payment which they then pass through the private providers in June rather than the following September. I'd be pleased to respond to any questions as applied to only the 702 children and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is... any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3426 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 ayes, 1 nos, none recorded as present."



This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3458."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3458. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Grossi: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. At this time I would like to table this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman tables House Bill 3458. Hearing no objections, House Bill 3458 is tabled. House Bill 3488."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3488. A Bill for an Act relating to tort immunity Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to bring this back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment that Mr. Leinenweber has to offer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Leave is granted. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Leinenweber. Amends House..."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. It repeals everything that was previously done. This is the Bill that originally attempted to put the CTA under the Local Government Tort Immunity Act. Many of us felt that it didn't belong there. We talked it over with the Sponsor and he talked it over with his people, and what they really wanted was immunity for the board of the authorities for injury resulting from act or omissions except for the willful and wanton misconduct. So, what we've done is we've deleted all the material for leaving it out of the Local Government Tort Immunity Act where it didn't belong, and we're merely extending immunity to the members of the board and also providing that, if they are sued, that the agency will defend them and that the agency may also purchase insurance. It's a good Amendment and I urge its adoption."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on the Amendment?"

Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Harry, does that put it in conformity with other boards or does this make it a little bit different?"

Leinenweber: "It's my understanding that most boards they are immune... the directors are immune from their ordinary negligence. Of course, it does not relieve the authority itself. It makes the individual members immune from their ordinary negligence not willful and wanton misconduct. It also provides for obtaining insurance and for defending a member who is sued in his capacity as a board member. I don't think it's anything earth-shaking. I think it's reasonable that we extend this protection."

Jaffe: "But is it in conformity with other boards? That's what I want to know."

Leinenweber: "Many boards, that's true. All... I can't say all, but I know that some boards...most corporate ... If I recall correctly, we have extended to immunity to board members of private for profit corporations so whether it's a blanket across the board. I don't think this is the only one that probably was left but this is not an earth-shaking or revolutionary idea."

Jaffe: "I was against that concept of extending it to the private sector..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Aaron. Please proceed, sir."

Jaffe: "I was against the concept of extending it to the private sector and certainly would be against extending it to the public sector unless that's what we have done in the past. So, Harry, could you tell me what boards actually do this..."

Leinenweber: "All local governments have immunity, for example."

Jaffe: "All local governments. So, you say that this would be the same as all local government bodies then I would



have no objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'.

Aye. Opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3490."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3490. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3436. I'm sorry. 3536."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3536. A Bill for an Act to revise obsolete references to Superintendent of Public Instruction and correct certain references to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Indeed as the synopsis states, the purpose of House Bill 3536 is to change obsolete references to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, an office which no longer exists. A determination had to be made, however; as to whether to give the powers and authorities involved to the State Board of Education or to the State Superintendent of Instruction. A group of us have been meeting on this matter all week, Legislators, both Democrats and Republicans and staffers, both Democrats and Republicans and the Executive Director of the School Problems Commission. We are going to make some changes and I want you to know that should you approve this Bill, and I hope you will, we will be offering an Amendment in the Senate that will make agreed upon changes in House Bill 3536. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from DuPage,



Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. I think there's an opportunity to clarify a lot of references and we will have this thing all cleaned up before you know it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3536 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Marco, vote me aye. Have all... The Chair has been asked a number of times how late we're going to be working. I have checked with the Speaker. It's the intent of the Chair to work till 8:00. At the request of the Speaker. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 ayes, 7 nos, 6 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3542."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3542, a Bill for an Act amending certain Acts in relation to tax rate limits of the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3542 is the rate increase for the Chicago Park District from 60¢ to 66¢ per \$100 of assessed valuation. The Bill also includes a rate increase from 9¢ to 12¢ for the museums and aquariums per \$100 of assessment. I think everybody understands what we're talking about in this Bill and I would feel free to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3542 pass?' Your light wasn't on, Ma'am. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill about which there has been some discussion since the attempt to amend this Bill to put a referendum requirement on it last week. This Bill is a tax increase without referendum and will further burden the taxpayers of the city of Chicago to the tune of some nine million dollars. The Civic ... Federation has noted its opposition to this Bill. Many of you have received notices from the Civic Federation regarding what we consider to be the outrage of the Park District double ganging on the citizens of the city of Chicago. I would point out first that there was a tax increase approved for the Chicago Park District in 1977. I would point out second that the Chicago Park District has refused to abate the personal property replacement taxes.. tax revenues. All in all the Park District will receive not only a windfall of tax money from its refusal to abate those taxes, but also some nine million dollars from this back-door tax increase on the citizens of the



people of the city of Chicago. Those matters of taxation policy depending on your point of view notwithstanding, I would point out to you the var.. there is a very serious problem within the city of Chicago regarding the distribution and allocation of services by the Chicago Park District. The corruption, the fraud and the refusal of the Chicago Park District to deal equitably with certain communities, particularly black communities, in the city of Chicago has been documented, not only by the Chicago Reporter, but also by a lengthy article .. series of articles in the Chicago Sun-Times. I would point out further, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this tax increase is not just a matter of providing services. Because again as I said last week I am a friend of the park. I consider myself to be a naturalist and I support Park Districts statewide. However, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Park District does not deliver for the dollars that is put into its' kitty. It does not deliver services in the black community. I would submit to you that it does not deliver services across the city of Chicago for the amount of money that is put into it. This.. These dollars, these extra tax dollars are needed not so much for increased services, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, but to maintain a personal empire that goes on in spite of itself and in spite of the opposition and in spite of the.. of the attempts by people in the city of Chicago to make it accountable for the way these tax dollars are spent. We are not just talking about providing for basic services in the city of Chicago. We are talking about getting something for our tax dollars. These tax... This Bill would put on the people of the city of Chicago a tax increase without a referendum. I encourage your 'no' vote. I encourage your vote for accountability in government and for



equitable and fair taxation policy. This Bill represents no more and no less than taxation without representation by many citizens in the city of Chicago and I encourage your 'no' vote on this legislation. Thank you."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the Members of the House that passage of this Bill will mean a doubling of the tax rate for the Chicago Park District in just 15 years. In 1965 the Legislature raised the rate to 33¢ for '66 and 35¢ for '67. Then in '67 it was raised to 33½ for '68 and 37 for '69. In '69 it was raised to 39 for '70 and 41 for '71. In '71 it was raised to 47. In '74 it was raised to 50. And in '77 it was raised to 60. All without referendum. You don't have any right to do that to the people of the city of Chicago no matter how their Legislators vote here today. It is the people of the city of Chicago that will have to pay and pay and pay and pay for this awful Bill. Please do not impose this on them. Please vote 'no' on this tax increase without referendum. It doubles the tax rate. Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, what you are about to do to the citizens of the city of Chicago could well be classified as statutory rape. Because by statute, by enactment, where the people have no right to protest, no right to assemble, no right to petition their Legislators, as to the wrong that they're doing, you're invading a fundamental right of the people to have some say-so about their money and where it is spent. The Chicago Park District could be indicted for a number of charges. They have been insensitive to the needs of the community. They have consistently through their hiring practices deliberately, overtly



and in other methods conspired to keep down the minority employment, not just Blacks, but Latinos and women. The Chicago Park District is a fiefdom run by Ed Kelly for the benefit of Kelly's ward and that is wrong. The Chicago Park District belongs to the people of the city of Chicago and not to Ed Kelly. I want to read you just a couple of things that we found from the Chicago Reporter talking about the way, the method, how the Park District funds are spent . . . representation, and you are going to put this on the people without referendum. The Park District, they talk about . . . they have money that has to be spent in low or middle class neighborhoods. Yet, in 1976 the Park District spent \$290,000 in federal ear-marked funds for low income neighborhoods to acquire a formal . . . a coal yard as the new park site near the Robert Taylor Home. That's a project. That same year the Park District spent \$322,240 of federal funds from the same program to purchase land for an extension, not the park, but an extension of 'Saganavsh Park' located in the wealthy northwest side neighborhood. 'Saganavsh Park' is the showcase with a new gymnasium and neatly manicured grounds. The lot located at 4134 to 4255 South State Street near the public housing high rise remains a junk yard cluttered with old cars, piles of tires and hazardous rubbish open to the thousands of Black children who live in the area. Going on, the Park District . . . "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Ewell. For what purpose does Mrs. Braun stand? . . . Seek recognition?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, the din in the room makes it difficult for me to follow Mr. Ewell's comments and I'd appreciate some order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Talk a little louder. The Park District fails to meet HUD guidelines requiring CD funds to be used primarily



in low and moderate income neighborhoods. Of the 117 parks for which the District allocated CD funds, 69 are located in higher income census tracts, while 37 projects are located in low and moderate income census tracts. Going on, the majority of contracting firms the Park District hires for CD projects are white owned and suburban based. It hired only one minority owned contract for the first year of CD projects. We could go on about the wrongs of Ed Kelly, about his private fiefdom, about the vassalage system that he employs, to bring in his particular ward.."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker...."

Ewell: "At the detriment of"

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

Farley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Gentleman would confine his remarks to the Bill and the merits of the Bill and not take a personal attack upon any Board Member or any General Superintendent, whether it be the Chicago Park District, or otherwise."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point's well taken, Sir. Please confine your remarks to House Bill 3542."

Ewell: "... And talk about the ills of the Park, I won't mention the name of the man who runs that park, nor will I mention his Ward. But I'll talk about the abuses that we found in this particular system. Ladies and Gentlemen...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly address yourself to 3542, Sir?"

Ewell: "No, no. I would not do that. Ladies and Gentlemen, talking about this Bill, the fundamental right of the people to be represented, to be heard, to have a fundamental right just to vote on it. Why can't you allow the people of the city of Chicago to vote or has the die been cast? Have you taken your dollars and silver Has there been an exchange that will not allow you to



stand with the people, but to turn your back for private gain? Ladies and Gentlemen, if you allow the Chicago Park District to double its rate in 15 years, to go on taxing, adding to the burden of the people I ask you how can you do this in good conscience? Ladies and Gentlemen, no political deal can be worth your basic morality. And I ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Ronan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again it's one week later and I stand here with the same amazement that I had last week when my colleagues from the city of Chicago who supposedly try to represent their constituencies are going to come here and make this foolish mistake by voting against the program that we need. There's one basic issue here and that's the kids in the city of Chicago. Where do my colleagues want these kids to go? What do you want? You want them in the street? You want them hitting people over the head? No, we want them in the parks. We've got instructors, we've got educators and we've got programs for them. These kids deserve an opportunity to learn how to play football and baseball in the sports that have made our country great. All I can say, I'm amazed when they talk about doubling in the last 15 years. What's inflation been for the last 15 years? We should triple it. We're not giving enough money to the parks. We should be taking 10, 12, 15 million dollars into the parks and let's make it our decision. We're the elected Representatives of the people of our Districts. We'll make the decisions. And that way the people get the benefits. They'll get the services. And the youth of our city will get the programs. Let's get around the business of the people of the city of Chicago. Let's vote this Bill up. Let's send it to the Senate where we've got a fight on our hands. But we'll pass it there be-



cause it's the right thing to do. Thank you very much and I'm proud of Representative Farley for putting in this fine Bill. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', Opposed. The 'aye's have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley, to close."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representati.. Representatives of the House. One speaker was quoting from an article written by the Chicago Reporter. I have here in my hand which is available to any Member, an answer to that report. I can read from this report which denies those charges and allegations. I can read to you a letter directed to the Department of Housing and Urban Development from Martin Murphy, from the Department of Planning, talking about the CD funds and the appropriate use that the Park District used those funds to. I would just suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is, in fact, a good Bill. Due to the personal property replacement elimination, due to the inflation factor, I think it is a necessary Bill and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3542 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Willer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to ask a question, but I can.. in explaining my 'no' vote, I certainly do not approve of not giving people the opportunity for referendum. But aside from that, I saw an interesting program on television where an alley was torn up in Chicago for the benefit of two families. I gather they had political clout, I can't remember their names. One was



a Judge. And turned into a park. Now if this is why.. how they're using money in Chicago, to create little Park Districts out of alleys, cutting off access for people through the alleys, private parks for individuals, no wonder they need money and I think this is a very bad Bill."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's obvious to me where the last Gentleman who spoke in favor of this Bill wants many of those children to play. I think he wants them to play in the coal yards and the junk yards and in those vacant lots that are full of rusted tin cans and broken concrete. But on the other hand, I wonder where they were all these years when the tax Bill passed with and every Session. They didn't holler for a referendum. Every Member, they idolized the Mayor who stood up here about eight years ago and said the referendum is the tool of the cowardly. The cowardly politician is the one who resorts to referendum. I believe in referendum. I believe those who are opposed to this Bill are correct this time and I think they have just cause to oppose this Bill and I will support them and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander. Timer's on."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was not here eight years ago in response to the other speaker. And I thank him for that statement. I would like to respond to the person who made reference to the children being in the parks. I received a list today from my district allocating the areas under the Chicago Park District which shows that a swimming pool has been in need of repair for over three years, that there were no washroom facilities, that the basketball courts were in total need of repair no marking that



there were no tennis courts or nets facilities, that the grass needs mowing, that there was no swings or anything. So I don't know where these children can play in these areas without proper rehabilitation to them. I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not here to defend the past record of the Park District. I do recognize my colleagues from my ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "... Microphone. Please continue."

Epton: "Probably just as well. I.. I certainly do not take issue of the remarks of my colleagues from my district and from the other districts of the city of Chicago. In many areas we have been short-changed. But there is no question that in order to rectify the errors of the past, this money must be forthcoming to the Park District. I have no patronage. I have no jobs. I have no voice in the operation of the Chicago Park District. But I will vote for this appropriation in hope in the belief that a good part of this money will go to correct the errors, to correct the past deficiencies of the Park District and I firmly believe that that will come to pass. Thank you."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The outcome of this Bill is quite evident to all who would look at the Board. But I merely want to say that we recognize how this Bill got 110 votes. Perhaps on the merits and perhaps on the Body politic. But I remember as a little boy growing up in North Carolina the Minister used to say to me that whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad. And that the mills of the Gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine."



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

Gaines: "It amazes me how unprincipled certain Legislators can get when a deal has been cut. Many Legislators have been hopping up here every since I've been here, talk about the sanctity of a referendum and about how they pledged back home they would not vote for a tax increase by a referendum. But yet, in this issue, where the most dictatorial agency in the Chicago area and most of you downstate claim all of them are dictatorial, but this is the most dictatorial, the most unreasonable governmental Body in the State of Illinois, wants to raise this tax without referendum. It's alright. And the Gentleman talking about my children, there are more Black children in Chicago than there are white children according to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Kane, Mrs. Karpziel. Timer's on."

Karpziel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to explain my vote. It seems that since I am quite new to all this, that it seems that for many years it is obviously the policy of this Legislature to set the tax rates for the Chicago Park District. Last week we had an Amendment on this Bill which I supported which would give the people of the city of Chicago the right to a referendum to increase their tax rate which I wholeheartedly agree with. I agree with all the speakers that say there should be no taxation without referendum. However, since that Amendment was defeated, it is still the policy of this Legislature to set the tax rate and if there is a tax increase needed then I am voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'aye's, 50 'no's, six recorded as



'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared... The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're entitled to that. "

Braun: "How many... How many votes does this require?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "89."

Braun: "Alright. In that case... In that case, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This question the Lady withdraws her request for a verification. There's 109 'aye's, 50 'no's, six recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. "



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 560."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 560. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. This is a very simple Bill. It's an attempt to clean up the provisions of legislation we passed last year regarding the pension tax shelter. Deals only with the downstate firemen's pension fund. It's supported by the Pension Laws Commission and it's my hope to send this to the Senate. And any pension fund that wishes to offer technical Amendments with regard to the tax shelter law may do so at that time. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 560 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 ayes, no nays, none recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Record Lechowicz and Domico aye on that. House Bill 803."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 803. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "House Bill 803 amends the IMRF Code and the purpose of this is to allow the General Assembly Retirement Members who are members of the IMRF to terminate their membership in the IMRF and transfer their service credits to the General Assembly Retirement Fund within 90 days following December 20, 1980. This has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission, and I'd urge your support."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "An individual who has served as a Member of the General Assembly who's served as a municipal official would be able to take credit for that time as a municipal official under this Amendment or Bill. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "It allows them to transfer credits over to the General Assembly Retirement System."

Schlickman: "What contribution would he have... additional contribution would he have to make?"

Terzich: "He would make the additional contribution of the differentiation between the General Assembly retirement cost and also what was contributed on his behalf into the IMRF."

Schlickman: "As has been done in the past."

Terzich: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Is it the same formula?"

Terzich: "Yeah."

Schlickman: "Okay. Now, this is not a Bill that comes out of the Law Revision Commission is it?"

Terzich: "No, this is the consolidation Bill actually. It's 1602 and 1603."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 803 pass? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 ayes, 1 nay, 7 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on Second Reading appears 2846."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McPike, Hannig, Birchler. Amends House Bill 2846 on page one and line one by deleting 205 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."



McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 2846 is identical to Representative Bradley's Bill that we debated the other day that gives a one percent investment tax credit to industry in Illinois changing to a two percent investment tax credit in 1983. The only difference between that... between Representative Bradley's Bill and this is that this Bill applies that investment tax credit against the four percent state income tax instead of against the corporate tax. I think you're very familiar with the philosophy behind this Bill. The business community tells me that if you give business an incentive, it will increase investment in the state. If you increase investments, you increase payroll, you increase income taxes, you increase corporate income taxes, and thereby; the state coffers grow. Theoretically, in the long run, the state loses no revenues because the investment tax credit is more than made up through growth in jobs and profits I would therefore solicit the favorable vote on this Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Mr. Sponsor, you indicated that business told you all the good things that would happen if we passed this Bill. Do you really believe it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McPike, did you hear the question? Mr. McPike, please. Leave him on."

McPike: "The question was, do I really believe the philosophy that they're pushing on this. Well, I certainly hope that it leads to increased investment in the state, yes."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Sponsor has indicated that he can't say that he really believes what he's proposing in this Amendment,



and I think we better vote it down, stay with the Bill that's out there and quit playing these games."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone who wants to bring their Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment see the Parliamentarian so he can come up with a list. Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye'. Aye. Opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Roll Call."

McPike: "I'd like to close, Mr. Sponsor (sic)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to close."

McPike: "The interesting thing about that last question was that that is the question that many of us on this side of the aisle posed two years ago when we were asked to remove the sales tax on new machinery in this state. We asked would it really lead to new investments. Well, so far after we've removed it, we haven't heard one word from the business community that it did increase investment in this state. But there is one thing I guess that we could say on this. The only way that they can get this investment tax credit is to indeed invest in our state. So if there's any philosophy... if there's any truth to this philosophy, the proof will be in the eating of the pudding and that will be the investments in this state, and if they make no investment then obviously they get no investment tax credits. I don't know if there's any other Bills currently on Third Reading that will give this House a chance to offer this investment. I understand there is one on postponed consideration. But considering the amount of time we've taken today on Bills on Third Reading, it's doubtful that we'll ever get to postponed consideration. For that and other reasons, I would solicit your favorable vote for the business community in this state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted



who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 75 ayes, 61 nays.

The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3173." "Second Reading." 3173, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3173. This Bill has been read a..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, it's on Second Reading. It's right on the Calendar. It's on page two. Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #3 was taken out of the record previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's Amendment? Mr. Bradley on Amendment #3. Yes, sir. Mr. Col... The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, what purpose seek recognition?"

Stuffle: "Point of order. The Bill... We went through a number of Amendments to Amendment #10. There was a request for a fiscal note. I think the next Amendment would be in order at this point would it not?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it would. Three was taken out of the record so that's not in order. It would be #11."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Macdonald. Amends House Bill 3173..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, this Amendment merely puts back in the counties that are three million and protects with the 8% all homeowners. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the previous time this Bill was considered on Second Reading we adopted an Amendment which would limit the increase in assessments for any home downstate to 8% next year. Representative Macdonald's Amendment makes this apply to Cook County as well. If we vote yes,



which I hope we do, no home in Cook County, in fact, no home in the entire State of Illinois would have its assessment increased more than 8% next year. And I do hope we give this a strong affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?"

There being no further discussion, the question is, shall Amendment #11 be adopted? All those in favor... All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Stuffle, Woodyard, Bradley. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 be deleting Section 2F-1 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, as I indicated when we went through the numerous Amendments on this Bill it's my opinion that the Amendment placed on the Bill by Representative Skinner may well kill this Bill. The Bill was introduced by myself, Representative Woodyard and others to deal with the farm assessment problems. I have no objection to the concept of the Skinner Amendment, however; I don't think it should be placed on a Bill that deals with farmland assessments. Amendment #12 very distinctly does the following. It provides for an 8% maximum aggregate farmland assessment increase from '79 to '80 assessment years and it takes out the County of Cook. This Amendment was worked in afternoon discussions among a number of people including myself, Representative Woodyard who, on the Republican side, is the hyphenated principal Sponsor, Representative Bradley and others who have dealt with this subject over a number of years with the Farm Bureau people, with the Department of Revenue. And I urge adoption of Amendment #12."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, what this Amendment does is guarantee that homeowners will not have a limit on the increase in their assessments next year. It completely guts the Amendment out. It returns the Bill to strictly a Bill that will give farmers special privileges. Now, it seems to me if we're going to give people special privileges homeowners are hurting just as much as farmers will. So I would respectfully ask that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?
There being no further... Mr. Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in support of this Amendment. This has taken a lot of time to work out an agreement. I'm a little unhappy with the loss of the individual parcels in going to an aggregate but I do believe that this will put the Bill in the passage form, and I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is indeed doing an injustice. We cannot exist in the State of Illinois half free, half slaves. What we have here is an Amendment that we have to... we must defeat this Amendment because all people in the State of Illinois must be treated equally. Now, we cannot have something that would separate just Cook County and take them out. That is not reasonable. We've always gone to the 500,000 people which only applies to the City of Chicago. But now when you start to separate between the counties and say that Cook County the people there don't need the same kind of relief, you're wrong. Even if there's only one farm, one farm in Cook County, they too deserve equal justice under the law. And what Mr. Stuffle is proposing here is not equal justice. It's separate, unequal and we know the evil that it will brew. Now, either we have to live together, be taxed together,



or we have to go down the drain together. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Amendment and people of good will will stand with Representative Skinner and his remarks."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I can see that some strange alignments coming along on this Bill. But I think what some of the people from Chicago are overlooking is that farm residential property is assessed the same as city residential property. There is no exception. What we've talking about is farmland which entirely different and if you assess farmland on the same basis that you did your residential property, a farmer wouldn't even be in business and you wouldn't have anything to eat and you might not like that either."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, well we had put in the Amendment to cover all homes and this absolutely takes out all of that. We have to remember that Cook County is half of the state population-wise of Illinois and I certainly do agree with the previous speaker, Representative Ewell and Representative Skinner. I think that this is an unfair Amendment and I would like to see it defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think our differences have been adequately explained and I would urge an aye vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #12 be adopted? All those in favor signify by voting aye, all those oppose by voting no. Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "No sir. I do not have that privilege, but I certainly do have the privilege of verifying the Affirmative Roll Call if the majority's reached and I would like that privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Daniels: to explain his vote."



Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think may be some of us have come in a little late on this issue and should have been able to address it a little more thoroughly. Everyone of you that has single family homes in your area, every single Member of the collar counties or Cook County should be concerned by this Amendment because it directly affects you. Directly affects your tax bill and your tax base. I submit to you that once again we have an unfair Amendment to those of us in single family areas, to those of us that have many times helped on farm legislation. We're going a little bit too far this time and this Amendment ought to be defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm not too sure how many of you are aware, but, you know, we do have some farms in Cook County as well and the Cook County Farm Bureau many times has had a little dinner, a little reception for the Legislators down here to try to make some people aware that we do have farms in Cook County. So this isn't a question of only the homeowners, but even the farmers who happen to have land in Cook County are exempt from this Bill as I understand it. I think this is blantly unfair. I think it's a bad precedent to be setting and I would urge some more red lights. Certainly everybody from Cook County ought to be voting against this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 82 ayes, 59 nos, 5 voting present. Mr. Skinner, do you persist in your request for a verification?"

Skinner: "I certainly do, Mr. Speaker. I see no other way to protect homeowners."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall proceed with a verification. Mr. Stuffle. Mr. Stuffle requests a poll of the absentees."



Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Anderson. Barnes.
Beatty. Borchers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bower, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bullock. Christensen. Ebbesen. Goodwin.
Greiman. Griesheimer. Harris. Hoffman. Huff.
Katz. Kelly. Klosak. Kucharski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kelly, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino. Leverenz. Margalus. Marovitz.
Mautino. McGrew. Molloy. Polk. Sandquist. Taylor.
Telcser. Walsh. Williams and Younge."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ralph Dunn, aye. Mr. Ralph Dunn
requests leave to be verified. Mrs. Stiehl requests
leave to be verified. Mr. Stearney requests leave to
be verified. Mr. Kulas requests leave to be verified.
Mr. Getty requests leave... Mr. Clerk, are you current?
Mr. Kulas requests leave to be verified. Mr. Getty
requests leave to be verified. Mr. Donovan requests
leave to be verified. Mr. Polk wishes to be recorded
as aye. And Mr. Greiman wishes to be recorded as no.
Mr. Doyle requests leave to be verified. Mr. Tuerk
wishes to be recorded as no. Mr. Leverenz wishes to be
recorded as aye. Mr. Clerk, proceed to read the affirmative
vote. Mr. Boucek wishes to change his vote from no to
aye. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn J. Please change me from aye to present, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Change Mr. Dunn from aye to present.

Jane Barnes, no. Proceed to read the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the affirmative vote. Ackerman.
Bell. Birchler. Boucek. Bower. Bradley. Breslin.
Brummer. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey.
Chapman. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico.
Donovan. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Flinn.
Dwight Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Hallock.
Hannig. Henry. Hoxsey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Keane.
Kelly. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas.
Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Matijevich."



McBroom. McClain. McMaster. McPike. Mulcahey. Neff.
 Oblinger. Patrick. Pechous. Polk. Pouncey. Preston.
 Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ronan.
 Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schuneman. Sharp. Slape.
 Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl.
 Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Terzich. Vinson.
 Watson. White. Wikoff. Winchester. Sam Wolf.
 Woodyard. No further."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kelly." Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I be verified as an affirmative vote, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Verify Mr. Kelly as an aye vote.

Are there any questions of the affirmative vote?

What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 85. Mr. Preston requests leave to be verified. Question of the affirmative roll. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Ah! The microphone is on. Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I asked for Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman."

Skinner: "Mr. Terzich."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich is in the center aisle."

Skinner: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Madigan: "Capparelli is on the side."

Skinner: "Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kornowicz is sitting right here."

Skinner: "Golly, everybody's is out of their seats. Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Madigan: "Who was that name?"

Skinner: "Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sharp. Mr. Sharp. Remove Mr. Sharp."

Skinner: "Mr. McClain."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McClain. Remove Mr. McClain."

Skinner: "Mr. Schisler."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schisler. Remove Mr. Schisler."

Skinner: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley. Remove Mr. Farley."

Skinner: "Mr. Keane."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane is at his chair."

Skinner: "Yes, I see his smiling face. Representative
Capuzi."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capuzi. Remove Mr. Capuzi."

Skinner: "Mr. Johnson."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson. On the Democratic side."

Skinner: "Mr. Domico."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Domico."

Skinner: "Mr. Richmond."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Richmond? Remove Mr. Richmond."

Skinner: "Mr. Pechous."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pechous. Mr. Garmisa should be restored
to the Roll Call. Mr. Goodwin wishes to be recorded
as aye. Mr. Marovitz wishes to be recorded as aye."

Skinner: "You're kidding."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor wishes to be recorded as aye.
Mr. Brummer wishes to change from aye to present."

Skinner: "I concede."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further questions?"

Skinner: "No. I concede The homeowners lose."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman concedes. And Mr. O'Brien
wishes to be recorded as aye. Mr. Stanley wishes to be
changed from no to aye. Aye to no. Mr. Bullock wishes
to be recorded as aye. Mr. Sandquist... Mr. Bullock.
Mr. Bullock is aye. Mr. Sandquist wishes to be recorded
as no. Representative Alexander like to be recorded
as aye. Mr. Clerk, do we have the count? Garmisa.
On this question there are 82 ayes, 62 nos and the
Amendment is adopted. Mr. McGrew wishes to be recorded
as aye. So the count shall be 83 to 62. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, Skinner. Amends House



Bill 3173 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is misnumbered. I wanted it to come after the next one. So I'll just withdraw it."

Speaker Madigan: "The Amendment has been withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3173 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Skinner: "I thought I was the Sponsor."

Stuffle: "Point of order. Mr. Speaker, I think this Amendment is dilatory. It's been considered and considered again with regard to this Bill. Obviously the vote on the last Amendment was the opposite of this particular issue. I think we have considered it in prior Amendments and I reiterate, I believe it is dilatory and I'd like a ruling from the Chair on that point."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Parliamentarian come to the podium? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, if you would like, I'll point out the differences between this Amendment and ... Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Parliamentarian, the question is, is this Amendment dilatory because it's duplicative of previous Amendments?"

Skinner: "Previous Amendments, Mr. Speaker, had to do with each individual farm tract not being able to be increased more than 8%. The Amendment which has just been adopted talks about farmland in the aggregate. What I have done in Amendment 14 is retain the Sponsor's revised language with regard to a limitation in the increase of assessed valuation on farmland in the aggregate and add into that language which was previously overwhelmingly adopted which would limit the increase in assessed valuation for each single family dwelling to 8%. In short, Amendment 14 is the best of all possible worlds."



Speaker Madigan: "The Chair rules that Mr. Stuffle's point is not well-taken. Mr. Skinner on the Amendment."
Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #14 is an attempt to give for these homeowners throughout the entire state a benchmark, a limit, a ceiling if you will above which their assessed valuations cannot rise next year. That benchmark will be 8% which has been previously adopted by the Representatives of homeowners in this General Assembly. I have included the new language which the Sponsor of the previously adopted Amendment which wiped out all homeowner gains, in this Bill wanted. We are limiting the aggregate, the increase in aggregate assessed valuation for farms to 8% as the Sponsor's desire. And what we're doing is cutting in the homeowners. Now there are a lot more homeowners in Illinois than there are farmers. Now the farmers are better organized which is quite obvious from the results from the last vote. But this is a very narrowly divided House, and a skillful Representative running against a less skillful Representative might be able to use this Roll Call to point out that a less skillful Representative did not really have the wishes and desires and needs of the homeowners in his district at a very high priority. I'm not suggesting that we not help out the farmers, but what I am suggesting is that we do help out the homeowners. If we don't adopt this Amendment, the homeowners are left out in the cold as usual. They are left out in the cold probably because they're not well organized. So it will take someone who is a skillful campaigner to put across that some of his opponents in the primary or in the general election do not vote for this Amendment. I'll be happy to provide the Roll Call if anybody wishes it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this



Amendment. To speak on point to the remarks of Representative Skinner, if you look at the vote on the last Amendment you will see Representative after Representative on both sides of the aisle who have supported the homeowner. Many who as I believe that this Amendment and the prior Amendments by the Gentleman from McHenry do not belong on a farm assessment Bill. He's had opportunities to introduce Bills to move them out on this floor on that subject. I and the others who are hyphenated Sponsors of this Bill introduced it to deal with farmland assessments. He knows that and we all know that. I would submit to you as well that there is still a vehicle on this floor to grant homeowner assessment breaks if you will, and that is Representative Campbell's Bill that changes the sales ratio studies and, in effect, I believe if you talk to the Department of Revenue will provide the same type of breaks you're working for but do it on a Bill that does it up front. Don't do it on our Bill that was submitted for farmland assessments only. I reiterate, I think we have no apologies to make. The record is clear, mine as others, on this type of legislation and I urge a no vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, too, would like to commend Representative Skinner for his sincere and dedicated effort to do something for homeowners. I'm sure that every Member in this House wants to do the same thing, but I would like to reiterate the comments by Representative Stuffle that this is a Bill that deals with one specific area and we hope that his concerns would be and should have been directed towards legislation introduced on his own and based on a yes or a no vote on its own merits. We would certainly support his efforts in that effort but we, on this particular issue, hope that the Bill remains intact as Representative Stuffle and Representative Woodyard have presented it to us."



Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not quite sure but I think I'm probably right. I'm the only one in the House here who has been an assessor. I assessed the land here in the City of Springfield for eight years. What you don't understand is that we farm people are not asking to reduce ours on our homes. They are assessed by square foot by construction and the rest of it just like the rest of yours. What we're talking about is that land out there in which we grow two dollars and fifty cent corn and that land is over inflated and I'll be very honest with you and fifteen years ago we bought our farm at 450 dollars an acre. It's now 4500 dollars and it's not worth it. And this is what we're talking about the over inflated land, not our homes. We're willing to continue to pay on our homes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The motion carries. Mr. Skinner to close the debate. Mr. Vinson on a parliamentary inquiry."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, is the Amendment germane? I would question the germaneness because it's not related to the title in that applies to a different year in change of the subject of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Parliamentarian come to the podium?"

The question is the germaneness of the Amendment.

Mr. Vinson, would you state your reasons again for the Parliamentarian?"

Vinson: "For two reasons, the title limits itself to farmland, number one. And number two, the title limits itself to 1979 and the Bill applies to 1980. The Amendment applies to 1980."



Speaker Madigan: "Parliament.. The Chair rules that the Amendment is germane. Mr. Skinner, to close the debate."

Skinner: "First of all I'd like to point out that there is no opportunity at the present time to amend Representative Campbell's Bill in the House because it's already passed. This is the last chance. I'd also like to let those people who have homeowners in their district realize that farmlands assessed somewhere between ten and eleven percent, maybe twelve percent of what it's worth, that is what it is selling for. It's fair market value in this state. And what this Bill is going to do is limit the increase in that assessment to 8% in the aggregate. That means the most it can be assessed if this Bill passes is twelve to thirteen percent. Homeowners, on the other hand, are assessed at 1/3 of market value, 33% of market value... of fair market value. What we're saying is that their assessments can't go up more than about two and half percentage points if this Bill passes. Every Member in this House does not care about homeowners who are real estate taxpayers. Don't let anybody suggest that that is not the case. Anyone who votes against this Amendment is saying about as loudly and as clearly as he or she can say that she doesn't give a damn about homeowners in his or her district. I do care about homeowners. I have heard about the problems in counties such as DuPage, in suburban Cook, about how high the assessments are increasing. There's only one way to put a limit on those tax... those tax assessment increases and that is to adopt Amendment #14 which is before you right now. I ask your approval of this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #14 be adopted? All those in favor signify by voting aye, all those oppose by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 58 ayes, 68 nos, no voting present. Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "I'm not going to verify it but there are 51 absentees and I would like them polled."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall poll the absentees."

Mr. Clerk, record Mr. Preston as no. Mr. Kosinski as no. Mr. White as no. Mr. McGrew from aye to no. Mr. Greiman no. Mrs. Catania as aye. Mr. Peters, aye. Mrs. Dyer, aye. Mr. Deuster, aye. Mr. Hallock, aye. Mr. Conti, aye. Mr. Williams, aye. Mr. Margalus, aye. Mr. Johnson, no. No. The Clerk shall call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Anderson. Beatty. Bianco. Borchers. Boucek. Brummer. Capuzi. Cullerton."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer, no. Brummer, no. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Darrow. Davis. Donovan. Doyle. Ebbesen. Farley. Gaines. Getty. Griesheimer. Grossi. Harris. Hoffman. Huff. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Klosak. Laurino. McAuliffe. Mugalian. Pechous. Polk. Richmond. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Sharp. Stearney. Totten. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Willer. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wikoff, no. What is the count, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Darrow, no. Darrow, no. On this question there are 63 ayes, 75 nos. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, has a fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 3569. Mr. Clerk, what order of business is this Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "3569: is on Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Bill is on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Daniels, do you wish to bring this back to the Order of Second Reading?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we had a lot Bills..."



Speaker Madigan: "Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, John Dunn-Daniels. Amends House Bill 3569 as amended with reference to page and line number of House Amendment #3 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Who is the Sponsor of the Amendment? Mr. Dunn, John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 deletes one of the two provisions of this Bill. The Bill did have a provision in it about the impoundment of files in the guardianship proceedings for disabled adults and we feel there are some possible real estate title provisions. So Amendment #4 deletes that provision and leaves the rest of the Bill as it was and I would ask for adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those opposed by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Would Mr. Garmisa come to the floor? Mr. Garmisa. On the Order of Postponed Consideration there appears House Bill 3200. Mr. Bradley asks that this Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Watson. Amends House Bill 3200 as amended in the last paragraph..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 to House Bill 3200 is a non-controversial Amendment. It has the endorsement of the Sponsor. It clears up a technical problem that we had in Amendment #6. I would like for a Roll Call vote on this, and I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."



Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies an Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman's entirely correct. It takes care of an Amendment that I think he placed on and clears up some language. We support the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any opposition to this Amendment? Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Two marvelous Sponsor but just out or curiosity, what's in the Bill besides the neat analysis that Watson gave? What's in the Bill or the Amendment?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "The Amendment included retailers in the Bill and the Department of Revenue had a problem with interpreting who a retailer was so this Amendment #9 clears that fact up."

Schneider: "What does it say retailer is?"

Watson: "Pardon me?"

Schneider: "Is a retailer a pharmacist or a...?"

Watson: "Yes, it includes pharmacists."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?"

There being no further discussion, there being no opposition to this Amendment; all those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2941. There was no opposition to the Amendment, Mr. Conti. No one rose in opposition to the Amendment. 2941. This Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mrs. Satterthwaite. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Satterwaite. Amends House Bill 2941 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Amendment proposed by the Legislative Reference



Bureau in order to put the previous Amendment in order with each other so to speak. Since we failed to table Amendment #2 before adopting Amendment 3 we need this technical Amendment. It makes no substantive change."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3365. The Bill shall be placed on Second Reading. Mr. Meyer. Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Amendment deletes... This is the hazardous waste Bill. It deletes any reference to siting authority or the state to have the power to set sites."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? Amendment #3. Question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3184. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments? Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have an Amendment which I would like to offer to this Bill but I believe there's some other Amendments already filed and you have to take them in order."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3184 in Section 1 by deleting Section 224 and so forth."



Bowman: "I see we seem to have caught Representative Skinner ... I think that one is the defective one. I think he wants to withdraw that and offer Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #2 shall be withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Skinner. Amends House Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in my constant attempt to be helpful to Sponsors of defective Bills, I've offered Amendment #3 which will... which will...which will limit this increase in the rapidity with which property taxpayers must pay real estate tax bills to Cook County. This cuts out all of downstate. In other words, if the Sponsors of this Bill which have plagued to be put upon the homeowners and the businessmen in Cook County, God bless them. They represent Cook County. I don't. But..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion?"

Skinner: "Leave it out of my county, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you Representative, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I resist the suggestion that the Bill is defective in the first place. However, in my constant efforts to satisfy persons who seem to have a hobby of offering Amendment to everybody's Bills, I'm very happy to accept this particular one. The problem is magnified many-fold in Cook County because the use of tax anticipation notes to a much greater extent than downstate. I'm happy to accept this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any opposition to this Amendment? There being no opposition, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Schuneman. Amends..."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman. Mr. Schuneman."

Q. Is Mr. Schuneman in the chamber? Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3184 on page one and line four..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you Representative... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since we've adopted Amendment #3, I'd like to withdraw 5 and offer 6 in its place."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #5 shall be withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 was worked out with the Department of Revenue after having learned of some problems that the Cook County Assessor and the Clerk and the Treasurer had with the Bill in its original form. Basically, Amendment #6 provides for two payments instead of three as the original Bill provided thereby cutting the postage cost. It provides that these two dates shall be accelerated up until the year 1990 in which case the first estimated bill will be due in April thereby giving the Assessor four months at the beginning of the year to complete his work. Those are the basic changes in the Bill that are contemplated by Amendment #6, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Schuneman."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what was the previous Amendment filed by Mr. Schuneman?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall return to Amendment #4. Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #4 shall be withdrawn. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Schuneman."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #7 simply provides that before this tax acceleration program can be put in effect..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has this Amendment been printed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Amendment is not printed and distributed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This is the last Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "No further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 1484, Mrs. Pullen. Mr. Bowman. Mrs. Pullen. Senate Bill 1484."

Pullen: "It's 'Miss', Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Senate Bill 1484 back to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Pullen. Amends Senate Bill 1484 on page one, line 25 and so forth."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1484 is a supplemental and transfer appropriation for the Department of Law Enforcement. This would add a Section providing for a new transfer that the Department was not aware they would need at the time that it passed the Senate. It would transfer monies from the Division of Administrative... Administration



Equipment line item in the amount of 25,000 dollars..."
 Speaker Madigan: "Is there any opposition to this Amendment?"

There being no opposition, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those opposed by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills, Second Reading, page two of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 697. There was a request for a fiscal note relative to this Bill. Mr. Clerk, has the fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Ebbesen. Amends House Bill 697 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had gone through Amendment 1, 2, and 3 and this Bill was just held for the fiscal note so it's ready to be passed on. I move for its passed on to Third Reading now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen in the chamber? Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Ebbesen is gone and is not here. I'm not sure how he feels about this Amendment and I wonder whether we should move the Bill without Mr. Ebbesen here."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, we..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birchler, the policy of the Chair, Mr. McMaster, would be that given the approaching deadline and Mr. Ebbesen's absence and the fact that we considered this Bill at great length on a previous day..."

Birchler: "He was here yesterday and that..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birchler, if you'd stop talking we'll move this to Third Reading. The Bill shall be placed on Third Reading. Are there any other Bills where the Sponsor wishes to move the Bill to Second Reading for



Amendments? Mr. McClain, do you have a Bill to be moved to Second Reading?"

McClain: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, 2520."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2520, shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, McClain. Amends House Bill 2520 as amended in the title and so forth."

McClain: "First, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 which was adopted by the House. There was a severe technical problem with that Amendment which was pointed out to us by the Governor's staff and we would ask, first, to... I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #3 was adopted by the House."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #3 was adopted. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The motion carries. The vote has been reconsidered."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, at this time then I would move to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #3 shall be withdrawn."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 to House Bill 2520 point out to us that Mr. Christensen's Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any opposition to this Amendment?"

McClain: "No, sir."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no opposition, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Giorgi, do you have any items for consideration? Are there any announcements? Are there any announcements? Mr. Ryan, do you have any announcements? Mr. Ryan, do you have any complaints? Grievances?"



Ryan: "No, I don't have any, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Very good. Thank you. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. For that purpose, the Chair recognizes Mr. Giorgi providing ten minutes for a Perfunctory Session. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn till 10:00 tomorrow morning. 10:00."

Speaker Madigan: "The motion is to adjourn till 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor signify by saying 'ayé'. All those oppose by saying 'no'. The ayes have it. The motion carries. We stand in adjournment until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Speaker... that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #91 adopted by the Senate May 21, 1980, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. That was Senate Joint Resolution 90 and 91. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence to the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #1664, 1609, 1612, 1614, 1619, 1621, 1629, 1635, 1638, 1639, 1483, 1497, 1518, 1538, 1677, 1694, 1712, 1739, 1740, and 1759 passed by the Senate May 21, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1573. Yeah. Richmond. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1579, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for retirement purposes for higher education institutions and agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill



1684, Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1817, no Sponsor... McGrew. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1819, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1820, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to child labor laws. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1821, Bower. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Financial Planning and Management Service Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1828, Keane. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1966, Ewing. A Bill for an Act in relation to township organization. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1881, Keane. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Home Care Reform Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1927, Ralph Dunn. A Bill for an Act to amend the Retailer's Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1978, Campbell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1979, Virginia Frederick. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1998, E.G. Steele. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating the investigation and prevention of fires. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1822, Reilly. A Bill for an Act in relation to the publication by the Secretary of State of Illinois Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1947, Bullock. A Bill for an Act in relation to instruction and testing of certain persons. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1999, Ewing. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Income Tax Act. First Reading of the



Bill. Senate Bill 2001, McBroom. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2002, Bell. A Bill for an Act in relation to public utilities and electric supplier taxes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2004, Ewing. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2005, Swanstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act provide for construction use maintenance of certain waters, terminal facilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2006, Hudson. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey quit-claim deeds. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2007, Woodyard. A Bill for an Act to release highway easements. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2019, Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend the Worker's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2022, no Sponsor... page 16. 2022, Reilly. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2027, Bullock. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2024, Reilly. A Bill for an Act concerning fairness and lending and real estate mortgages by financial institutions operating in this state. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 21, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0560	3RD READING	PAGE	218
HB-0697	2ND READING	PAGE	242
HB-0803	3RD READING	PAGE	218
HB-1602	3RD READING	PAGE	60
	TABLED	PAGE	63
HB-1603	3RD READING	PAGE	60
	TABLED	PAGE	63
HB-2027	1ST READING	PAGE	246
HB-2220	3RD READING	PAGE	63
HB-2520	2ND READING	PAGE	243
HB-2762	2ND READING	PAGE	39
HB-2788	3RD READING	PAGE	102
HB-2793	3RD READING	PAGE	72
HB-2837	3RD READING	PAGE	110
HB-2845	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-2846	2ND READING	PAGE	219
HB-2866	3RD READING	PAGE	113
HB-2876	3RD READING	PAGE	116
HB-2914	3RD READING	PAGE	118
HB-2926	3RD READING	PAGE	119
HB-2935	3RD READING	PAGE	119
HB-2941	2ND READING	PAGE	237
HB-2947	3RD READING	PAGE	120
HB-2948	3RD READING	PAGE	121
HB-2949	3RD READING	PAGE	121
HB-2950	3RD READING	PAGE	121
HB-2975	3RD READING	PAGE	122
HB-2987	3RD READING	PAGE	122
HB-3071	3RD READING	PAGE	123
HB-3114	3RD READING	PAGE	125
HB-3120	3RD READING	PAGE	128
HB-3127	3RD READING	PAGE	129
HB-3147	3RD READING	PAGE	132
HB-3160	3RD READING	PAGE	132
HB-3173	2ND READING	PAGE	6
	2ND READING	PAGE	222
HB-3184	2ND READING	PAGE	238
HB-3196	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-3200	2ND READING	PAGE	236
HB-3204	3RD READING	PAGE	75
HB-3206	2ND READING	PAGE	137
	3RD READING	PAGE	138
HB-3209	3RD READING	PAGE	139

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 21, 1980

PAGE 2

HB-3214	3RD READING	PAGE	80
HB-3216	3RD READING	PAGE	83
HB-3217	3RD READING	PAGE	90
HB-3218	3RD READING	PAGE	91
HB-3219	3RD READING	PAGE	93
HB-3236	3RD READING	PAGE	139
HB-3237	3RD READING	PAGE	140
HB-3246	3RD READING	PAGE	95
HB-3262	3RD READING	PAGE	154
	MOTIONS	PAGE	169
HB-3272	3RD READING	PAGE	162
HB-3281	3RD READING	PAGE	170
HB-3314	2ND READING	PAGE	179
	3RD READING	PAGE	190
HB-3325	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3365	2ND READING	PAGE	238
HB-3368	3RD READING	PAGE	198
HB-3376	3RD READING	PAGE	46
HB-3395	3RD READING	PAGE	95
HB-3404	3RD READING	PAGE	99
HB-3425	3RD READING	PAGE	101
HB-3426	3RD READING	PAGE	202
HB-3458	TABLED	PAGE	203
HB-3488	2ND READING	PAGE	203
HB-3536	3RD READING	PAGE	205
HB-3542	3RD READING	PAGE	207
HB-3569	2ND READING	PAGE	235
SB-1484	2ND READING	PAGE	241
SB-1505	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1571	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1572	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1573	1ST READING	PAGE	244
SB-1574	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1575	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1576	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1577	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1579	1ST READING	PAGE	244
SB-1581	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1583	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1613	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1622	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1632	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1641	3RD READING	PAGE	42

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 21, 1980

PAGE 3

SB-1646	3RD READING	PAGE	42
SB-1648	3RD READING	PAGE	43
SB-1649	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1656	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1684	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1709	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1729	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1747	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1752	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1808	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1813	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1815	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1817	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1819	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1820	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1821	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1822	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1828	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1834	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1837	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1844	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1881	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1886	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1927	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1947	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1956	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1966	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1967	1ST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1978	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1979	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1981	3RD READING	PAGE	45
SB-1984	3RD READING	PAGE	45
SB-1998	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-1999	1ST READING	PAGE	245
SB-2001	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2002	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2004	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2005	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2006	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2007	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2013	1ST READING	PAGE	6
SB-2014	1ST READING	PAGE	6
SB-2019	1ST READING	PAGE	246

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 21, 1980

PAGE 4

SB-2020	1ST READING	PAGE	6
SB-2022	1ST READING	PAGE	246
SB-2024	1ST READING	PAGE	246

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 21, 1980

PAGE 5

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	244
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	244
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	246