

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives. The House will convene in 5 minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record show, that Representative Walsh is in the chamber. The House will come to order, Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Father, Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Oh Lord bless this House to Thy service this day, Amen. I've been asked to say a prayer for Hyman A. Pierce who died. He is the father of State Representative Daniel M. Pierce, of Highland Park. Let us pray. Oh God, his mercies cannot be numbered. Except our prayers in behalf of the soul of Thy servant Hyman and grant him then entrance into the land of light and joy and the fellowship with all Thy Saints. Amen. May he rest in peace and may light perpetual shine upon him. Joseph Joberet said, children have more need of models, than of critics. Let us pray. Oh Lord our Father almighty, we beseech Thee to hear us as we call upon Thee this day for guidance and inspiration. We have been chosen to serve the people of this State of Illinois, as Members of this House of Representatives. We are mindful of the awesome responsibility which is entailed. And we are keenly aware of the scrutiny with which the electorate views us. Do Thou oh Lord, give us the wisdom and prudence to be constantly committed to exemplary conduct and deportment, that the example we do here portray may be emulated by all as the epitome of perfection and so stimulate the youth of this state and all others to initiate within themselves similar attributes. Through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, Pledge of Allegiance."

Walsh: "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. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary."

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, that the Senate has concurred with House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit. Bills 1508, 1529, 1540, 1542, 1600, 1692, 1708, 1718, 1733, passed by the Senate June 25th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Further messages. A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit. House Bills 1972, 2014, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2076, 2078, 2144, 2145, passed by the Senate June 25th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit. House Bills 1767, 1780, 1784, 1803, 1874, 1885, 1900, 1907, passed by the Senate June 25th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Messages from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of Bills to wit. House Bills 2111, 1470, 2132, 1478, 2129, 1482, 1526, 1535, 1570, 1576, 1623, 1681, 1686, 1693, 1769, 1771, 1782, 1790, 1802, 1804, 1805, 1811, 1840, 2041, 1841, 1873, 1888, 1968, 1922, 1939, 1944, together with the attached Amendments hereto, which Amendments have been printed by the Senate and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit, passed the Senate as amended, June 25th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "...Reading on Constitutional Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 46. Friedrich-McClain. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electorates of the state for the adoption or rejection at the General Election, next occurring at least six months after the

adoption of this Resolution. A proposition to amend Section 15 80  
 of Article VI of the Constitution to read as follows: Section 81  
 15, retirement, discipline. The General Assembly may provide  
 by law for the retirement of judges and associate judges, at a 82  
 prescribed age. Any retired judge or associate judge with his 83  
 consent, may assign by the Supreme Court, to judicial service 84  
 for which he shall receive an applicable compensation, in lieu 85  
 of retirement benefits. A retired associate judge may be 86  
 assigned only as an associate judge. The Judicial Inquiry 87  
 Board is created. The Supreme Court shall select two circuit 88  
 judges as members and the Governor shall appoint four members 89  
 who are not lawyers and three lawyers as members of the board. 89  
 No more than two of the lawyers and two of the nonlawyers 90  
 appointed by the Governor, shall be members of the same 91  
 political party. The terms of the board members shall be for 92  
 four years. A vacancy on the board, shall be filled for a full 92  
 term in the manner the original appointment was made. No 93  
 member may serve on the board more than eight years. The board 94  
 shall be convened permanently with authority to conduct 95  
 investigations received, or initiate complaints concerning the 96  
 judge or associate judge and file complaints with the Courts 96  
 Commission. The board shall not file a complaint unless five 97  
 members believe that a reasonable basis exists. One, to change 98  
 the judge or associate judge with willful...to charge the judge 99  
 or associate judge with willful misconduct in office. 100  
 Persistent failure to perform his duties or other conduct that 101  
 is prejudicial to the administrative of judges justice or that 101  
 brings the judicial office into disrepute. Or, two, to charge 102  
 that judge or associate judge with physical or mental...unable 103  
 to perform his duties. All proceedings of the board shall be 104  
 confidential, except the filing of the complaint with the 105  
 Courts Commission and as provided in Subsection H, of this 106  
 Section. The board shall prosecute the complaint. The board 107  
 shall adopt rules governing it's procedures and shall have 107  
 subpoena power and authority to appoint and direct its staff. 108  
 Members of the board who are not judges, shall receive per diem 109

compensation and necessary expenses. Members who are judges, 110  
 shall receive necessary expenses only. The General Assembly,  
 by law, shall appropriate funds for the operation of the board. 111  
 A Courts Commission is created consisting of one Supreme Court 112  
 judge selected by that court, who shall be its chairman. Two 113  
 appellate court judges selected by that court and two circuit 114  
 judges, selected by the Supreme Court. The Commission shall be 115  
 convened permanently, to hear complaints filed by the Judiciary 116  
 Inquiry Board. The Commission shall have authority after  
 notice and public hearing. One, to remove from office, suspend 117  
 without pay, censure or reprimand a judge or associate judge 118  
 for failure...for willful misconduct in office. Persistent 119  
 failure to perform his duties or other conduct that is 120  
 prejudicial to the administration of justice or that, brings  
 the judicial office into disrepute. Or, two, with or without 121  
 pay or retire a judge or associate judge who is physically or 122  
 mentally unable to perform his duties. The concurrence of 123  
 three members of the Commission, shall be necessary for a 124  
 decision. The decision of the Commission shall be final. The  
 Commission shall adopt rules governing its procedures and shall 125  
 have power to issue subpoenas. The General Assembly shall 127  
 provide by law, for the expenses of the Commission.  
 Information obtained or received by the Judicial Inquiry Board 128  
 in connection with any investigation or hearing pursuant to 129  
 this Section, which reasonably relates to a judges or associate 130  
 judges criminal misconduct, shall be furnished to the 131  
 appropriate State's Attorney's within thirty days at the  
 completion or termination of any proceedings of the board or 132  
 commission, as the case may be. First Reading of this 133  
 Constitutional Amendment." 134

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal." 136

Clerk Leone: "Sixty-sixth legislative day, June 14th, 1979. The 137  
 House met pursuant to adjournment, with Speaker in the Chair. 138  
 Prayer by Reverend Robert E. 'Schrake', Pastor of Lutheran 139  
 Memorial Evangelist Lutheran Church." 140

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz." 142

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journals number 66 of June 14th and Journal number 67 of June 15th, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. The reading of the Journal is dispensed with and the Journals are approved as if read. Roll Call been locked? If it is, Laurino is on green. ...eleven...the Order of Speaker's Table. House Resolution 81. Representative Ebbesen on the floor? Out of the record. 220. Representative Ewing. Ewing. Out of the record. Yeah. Out of the record. 236. Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. Representative Cullerton. House Resolution 236. You may not get back here again. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 236 calls for the establishment of a 'Gang Crime Committee', of the House. The Bill has been amended by Representative Piel, so that there are an equal number of Republicans as well as Democrats and the Committee will terminate after the completion of the 81st General Assembly. The Committee will not cost any money. The purpose of the Committee would be to study the need for legislation to in some way, help combat the increase in the number of gang crimes, especially evidenced recently with murders by different gangs in the City of Chicago. I'd ask for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Cullerton: "I will."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Polk: "Well, I'm very interested in what you're attempting to do, because it's obvious that in your community that you have some need. But I question your point of saying it will cost no money, how do you plan on funding this? Do you plan on having meetings throughout the state and other major metropolitan

areas where there may be crime problems? Do you plan on having 180  
travel. Do you plan on submitting a report to us?" 182

Cullerton: "The ah...as initially conceived, it was only going to 183  
deal with the activity, crime activity that we are aware of in 184  
the City of Chicago. And I anticipated that the members of the 185  
Committee would be members from Chicago and we would have 186  
meetings like at local community churches and places where we 187  
wouldn't have to spend any money to have a meeting. Other 188  
than...so there wouldn't be any travel allowance involved and 189  
there wouldn't be rent...renting of facilities involved. If we 190  
had to go, say to other areas of the state, then there would 191  
definitely would be an increase...there would be some cost 192  
involved. But, I didn't envision that when I first put this 192  
in."

Polk: "When it was discussed in Committee, did...were there other 193  
cities such as Peoria, East Moline, Rock Island that indicated 194  
they might also like to have some input?" 196

Cullerton: "They didn't really indicate that they wanted to have 197  
input, but I certainly am not adverse to that. Representative 198  
Piel just wanted to make sure that we had an equal number of 199  
Representatives from both sides of the aisle and it did have a 200  
definite time to terminate. But I don't recall any other 201  
Representatives indicating that they had any particular 202  
interest. If there is, then I still think it's a very good 203  
idea and I think that the cost would again still be minimal." 204

Polk: "You would be prepared then, to introduce appropriated 206  
legislation for revenue to...or for an appropriation to cover 207  
it?" 208

Cullerton: "Well, if it's needed. I just don't right now at this 209  
time, feel that it's going to cost any money if we restrict it 210  
just to Chicago." 211

Polk: "Well, obviously though, if you do put out...obviously if you 212  
gain...come to a conclusion, you're going to have to put out a 213  
report. Someone is going to have to type the report, there's 214  
got to be paper, ink. Very obviously it'll take some money to 215  
come up with a report." 216

Cullerton: "Well, we do have a commitment from staff, from the City of Chicago that it is going to work for us in this area, since it does involve potentially new ordinances in the City of Chicago as well as new legislation in the state."

Polk: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was on the Executive Committee and Representative Cullerton did deal with a rash of questions in reference to this. And I think the one thing that John wanted to get across when he did bring this up, that obviously Chicago out of all the communities in the State of Illinois probably has more gang crime and gang violence, than any city in this state. And it was with this in mind, that they were going to start with the City of Chicago, keep that on a local level. We had an expiration date and obviously if this goes over well, in the future it could go to other cities. And at that time you know, in future legis... in the future General Assemblys we could come up with an appropriation, but this is basically set up for the City of Chicago. And I think it's a very good idea and I would urge the adoption of House Resolution 236."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. Now this Commission under this Resolution..."

Cullerton: "It's not a Commission. It's not a Commission, a Committee."

Borchers: "Oh, Committee, very well, Committee. This really is not a bad idea, but I'd like to warn you about a few things, which you may not want to think of. First of all, I've long ago, I worked for the French Underground during World War II and I know very well with experience, the best way to know about the enemy is to go look at him. Now if this Committee is going to sit around and take other peoples ideas and reports, you're not going to be very adequate. You've got to have the guts to get out there and take a look at the Black Panthers, the Black P-Stone Nation, the Vice Lords, there're very

numerous...innumerable Latino gangs. Now that's going to take 255  
 some guts and some digging into the background, to know what in 256  
 the devil it's all about. And it is no use of embarking upon 257  
 this, unless you do the right kind of a job, or spending the 258  
 money, that lets you do the right kind of a job. I don't 259  
 believe in just taking reports here and there to the police 260  
 department. Very often, they are very inadequate. If you're  
 truly interested, you've got to dig underneath the surface. 261  
 Now again, it's going to take some guts to do this. I hope you 262  
 success, because it is a good idea. But I would hate to come 263  
 back and read your report, type written in some office and 264  
 realize that it doesn't adequately cover and you've not 265  
 adequately gone into and discovered the background and...well  
 the reasons are not too hard to ascertain. But the 266  
 information, who and what and the leadership and their 267  
 attitudes that will have to be countered, that is going to be 268  
 hard and important to do. So I just really want to caution you  
 that once upon a time this was part of my activities in life 269  
 and I don't invite myself on this Committee whatsoever, because 270  
 I just don't want to get into that anymore. I've about had 271  
 enough of that kind of business. But I do hope you success." 272

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on 274  
 Representative Cullerton's motion that the House adopt House 275  
 Resolution 236. Those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 276  
 Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115...117 277  
 'aye' and 2 'no' and the House does adopt House Resolution 236. 278  
 220. Representative Ewing." 279

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House 280  
 Resolution 220, would create a Committee. There is no cost or 281  
 appropriation on this, but a Committee to examine how we are 282  
 implementing our highway and road sign program in this state. 283  
 There seems to be a great deal of diversity across the State of 284  
 Illinois on the implementation of this program. It's very 285  
 important to the economic health of many of our communities.  
 And I am hopeful that this Committee of interested Legislators 286  
 might find some answers or some ways to improve our program 287



within the guidelines of the Federal Highway Act, which 288  
controls highway signs throughout the State of Illinois. I 289  
would ask for a favorable adoption." 290

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's 291  
motion that the House adopt House Resolution 220. Those in 292  
favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 293  
Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 294  
question, there's 110 'aye, 1 'no' and the House does adopt 295  
House Resolution 220. 265. Representative Willer." 296

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 265 would 297  
create a seven member ah pardon me, a thirteen member Committee 298  
to study management, accounting and programatic problems and 299  
evaluate solutions of our correctional industries. There is no 300  
appropriation connected with this. They must bring in a report 301  
by December 1st. It would consist of seven House Members in an 302  
advisory body from business and labor and the Department of 303  
Corrections. And I think this is an extremely important 304  
matter. In the Executive Committee there were only two 305  
dissenting votes, in Executive Committee. And I hoped that we 306  
would meet, the Committee would meet and come back with a good 307  
report, on what can be done with correctional industries. I 308  
think you all know it's in a mess. The Accounting Auditor 309  
General has thrown his hands up in horror at their bookkeeping. 310  
We have had four very good reports we can use as a basis of the 311  
study and I think its sufficient seriousness, that we get going 312  
with a good prison industry system, because it's certainly has 313  
sunk into a help in quelling the disturbances in our prisons 314  
and help prisoners to earn some money, have some self respect 315  
and when they go back into society perhaps have a skill. And I 316  
would ask for your support." 317

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner." 318

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't see the Chairman of the Legislative 319  
Audit Commission on the floor. But as a Member of the 320  
Legislative Audit Commission I would like to second 321  
Representative Willer's thought that this division of the 322  
Department of Corrections certainly needs all the attention it 323

can get. It is one of the sloppiest run operations that we in  
 the Legislative Audit Commission have ever seen. The  
 accountant, really does just throw up his hands, after he gets  
 finished auditing the the thing. It sort of comes to us is  
 that we sort of cross our fingers hopeing things will work out  
 okay. Or hopeing they have worked out okay. And it really  
 needs improvement. I'm for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is any duplication here?  
 Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is any duplication  
 here, between this proposed Committee and the House-Senate  
 Joint Committee on corrections, which you yourself, Mr.  
 Speaker, are the principal Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Different subject matter. I think that one  
 primarily concerns the physical facilities, the harboring of  
 the criminals. It has nothing to do except on a collateral way  
 with industries. I wouldn't consider it to be a duplication."

Getty: "Very good."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further. Question's on the Lady's motion  
 that the House adopt House Resolution 265. Those in favor vote  
 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Clerk will take the record. On this  
 question, there's 125 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does  
 adopt House Resolution 265. 284. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 284 is a  
 Resolution which urges the Southwest Regional Port District to  
 undertake to assist former employee groups in their need and  
 their desire to develop job opportunities for themselves. This  
 Resolution does not have appropriation. It is merely a urging  
 on the part of the House of the Southwest Port District and I  
 move for the passage of this Resolution. I ask for your  
 favorable consideration of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this out of the record, for a moment. Talk to  
 the Parliamentarian. 289. Representatives DiPrima, Pullen,  
 Kelly and Bower. Took it out of the record. Out of the  
 record, is that what you want? Well, I can't understand the  
 'wig wag' signals."

Anonymous: "I will go." 362

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly." 364

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the 365  
 passage of House Resolution 289. This protests the use of 366  
 public funds at the federal level to prevent 'virtual' 367  
 fertilization, which is the test-tube procedures. And I ask 368  
 for your support." 369

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's 370  
 motion that the House adopt House Resolution 289. Those in 371  
 favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', 372  
 opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 373  
 who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question 374  
 there's 83 'ayes' and 31 'no' and the House does adopt House 375  
 Resolution 289. 332. VonBoeckman." 376

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 377  
 What House Resolution 332 does, is direct the Depart...the 378  
 Transportation Study Commission to study the feasibility of 379  
 state acquiring abandoned railroad right-of-ways for use by 380  
 public for recreation or other purposes. The Executive 381  
 Committee recommend do adopt." 382

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Question is on... 383  
 Representative Ropp." 384

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think this is not a 385  
 bad Resolution, however I would think that I'd like to call to 386  
 your attention that we have found ourselves in the last few 387  
 days and few years, in a position where the state has more 388  
 facilities than they can actually handle financially, as well 389  
 as personnel wise. And I would hope that this particular 390  
 Commission would take into consideration that where there are 391  
 opportunities for more effective use of abandoned railroads for 392  
 let's say an agricultural production. Since land is certainly 393  
 not coming into production anymore, that we're losing it year 394  
 after year, that that ought to be given priority consideration, 395  
 so that we can continue to maintain facilities for production 396  
 of food rather than to always consider that it ought to be used 397  
 for recreational facilities, when in fact we may not have the 398

dollars to adequately fund it, develop it and to properly 397  
maintain it. So I hope that that Commission does give that 398  
some consideration." 399

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my thoughts to that, 400  
I agree with him one hundred percent. I feel that there are 401  
areas where abandoned railroads would serve as arterial 402  
highways through a community and I think if it's necessary, the 403  
community can acquire these and if it's feasible and for 404  
nothing else and the farmers want to buy it. But I think it 405  
has to be done constructive wise, instead of piecemeal and  
that's why I introduced this legislation." 407

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner." 409

Skinner: "Over the past several years, the thought has...the comment 410  
has come in the newspapers that the Rock Island and the 411  
Milwaukee may be going bankrupt. If they go bankrupt, they may 412  
abandon...they may attempt to abandon their right-of-way, which 413  
probably still should be continued to use for railroad 414  
commuting. Would your Committee consider studying that as  
well?" 415

VonBoeckman: "Well, I think that's what we're talking about." 417

Skinner: "Marvelous, thank you." 419

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Piel." 421

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield to a 422  
question? Representative VonBoeckman, just one question. The 423  
question has been brought up in the last couple of weeks, after 424  
looking at the HR 332. Is the basic purpose of this, the 425  
Commission, to come out with a recommendation in reference to 426  
the Rock Island Trail?" 427

VonBoeckman: "If need be." 429

Piel: "Pardon me." 431

VonBoeckman: "If need be." 433

Piel: "No, because this is what I've heard, this is the sole purpose, 434  
is to defeat the Rock Island Trail. Now if this is..." 436

VonBoeckman: "No." 438

Piel: "The Commission is one thing, but the Rock Island...just to 439  
defeat the Rock Island Trail is a different thing. That's the 440

reason I'm asking the question." 441

VonBoeckman: "Well, this isn't the reason I put in the legislation. 442  
We in the General Assembly, have been hassling this Rock Island 443  
Trail over and over and I can't see for the life of me, why we 444  
should have the future Legislators get in this kind of 445  
quandary. And I think that a regular Commission of the House 446  
should study this, and recommend it." 447

Piel: "Basically it is to study the Rock Island Trail situation. 448  
Thank you." 449

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the 450  
House adopt House Resolution 332. Those in favor say 'aye', 451  
'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 452  
'no'. Have all voted who wish? Sounds like we have a rather 453  
vocal minority. Take the record. On this question there's 120 454  
'aye' and 5 'no'. The House does adopt House Resolution 332. 455  
343, Representative Griesheimer. Representative Griesheimer,  
House Resolution 343. I understand that you have to suspend 456  
Rule 41(a). Are you aware of that?" 458

Griesheimer: "That's correct, I believe there's a motion filed." 460

Speaker Redmond: "Okay." 462

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker do you wish me to proceed on the motion?" 463

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? You have a motion on that you say?" 465

Griesheimer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I filed a motion some time ago." 468

Speaker Redmond: "It's on page 14. Okay, let's go to motions then. 469  
House Resol...order of motions with respect to House Resolution 470  
343. Representative Griesheimer." 472

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend the Rule 473  
pertaining to...reference to Committee of House Resolution 343, 474  
request immediate consideration on the basis that it is an 475  
emergency and should be given the immediate attention of the 476  
House." 477

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald, are you seeking 478  
recognition? The question is on Representative Griesheimer's 479  
motion that Rule 41(a) be suspended in order that House 480  
Resolution 343 may be given immediate consideration. Those in 481  
favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

Have all voted who wish? Representative Giorgi." 483

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, before we vote for this ludicrous Resolution, 484  
how many votes does it take?" 486

Speaker Redmond: "This motion requires 107." 488

Giorgi: "107, well, I suggest you read your...your Calendar to see 489  
whether you want to join in this folly of Griesheimers to 490  
declare war on Wisconsin. I think it's asinine and it's a..." 491

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer." 494

Giorgi: "...time of the House and if you..." 496

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't try to respond to the 497  
comments of the prior Representative for the Labor Unions from 498  
Wisconsin, but I would like to suggest to the House that 499  
although there is a certain degree of levity in this Resolution 500  
that the point of the Resolution is most sincere. And although 501  
the prior Speaker is so myopic as to afford the obvious that 502  
Illinois is losing jobs to the State of Wisconsin, I think that  
all of us should be readily aware of the fact that the State of 503  
Wisconsin is not merely drawing to the benefits out of the 504  
stupidity of this Legislature, but rather, it is invading this 505  
state, stealing jobs and business away. And it is a most 506  
serious problem that is affecting all of us. It's mind  
boggling to me that the Speakers who oppose so many of the 507  
corrections in the unemployment compensation and workman's 508  
compensation don't realize that they're laying the foundation 509  
for Wisconsin to come down here and take these jobs away from 510  
us. In fact, yesterday night well have been a total surrender  
of this state to the State of Wisconsin. I feel that this 511  
Resolution is no more ludicrous than the Resolutions that we 512  
continually memorialize Congress with. I feel it's a 513  
suggestion to the Governor that he, as our leader, regardless 514  
of what party the Governor may be, must take the reins of this  
entire governmental Body and charge forward to stop the State 515  
of Wisconsin from their continual infringements on the business 516  
and economic interest of this state. In the last several 518  
months the State of Wisconsin has been responsible for  
literally stealing hundreds and maybe even thousands of jobs 519

from Northeastern Illinois and I'm sure from 520  
 Representative...from the Representative's area that previously  
 spoke. Rockford is in an area of proximity to Wisconsin where 521  
 cities of Beloit and Madison readily can come across the border 522  
 and take those jobs. What we have to do as Legislators is 523  
 recognize these problems and call them to the attention of our 524  
 given leaders and the leader in this case is our Governor. I 525  
 would certainly hope that a few more votes would go up there on 526  
 the board to allow the suspension of this rule so that we can  
 memorialize our Governor to declare economic war on the State 527  
 of Wisconsin and so far as I am concerned he could easily do it 528  
 on all of the neighboring states. I feel we must do something 529  
 to improve our business climate in this state and at least one 530  
 of those things is to stop neighboring states from coming in to 531  
 our state and literally stealing jobs away from us. If you  
 have any doubts about the particulars of this particular 532  
 invasion, I'd be glad to give them to you. We have those 533  
 particulars, the 'if', 'ands' and 'whens' of when these 534  
 economic strike teams from the State of Wisconsin have come in 535  
 to Illinois, have caused businesses to give up options to  
 purchase new land, they have caused businesses to stop building 536  
 factories. In some cases, Goodyear Tire and Rubber moved out 537  
 of the North Chicago area and moved to Wisconsin. That lost 538  
 three hundred jobs and I believe the Representative from 539  
 Rockford's seatmate can confirm that. I think we need this. I  
 see that the Representative from Rockford is now in conference, 541  
 maybe a war conference over there, with the 542  
 Representative...with the Representative from Joliet. And who  
 knows, Indiana could be invading Joliet soon. So, in all 543  
 deference to the prior Speakers, I would urge this Legislature 544  
 to give immediate consideration to this important item. And I 545  
 also wish to dispel the rumors started by the Speaker, I am not 546  
 trying to be appointed Secretary of War of the State of  
 Illinois." 547

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi." 549

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if General Griesheimer would answer a 550

question? Inasmuch as Rockford is going to be near the 551  
perimeters of the war, do you plan to put women in the 552  
foxholes?" 553

Griesheimer: "Well, I've seen some pretty foxy things down there 554  
but...no...I would be willing to do it, Representative Giorgi. 555  
For you, in fact, I would make you a Lieutenant Colonel in this 556  
battle." 557

Matijevich: "How many votes does it take to declare war?" 559

Speaker Redmond: "You're going to have to refer that to the Senate." 560

Griesheimer: "Well I guess it does take the advice and consent of the 562  
Senate, yes." 563

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz." 565

Katz: "Well, I want to know if Mr. Griesheimer and Mr. Giorgi are 567  
going to claim combat pay?" 568

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer." 570

Griesheimer: "Well, there's no question. If you do have a right to 571  
combat pay, it'll be double per diem and each one of you will 572  
be issued a helmet with a spike on the top of it. And 573  
Leinenweber, by the way, is going to be the Herr Ober Leutness 574  
(German Title) of the entire operation. He will handle the 576  
panzer group. I'm...I'm taking care of the new submarine base  
that's being built at Waukegan Harbor." 578

Speaker Redmond: "Representatives Borchers." 580

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I've just been...I've just had some Members 581  
around me enlist in my regiment. They want to serve under me 582  
and so since Wisconsin doesn't know anything about this, I 583  
propose an instant strike against Milwaukee, Blist Creek, if 584  
you please, and I think it will be very successful. Those 585  
people don't know we're coming. So anyone that wishes to 586  
volunteer, just step over and I'll sign you up. You take your 587  
own risks. It will probably be very harzardous and dangerous 588  
because that's where the fun is." 589

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi." 590

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, will Fuel Commander Griesheimer...would you 591  
take an Amendment to this to include a pay raise for us?" 593

Griesheimer: "For military duty I would and please, you can refer to 594



me as Field Marshall." 596

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Representative Grieman." 597 598

Grieman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's with a heavy heart that I stand here before you all. My daughter, my #3 daughter Judith, lives in Madison, Wisconsin and if the war is declared, I'm going to tell her she can no longer come back to Tara, she can no longer cuz she's got to choose between the state of her birth and the state of her choice. When I go to join the 104th Skokie volunteers, on the front, it will be with no mercy in my heart and despite the fact that my baby is lying across those lines, she will have to meet the full onslaught of the Illinois Armed Forces. God help us all, brothers and sisters." 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 608

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster." 610

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a sign-up sheet here, the 107th Regiment from Mundelein is going to attack the Playboy Club at Lake Geneva and we need all the help we can get." 611 612 613 614

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis." 616

Davis: "Well, Mr. Sponsor...Mr. Speaker, rather, I'm a little upset with the Sponsor here this morning for offering this Resolution without having talked to the commanding officer of the Illinois Naval Auxiliary Defense Corp. But I just want to tell you, Representative Griesheimer, I'm voting green and the whole facility of the Defense Corp is going to be at your disposal and they'll be operating out of Blarney Island, the Representative...the Blarney Island Base and we've got the tire fixed on the Bass boat's trailer so the executive officers flag ship will be there. And when they come, we're ready." 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625

Speaker Redmond: "Colonel Mahar, United States Army Retired." 627

Mahar: "What I was going to say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, was the fact that we missed the whole point. For years we've been looking for some method by which we could use the Naval Militia. And there's nothing wrong I think with testing the Naval Militia and see if they can lay seige to Milwaukee and how well they can do as whether we should retain 628 629 630 631 632

them or not." 633

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel." 635

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two things. First of all, I realize 636  
right now I'm voting green, but I'm going to have to vote 637  
yellow for the main reason that my in-laws live in Wisconsin, 638  
that could possibly be a conflict of interest. And second of 639  
all, I would ask the Sponsor if he would withdraw this from the 640  
record so that we could have Representatives Stuffle, Terzich 641  
and Beatty work out the pension system for the Army and Naval 642  
Militia before we go in to war." 643

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins." 645

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm truly appalled by this air of appeasement 646  
that is prevalent in this chamber today. When you realize the 647  
assets that we have at our disposal, we've got Wolf and Davis 648  
to lead the Naval Militia, we've got DiPrima and Mahar to 649  
organize the land forces and with Southern Illinois University 650  
and the University of Illinois' Air Force, one quick strike and 651  
we've got them. And if you're worried, if you're worried about  
Indiana, we'll keep them diverted in Cal City." 653

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. Wikoff, then I'll be back 654  
to Waddell." 655

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder if all those voting 656  
yellow up there really are." 658

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell." 660

Waddell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's with reluctance that I remind you 661  
that Representative Wolf sunk the Illinois Navy. And 662  
therefore, Admiral Griesheimer cannot attack their bastion up 663  
there at Milwaukee." 664

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative 665  
Griesheimer." 666

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an opportunity 667  
to close on this most important issue. Just during the brief 668  
time we've been discussing this magnanimous matter here, I have 669  
had a number of people come up to me and offer their talents. 670  
For instance, can you imagine any one of us declining to serve 671  
in the military forces, the grand Army of Illinois, when 672

Colonel DiPrima is the recruiter. Have any one of you ever  
 voted against one of his Bills, obviously not. He could easily  
 recruit every person in this state. But Representative Brummer  
 will obviously be the tactician. He will be the tactician  
 because he came up with the master stroke. We need the  
 ultimate weapon and he has it. He suggested that we let Skylab  
 fall on Wisconsin, then we don't even have to invade them. And  
 when we have Colonel Jake Wolf in charge of the Coastal River  
 Patrol System we make have another President in the offing, you  
 know it worked for John Kennedy. But in conclusion, I want you  
 to know that my military background would offer an invaluable  
 assist, it...we are close to the border and I'd be willing to  
 take on the responsibility of organizing the military forces.  
 The first strike would be at Racine, of course, and if we took  
 Racine we'd move on to Milwaukee. We could probably take over  
 because 'Don Goff' here goes up there in uniform about once a  
 month anyway to serve in his military capacity and actually,  
 he's been an undercover agent for the Governor for years up  
 there. With all this background, I offer my services to you.  
 I will organize it and I humbly do accept the title that's been  
 bestowed upon me as the new 'Prairie Fox'."

Speaker Redmond: "What plans do you have for Lieutenant-Commander  
 Geo-Karis from Lake County?"

Griesheimer: "She will handle the heavy duty guns."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am  
 enjoying the jest, if it wasn't so serious. We are exporting  
 our jobs by our own actions. So the first thing we need to do  
 is to mobilize ourselves here at home and put together Bills  
 that will keep the industry in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the provincial forces of the 33rd District  
 hereby volunteer. As a three star general in the Fox River  
 Road Air Force, I'm authorized to say that our hot air balloon  
 force will drop pamphlets over Wisconsin if the winds are  
 right. And as an Admiral in the Lake in the Hills Navy, I will

authorize the forces that can no longer float on the Lake in 710  
the Hills because the Department of Transportation forced the  
lake to be drown...drained, to be transferred to the Fox River 712  
and we attack through the chain of lakes." 713

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes." 715

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Relative to 716  
Representative Griesheimer and his frontal attack on Wisconsin, 717  
I understand he said Racine in Milwaukee, but I want to 718  
suggest, don't forget the Dells, move them closer to Chicago so 719  
it don't take me so long to drive up there." 720

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 721  
record. On this question there are 73 'aye', 31 'no'. Motion 722  
fails. Should have kept that until Saturday night at midnight. 723  
House Resolution 372, Representative Younge. Representative 724  
Younge in the Chamber? Take that out of the record. House 725  
Joint Resolution 2. Pechous. Out of the record. 726  
Representative Ebbesen. Out of the record. House Joint 726  
Resolution 13, Representative Yourell." 727

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 728  
House Joint Resolution 13, was presented to the last session of 729  
the General Assembly and passed out of the House with an 730  
overwhelming vote. What it does is to instruct the Clerk of 731  
the House of Representatives, Secretary of the Senate, in 732  
response to inquiries on a toll free telephone service, to 733  
provide legislative information to any constituent that has 734  
need of that information. If anybody wanted to find out how an 735  
individual voted on any specific issue, they could find that 736  
out on an Amendment and they could get a Roll Call if they  
want. I think this is one area where we can be valuable to our  
constituency, so that we don't have to mail out Roll Calls. 737  
All we have to do is let them exercise there citizen 738  
responsibility and request the vote of any Member of the 739  
General Assembly, should they care to do so. I move for the 740  
adoption of House Joint Resolution 13." 741

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's 742  
motion to adopt House Joint Resolution... Representative 743

Leinenweber." 744

Leinenweber: "Yeah, will the Gentleman yield to a question?" 746

Speaker Redmond: "He will." 748

Leinenweber: "What is this going to cost the state?" 750

Yourell: "The last figure I had, was \$2,000, because it does not go 751  
into effect...I mean it goes into effect from now to January 752  
1980, on a trial basis to see how it works out. About \$2,000." 753

Leinenweber: "You mean they are already going to be doing it, even 755  
without the Resolution?" 757

Yourell: "No, they're not." 759

Leinenweber: "I thought you just said, that it's going to go on a 760  
trial basis in 1980." 761

Yourell: "I said it will go on a trial basis, if this Resolution 762  
passes, until January 1980." 764

Leinenweber: "Well Mr. Speaker, very briefly. This information is 765  
public knowledge now. There are toll free numbers, if the 766  
constituents knew them. I think you could even tell your 767  
constituents what the toll free numbers are. I don't see any 768  
reason to have an additional toll free line. This...all of 769  
this information is available now and I don't see why we should  
tell the Clerk to do something else." 771

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine." 773

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a 774  
question? Is it possible now for somebody to call in and 775  
request a Roll Call of a Bill and say I want a Roll Call on 776  
that ERA Bill, or something like that and they'll receive such 777  
a Roll Call?" 778

Yourell: "No." 780

Birkinbine: "From the way it's described in this, it sounds as though 781  
we're limiting the amount of information people can get. Are 782  
you limiting it, or simply specifying?" 784

Yourell: "I'm specifying what they can get, to make it easier for the 785  
Clerk and to avoid any conflict with Members of the General 786  
Assembly. All this does, is provide a toll free telephone 787  
number. We do not have, as one individual stated, a toll free 788  
number now for the citizens of Illinois to call to get 789

legislative information. That number does not exist, in spite 789  
of what the former speaker...prior speaker said. There is no 790  
toll free number. This would provide a toll free number to be 791  
publicized by the media of the state, if they would do that, I 792  
have doubts about that. But I would hope that the news media 793  
of the state would publish the toll free number with a little 794  
information. And if anybody wanted a Roll Call record vote, 795  
they could get it. If any vote of any Member of the General 796  
Assembly on an issue, an Amendment, or any other legislative 797  
matter pertaining to our activities here in the General 798  
Assembly. I think we can do no less than to provide our 799  
constituency with that information, because at election time, 800  
many individuals run around the state in their districts and 801  
say, oh yes, I voted for this, I voted against this, I did this 802  
and I did not do this. There's no real way, unless you provide 803  
a number for the citizens to call the Clerk of the House or the 804  
Secretary of the Senate to get that information. I don't think 805  
anybody doesn't want their Roll Call record known. I wouldn't 806  
imagine for what reason that information should be kept secret. 807  
If we vote yes or no or present on an issue in the General 808  
Assembly, we should vote that way, because of reasons that we 809  
believe in and that those reasons and that vote should be 810  
public to all of the citizens of Illinois." 811

Birkinbine: "I agree, that sounds like a fine idea. My only concern 812  
was, that you would be limiting the kind of information they 813  
could get. I think they should have full access to our voting 814  
record. Thank you." 815

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten." 816

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am really surprised at the 817  
Sponsor on this measure to allow this information to go out. 818  
It's going to cost the state some money and he well knows that 819  
he has a running mate in his own district, who supplies that 820  
information to all the newspapers and to all the people in the 821  
district. And it can be done by your colleague like that, for 822  
nothing. And we really don't need this Resolution." 823

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen." 824

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Members. This Resolution really is unnecessary. People know where we are. Most of us have legislative offices in our districts. They can contact us and ask for this kind of information. We are the liaisons between the Legislature and the people in our district, that's one of the things we are elected to do. If anybody really wants to know my vote on something, I'll tell them my vote on something. And if I won't, I imagine someone else in my district will. This will also cost the idea of someone in the Clerk's Office sitting there to answer that telephone and give that information on a regular basis. It's going to cost more than \$2,000. And I think it's a little bit strange to have it installed now on a trial basis until January 1, 1980, which is next January, so that we're going to be paying the phone bill for a toll free number all that time, when we are in session almost none during that time and very few people would even be using it. Maybe that's to our advantage, because we could say next January, we don't need this anymore, look nobody called. But I think that we'd be putting an awful lot of money into something that isn't...that is obviously not going to work. Why do we need to try it? If we were going to try it, it would be better to do it while we're in session than during the off time. And I urge everyone to vote 'no' on this costly, useless Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't understand the logic of the prior speaker. She says...uses the word obviously quite generously as to the amount of money this will cost for your information Representative, the obvious answer is, that the Department of General Services has advised me it will cost \$2,000. Now as to why we're putting it in now, this Bill was filed a long long time ago, at the beginning of the session. Just now, we're getting around to calling it. I think now is the proper time at the conclusion of our legislative activities where all of the Bills, or all of the Bills will soon to be voted on and now the newspapers will be

hopefully talking about what happened in this session of the 856  
 General Assembly and will soon be going into a campaign and we 857  
 ourselves are going to be traveling about the state, saying I 858  
 voted for this and I voted against that. We all know that 859  
 that's not true in all cases. All I'm suggesting is, that we  
 provide a toll free telephone number that our citizens can 860  
 inquire as to how we voted on any issue confronting this 861  
 General Assembly. Now if you're afraid of that, if you're 862  
 afraid of having your constituents find out how you voted, then 863  
 I suggest you vote against it. But if you're not afraid to let 864  
 them know how you voted, then vote 'aye'." 865

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House 866  
 adopt House Joint Resolution 13. Those in favor vote 'aye', 867  
 opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 868  
 who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question 869  
 there's 73 'aye' and 32 'no'. The motion carried and the House 870  
 adopts House Joint Resolution 13. Representative Walsh." 871

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, since this requires an expenditure of 872  
 funds, it's my view that it takes 89 votes for it to pass." 874

Speaker Redmond: "If that's true, the Parliamentarian has a notation 875  
 here, that it was simple majority. I don't know... 876  
 Parliamentarian will you please come to the podium? I cut it 877  
 off short, we could open it up again. The Parliamentarian 878  
 advises me, that the language urges the General Services to 879  
 install a toll free telephone, it doesn't mandate any  
 expenditures. So he still advises me, it's a simple majority. 880  
 Motion carried and the House adopts House Joint Resolution 13. 881  
 21. Out of the record. Yeah, it carried. The House adopts 882  
 House Joint Resolution 13. House Joint Resolution 24. 883  
 Representative Brummer. You want to go with that one? 24. 884  
 Out of the record. I think we have enough attendance here that 884  
 we probably should go back to things we have to do. Roll Call 885  
 for attendance. Is that yesterday's Calendar there? 886  
 Representative Leinenweber." 887

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I think Representative Kornowicz wanted to take 888  
 59. It's a good Resolution. While you're there, why don't you 889



go to that one?" 890

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll get back to that, I think we have to do 891  
the things we have to do. We'll get back to that. 892  
Representative Madigan." 893

Madigan: "Will the record show, that Representative Pierce is excused 894  
because of the death of his father?" 896

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody did mention that there's an urgency on 897  
House Joint Resolution 59. Is that correct? Maybe I better 898  
call this one more. House Joint Resolution 59. Representative 899  
Kornowicz." 900

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Joint 901  
Resolution 59, proposed to create a joint seat...ah CETA 902  
investigating Committee, for the purpose of investigating of 903  
alleged abuses and misuses of the CETA program in the State of 904  
Illinois. It is to report to the General Assembly on April the 905  
1st. Now this Committee, would be composed of twelve Members, 906  
six Members of the House, three appointed by the Speaker and 907  
three appointed by the Minority Leader. And also, six Members 908  
of the Senate, three appointed by the President and three 909  
appointed by the Minority Leader. There was an Amendment to 910  
this, that the Committee is to report by April the 1st 1980 and 910  
the 'destruction' of the Committee on July the 1st, 1980. This 911  
is a very important House Joint Resolution. I had the great 911  
pleasure to have one of the greatest State Representatives on 912  
the Republican side to endorse it and Mr. Leinenweber. And I 913  
ask for a..." 914

Speaker Redmond: "The questions...any discussion? The question's on 915  
the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt House Joint 916  
Resolution 59. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 917  
Representative Collins." 918

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I was with him until that last sentence and I 919  
have to vote 'no'." 921

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 922  
Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' 923  
and 6 'no' and the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 59. 924  
I'm going to go to Third Reading. Short Debate. Page 2, 565, 925

Representative Marovitz. Is Representative Marovitz here? 926  
 Marovitz. Out of the record. 651. Representative Lechowicz.  
 Out of the record. 768. Representative O'Brien. Out of the 927  
 record. 1038. Representative Ewing, are you handling that? 928  
 You handling that? 1038." 929

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1038. A Bill for An Act in relation to 930  
 the penalties for failing to file or for filing fraudulent tax 931  
 returns. Third Reading of the Bill." 933

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could hold that for just about 5 934  
 minutes? Come right back to it." 936

Speaker Redmond: "I'll hold it for 5 minutes and I'll try to get 937  
 back." 938

Ewing: "Thank you." 940

Speaker Redmond: "1072, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. 941  
 1172, Stuffle. 1172." 943

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1172. A Bill for An Act to amend 944  
 Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 946

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle." 948

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Senate Bill 1172, is as 949  
 amended. The school aid formula that we passed and sent to the 950  
 Senate with over 150 votes on House Bill 513. In addition to 951  
 that, Representative Hoffman, Schneider and myself have amended 952  
 into this Bill the provision that would prevent any windfall by 953  
 school districts in 1981, when the infusion of corporate 954  
 replacement money has an effect on the school aid formula.  
 This has been debated on a number of occasions in Committee. 955  
 It was debated in the person of House Bill 513. I would be 956  
 glad to answer any questions that you might have. And would 957  
 ask for a favorable Roll Call." 958

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman." 960

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 961  
 of the House. The Sponsor of the Bill describes the Bill 962  
 accurately. I would just refresh your memory that House Bill 963  
 513, that we sent out here, sent out of this House, eliminates 964  
 the...ah through the elimination of the...adjustment. Will 965  
 move us onto a one payment rather than a two payment a year,

which will make it much easier for the Legislature to deal with 966  
 and for school districts to relate to. The formula, we 967  
 increased the resource equalizer level for students up to 1363 968  
 and provide some assistance for Strayer-Haig districts, as well 969  
 as providing for full access to the state money over a three 970  
 year period. I think this is an excellent program and would 971  
 encourage your support of this Bill." 972

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor 973  
 vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have 974  
 all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 975  
 question, 149 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received 976  
 the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1342." 977

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1342. A Bill for An Act to amend 979  
 Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the 980  
 Bill." 981

Speaker Redmond: "...immigration into DuPage County. Senator Pate 982  
 Phillips, former House Member. If you want to come into the 983  
 county, you have to see Pate. 1342, out of the record, request 984  
 of the Sponsor. Senate Bills Third Reading. 47. 985  
 Representative Kelly. Out of the record. 101. Representative  
 Deuster. Representative Anderson." 987

Anderson: "I wonder if the Sponsor would hold that Bill for a 988  
 meeting. I have..." 989

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, what's your 990  
 respect...wishes." 991

Anderson: "I have our staff meeting with BOB, trying to resolve some 992  
 of the fiscal problems with this, to try and get some correct 993  
 facts." 994

Deuster: "Well, Representative Anderson, I... normally I'm always 995  
 happy to accede to any requests on...in that nature. I don't 996  
 know how much time you need, or when we would get back to this. 997  
 We're in the last week of the session. You have a copy of the 998  
 fiscal note from the Bureau of the Budget. I don't know how 999  
 much more fiscal information you need than that, or..." 1000

Anderson: "Well, I have your handout, Representative Deuster and 1001  
 there's quite a discrepancy with the fiscal note that I have 1002

House  
SB 745

and what you passed out. If I could have another half hour, I think that would be sufficient." 1003  
1004

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm one that always believes in responding to a reasonable request of any Member. If this could be brought back after a half an hour...that takes us into lunch time, but..." 1005  
1006  
1007  
1008

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll do the best I can." 1010

Deuster: "Thank you. I'd be happy to do that." 1012

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 375. Representative Stuffle. Out of the record. 574. Terzich. ...out of the record. 687. Representative McBroom. Is Representative Broom(sic) here? Out of the record. 745. E.M. Barnes. Out of the record." 1013  
1014  
1015  
1017

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 745. A Bill for An Act in relation to state contracts with small construction businesses. Third Reading of the Bill." 1018  
1019  
1020

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes." 1022

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 745 would provide for a certified contract, in a manner similar to Section 88 of the U.S. Business Administration. The key difference is, however, is that Senate Bill 745 will provide for competitive bidding on such contracts whereas under 88 such contracts are negotiated. This would allow the state to maintain competitive awards and would allow small contractors a greater opportunity to participate in the competitive bidding process. The advance payment provisions of this Bill, would allow for participation of qualified small contractors faced with a cash flow problem. Such advanced payments would be only for labor and materials. And I reiterate, only for labor and materials and would be co-signed by a representative of the CDB or an authorized officer of DOT or DAS. The prime interest rate charged on such advance, would tend to reduce overall costs of the projects and small contractors traditionally pay high interest rate on contractual loans, construction loans. Number 3 under this Bill, is CDB and DAS and DOT will maintain control over what contracts are to be included in the certified package and will

 1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039

have the needed flexibility to select the most appropriate 1040  
 contract for the designation. A four year provision for review 1041  
 was originally in this Bill when it came from the Senate. 1042  
 Representative Leinenweber amended this Bill to have the  
 destruction clause in it at the end of the four years. So at 1044  
 the end of the four years this total provision self-destructs.  
 So I would ask and urge the support of the House on Senate Bill 1045  
 745. This Bill, as I understand and I don't have the digest 1046  
 before me, had very little, very little problems in the 1047  
 Committee. One of the things...the question that was raised in 1048  
 Committee was relative to the self-destruct provision and 1049  
 under...as I indicated earlier, under an Amendment offered by  
 Representative Leinenweber we took care of that situation. It 1050  
 was heard in the Executive Committee of the House. And it was 1051  
 recommended due pass 17 to 1. I would urge the support of the 1052  
 House for Senate Bill 745." 1053

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman." 1055

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?" 1057

Speaker Redmond: "He'll yield, yes." 1059

Schlickman: "What definition in the Bill is there, of small 1060  
 construction business?" 1061

Barnes: "As I understand the Bill Representative, and I was looking 1062  
 for the Bill here, I don't have the Bill right here, but as I 1063  
 understand, that definition is the same definition as now 1064  
 currently ...in law, relative to...ah in the Purchasing Act. I 1065  
 would assume the same definition would prevail here." 1066

Schlickman: "I don't know that there is any definition of a small 1067  
 construction business in the Purchasing Act." 1069

Barnes: "I believe that Representative Jones did have one and it is 1070  
 one that was in the Act." 1072

Schlickman: "What is that definition?" 1074

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones." 1076

Jones: "Yes thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the question, I 1077  
 believe as I...cause I passed that Bill, oh about 4 or 5 years 1078  
 ago and I believe we deal with sales, annual sales of a 1079  
 particular small business. I believe that annual sales was 1080

around \$300,000. I'm not certain at this point." 1081

Schlickman: "Well, is that of a small business or a small 1082  
construction business?" 1083

Jones: "Small construction." 1085

Schlickman: "Under the Purchasing Act, no advances can be made until 1086  
the project has been completed. Under your Bill, you authorize 1087  
the Capital Development Board to make advance payments. How do 1088  
you reconcile that conflict?" 1089

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes." 1091

Barnes: "As I indicated, number 2 change in this provision would 1092  
allow for advance payments, but only, only in the area of labor 1093  
and materials. And it would necessitate co-signing by the 1094  
representative of the CDB, or an authorized officer of DOT or 1095  
DAS. The reason for that, is the problem that small 1096  
contractors face, with their cash flow situation. And it 1097  
would...as I indicated would allow it for those two purposes, 1098  
labor and material and it would have to be co-signed by those 1099  
representatives. The prime interest rate charged on such 1100  
advance, as I indicated, would tend to reduce the overall cost 1101  
of the project because of the traditional higher interest rate 1102  
on the construction loans of small businesses." 1103

Schlickman: "One more question. Under this Bill, you would provide 1104  
that 10 percent of state construction projects be set aside for 1105  
small construction firms?" 1106

Barnes: "I believe that the 10 percent figure is concurrent with the 1107  
federal provisions that are already standard." 1109

Schlickman: "Now, won't that have the effect of reducing the number 1110  
of bidders on those designated projects and thereby up the cost 1111  
to the state for the work?" 1112

Barnes: "To the contrary, I think it would have the effect of 1113  
increasing the bidding on those projects because you would have 1114  
more small businessmen able to participate in the program, 1115  
contrary to the manner in which it is now, where they simply 1116  
cannot, I'm talking about small construction firms now, simply 1117  
cannot compete with the larger firms on an equal basis. I'm 1118  
sure you understand that. This would open up vistas for those

small construction companies on these various projects that they can have a track record, can perform on, but right now simply can't compete with the larger firms. That's all it will do. Instead of narrowing the scope of it, it would expand it in the sense it would allow more small business construction firms to get into the construction area."

Schlickman: "One final question and I apologize for stating earlier that that was my last question. Is it true that the Capital Development Board, the Department of Administrative Services and the Department of Transportation are in opposition to this Bill?"

Barnes: "To the best of my knowledge, that is not true. The Bill was heard in Committee as I indicated. That was not...and either the Senate Committee or the House Committee, 'no' in the House, 'no' in the Senate floor, did either one of those agencies as you indicated, express any opposition to this Bill. Contrary, they worked with and tightened up the provisions of the Bill and indicated at the time of passage in the Senate that they would support it."

Schlickman: "Well, according to our staff analysis, dated June 4th, 1979, the Capital Development Board, the Department of Administrative Services and the Department of Transportation all opposed this Bill."

Barnes: "I know of no time, that either one of those agencies filed an opposition to this Bill during the period of time it has worked its way through the legislative hopper."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I can recall this proposal back oh, probably 1973, it came before the Labor and Commerce Committee when I chaired that particular Committee. Senator Washington has had this concept for a long time and as recently as 77 it was held in the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee. I understand the concept, I'm sympathetic to it to the extent that it can be implemented. But as Representative Schlickman pointed out, there are various agencies throughout

the state that feel this legislation has some holes in it, to 1156  
 the point it cannot be implemented properly. I think the State 1157  
 of Illinois has the concept in its heart and is trying to do 1158  
 what it can, but I frankly think the legislation just puts too 1159  
 many straps on the state agencies. And I would hope that this  
 Bill would not be passed." 1161

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, to close." 1163

Barnes: "Well, thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of 1164  
 the House, as I indicated this is a full face attempt to try to 1165  
 expand the opportunities and scope for small construction firms 1166  
 to get into the competitive bidding process for work in the 1167  
 construction field. This in no way would limit, nor would it 1168  
 increase the cost of these various projects to state  
 government. It will simply include on a competitive and I want 1169  
 to underline that, on a competitive basis, those small 1170  
 construction companies that are within the state, that would 1171  
 under this Act, be able to compete in this area of construction 1172  
 for the State of Illinois. I see no reason why we should not  
 attempt and we are always trying to include all of the aspects 1173  
 of the business community, to be able to on a competitive 1174  
 basis, to be able to involve theirself in the economic climate 1175  
 of the State of Illinois. The only thing this Bill is doing, 1176  
 is trying to insure that those small construction firms and  
 there are many many of them, spread out all across the state, 1177  
 North, South, East and West, would be able to become involved 1178  
 in the construction, construction industry on a competitive 1179  
 basis. And I would urge the support of the House on Senate  
 Bill 745." 1181

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor 1182  
 vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have 1183  
 all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 1184  
 question there's 127 'aye' and 13 'no' and the Bill having 1185  
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1186  
 760, Representative Stuffle. Out of the record. 762, 1187  
 Representative Van Dwyne. Representative Van Dwyne. Out of  
 the record. 905. Stuffle." 1189



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 905. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections 1190  
of the Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill." 1192

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle." 1194

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I would ask leave to hear 1195  
Senate Bill 905 and 906 together." 1197

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no 1198  
objection, leave is granted. Read 906, Mr. Clerk." 1200

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 906. A Bill for An Act to authorize the 1201  
establishment of communication networks in order to provide 1202  
people of Illinois with the ability to complete certain 1203  
financial transactions through electronic means. Third Reading 1204  
of the Bill." 1205

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle." 1207

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Senate Bills 905 and 906 - 1208  
were debated at length in the Financial Institutions Committee 1209  
and on Second Reading by this House. Many Amendments were 1210  
offered. I indicated at that time that these Bills have the 1211  
support and the approbation of all the major banking groups in 1212  
this state and the support of the Savings and Loan League in 1213  
this state. I know of no organized opposition to these Bills.  
Senate Bill 905 provides for automatic teller machines to be 1214  
deployed by banks in the State of Illinois and gives the same 1215  
authority to savings and loans that are state charters in 1216  
Illinois. It provides that those institutions may operate up 1217  
to 10 off-premise automatic teller machines. It provides for 1218  
home office protections within the legislation. It provides  
and sets out those types of transactions that.. and functions 1219  
that are allowed in the ATM structure. Senate Bill 906 1220  
provides for the deployment of point of sale terminals at 1222  
retail operations by financial institutions and details the  
types of networks that would transmit under the EFT program, 1223  
both proprietary functions, that is proprietary operations in 1224  
state-wide networks. It also sets out in the two Bills 1225  
together a number of provisions that are consumer protections.  
In fact, about ten pages of such adopting federal programs and 1226  
provisions with regard to the point of sale terminals and their 1227

transactions. The Bill also points out the types of transactions that are allowed on the point of sale terminals. There are specific provisions in the Bill to prevent any monopoly. There are provisions in the Bill protecting the consumer and protecting little banks as well as large. The Bill provides that there has to be 200 banks in the ownership of a state-wide facility operation for it to act and 100 on line and ready to go before we can activate a program. I would answer any questions that you might have and I would ask for a favorable vote on Senate Bills 905 and 906."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Representative Stuffle, I have a series of questions and I'd like to start off by saying, 'What is the potential for error in 905 and 906 if we were to go into the...the computerized system of financial transactions in the State of Illinois?'"

Stuffle: "We already have computerized transactions in the State of Illinois. We have them in the city of Springfield. I happen to have been involved with those programs. I know many people who are and they have worked smoothly to my knowledge. I have discussed those programs with people who are involved with them here in the banking community. I think there's obviously a margin for error anywhere. It would be a guess as to what that margin might be, but there are consumer safeguards built into the Bills to protect against that sort of error and to provide for recourse by the consumer if he is wronged."

Mautino: "Would you then tell me how it is possible with electronic funds transfer system to stop payment on a check.. stop payment on a transaction with the electronic funds system?"

Stuffle: "The Bill provides for a period of time and pre-authorized line of credit where you could indicate, for example Representative Mautino, if every month your insurance bill, or whatever, for example, were being paid by an electronic funds transfer by a card or by an access device that you could tell

whoever might be involved in advance within three days of when that transaction was to take place on a pre-authorized activity that you want the payment stopped. With regard to one that you make yourself, you activate the device. If you go down and just as you cash a check, that would go through.. definitely go through the bank. But you could then have the recourse. You could call the bank obviously and tell them that once the transaction is made you want payment stopped. Just as you do with a check now, when you've written a check now, you've got to go back and go to the bank and tell them that you want the payment stopped."

Mautino: "Then as a final question, 'Who are putting the bookkeeping procedures and the record keeping procedures on now?' At least as it is now in the system you have the advantage of your own bookkeeping system and corrections if necessary. On electronic funds, how would this be addressed, Sir?"

Stuffle: "I answered that question in Committee for you and I believe the Representative from the Illinois Bankers Association answered it as I did, that there would still be the same sort of pencil and paper and computer operations in the banks of financial institutions to keep track of the records and keep track of the transactions just as they do now where you have pencil and paper accounts and you, yourself, I assume would keep your own records as you do now in your own checking account."

Mautino: "Well, may I speak to the Bill then, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mautino: "The Bills 905 and 906... I stand in opposition, not organized opposition and I understand that this piece of legislation is supposedly agreed upon by the financial institutions in the State of Illinois. I stand because of the questions I raised and I add one more provision to it and that is the provision of privacy. And I think that's an issue where people have to face with enactment of this type of legislation and most importantly I don't think that anyone on this House floor, male or female, has the answers to those type questions."

It's my feeling that since I do have some knowledge and a 1300 1336  
 business that is involved with computer sciences and computers, 1338  
 there are mistakes. Computers break down. Error is possible. 1301 1339  
 I think you're taking a step with this type of legislation at 1302 1340  
 both the retail level and through all financial transactions 1303 1341  
 that you're opening up an area that should not be opened in the 1304 1342  
 State of Illinois. I have reservations and I think something 1305 1344  
 new and shiny in this respect is not very timely. The 1345  
 potential for error and the bookkeeping procedures and the loss 1306 1346  
 of the intimate situation and record keeping devices that you 1307 1348  
 now have under the existing system I think would be lost. Most 1308 1350  
 importantly there's going to have to be a major terminal 1309 1352  
 somewhere in the State of Illinois. I don't know where that 1354  
 terminal is going to be, but I now that there has to be an 1310 1355  
 interconnecting link between the regions that are set up under 1311 1356  
 this legislation on adjacent counties. I think we have a 1312 1357  
 problem with it. I'm not organized opposition but I do know 1359  
 that if you have ever tried to get a bill or something 1313 1360  
 corrected with a computer, you've had a hell of a problem. And 1314 1361  
 I think to do it in the financial arena is going to do nothing 1315 1362  
 but cause chaos and I stand in opposition to both of these 1316 1363  
 Bills, 905 and 906."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Balanoff." 1319 1366

Balanoff: "Will the Sponsor yield?" 1321 1367

Speaker Redmond: "What'd you say?" 1323 1368

Balanoff: "Will he yield?" 1325 1369

Speaker Redmond: "He will." 1327 1370

Balanoff: "Is this electronic device just another name for branch 1328 1371  
 banking?" 1329

Stuffle: "Not in my opinion. It may be ruled by this House that due 1330 1372  
 to the peculiar nature of the language in the Constitution that 1331 1373  
 this may be branch banking. It is not branch banking in my 1332 1374  
 opinion. It's not brick and mortar branch banking, but rather 1333 1375  
 it seems to me the difference between this and the potential 1334 1376  
 for brick and mortar branch banking is simply that the consumer 1335  
 here has the ability to decide whether he wants to use this 1336 1377

type of activity or the conventional banking activities as they exist now. There would be no new banks." 1336

Balanoff: "My other question. The synopsis says that the administering of these devices would cost the State of Illinois \$250,000,000. Is that correct?" 1338

Stuffle: "I don't know where you got that. The fiscal note is \$1..." 1339

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty and Capparelli, will you please step aside?" 1340

Stuffle; "The fiscal note filed by the Commissioner of Banks indicates the cost at \$110,000." 1341

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell." 1342

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?" 1343

Speaker Redmond: "He will." 1344

Waddell: "What do we have now in the way of mileage as you would relate it to let's say banking facility at the... at the county seat? And then for a town let's say that's 15 miles away, are you providing for an electronic device with no mileage in there at all?" 1345

Stuffle: "Representative Waddell, I'm not certain if you're speaking to where the transmission facilities would be or where the terminals might be?" 1346

Waddell: "The terminal." 1347

Stuffle: "Okay, Representative Waddell, the Bills provide with regard to the tellers in the terminals...with regard to the tellers, that they may only be established by banks or savings and loans in their own county or in contiguous counties and there is a limit of 10 teller machines in those operations by each institution. Any institution may deploy them. There may be no more than four in the contiguous counties out of the total of 10. They may not go beyond their own county and the contiguous counties. The same basically holds true for financial institutions on the terminal operations and the Bill does not affect those terminals that may now be or in the future deployed by let's say Sears and Roebuck or someone, so long as those retail outlets do not begin bank transactions with the bank. Those protections were written in for the retailers in

this state at their request. But this basically is written so that everyone has the same ability to get on line to deploy terminals, to deploy automatic teller machines. They have to be shared in most cases in the Bill and in fact the only instance where a bank can, if you will, control its own machines and keep people off is their ability to deploy only two teller machines and not share those. But they may even share those. I think you also may have raised the question about how far away from where these may be done. We've written into the Bill basically the provisions that are in the facility law now to limit where these can be deployed. The two teller machines have to be deployed within 3500 yards of the home office, the main banking house. And secondly they are the same in similar provisions written in as are in the facility law for home office protections throughout Illinois and particularly in the central business district of Chicago."

Waddell: "May I give you an example? Let's say that you had 3 banks in Peoria and 3 banks at Pekin and now you have Bartonville between, how many outlets could they actually place in Bartonville?"

Stuffle: "Representative, I think your question... it depends on whether they're in the same county or not. You can...you can... any bank can deploy 2 automatic teller machines in its own county. Any bank over a period of 3 more years can deploy 8 more, four of which may be in the contiguous counties... any bank, four of which would be in their own county. So there could be six in their own county and four in the contiguous counties. So if those banks are in different counties the answer is two in their own and as many as four in the other contiguous counties."

Waddell: "Well in that case we are authorizing branch banking. And I would then be in opposition to these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have one question of the Sponsor and then I have a parliamentary inquiry if I may."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

- Dunn: "Mr. Sponsor, the Bill... House Bill 1299 was not amended into either of these Bills, was it?" 1416  
1418
- Stuffle: "House Bill 1299 was not amended into either of these Bills and as far as I'm concerned it will not be. As you know I am an opponent of branch banking in the brick and mortar sense completely. So it was not amended in." 1419  
1420  
1421  
1422
- Dunn: "Thank you, I thought that was right, but I wanted to be sure for the record. I understood there was some Amendments offered. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Under Article XIII in Section 8 of the Constitution on branch banking seems to me like this would be branch banking, should require an extraordinary Majority. Is that correct?" 1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428
- Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that that is correct and it would appear that it would require 107 votes. In the Senate they sent the message over and specifically said it had a three-fifths Majority." 1429  
1430  
1431  
1432
- Dunn: "Mr. Speaker...then I'd like to address the Bill..." 1434
- Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute...the Majority of the Members elected. Three-fifths of the Members voting on the question. Representative Stuffle." 1435  
1436  
1437
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on that point would you clarify for the Membership that is not 107 necessarily?" 1438  
1440
- Speaker Redmond: "That's three-fifths of the Members voting...Representative Dunn." 1441  
1442
- Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I...in light of your ruling that this is branch banking, I call the attention of the Members that this is what many of us have been opposing and while it's not brick and mortar branch banking, it is branch banking and we'll have terminals and we'll have branch banking all over the state. I join with Representative Mautino and others who have some concern about the Bill. I think probably we're going to have it some day. I'm not sure that this is the right vehicle at the right time and inasmuch as this is branch banking in its purest form outside of the brick and mortar connected with it, I would urge that we oppose and not approve the Bill. Thank

you." 1452

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing." 1454

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 1456

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The 1457  
question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor 1458  
indicate by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' 1459  
have it. The motion carries. Representative Stuffle to 1460  
close." 1461

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I as much if not more than 1462  
most or many of the Members of this House oppose branch 1463  
banking. I do not believe this to be branch banking in its 1464  
classical sense despite the ruling and the peculiarities of the 1465  
Constitution with regard to its language on branch banking. I 1466  
believe in effect...in fact that this Bill if passed, that 1467  
these 2 Bills may well mean that those of us who have fought 1468  
branch banking may have won the battle. I certainly hope so. 1469  
But I present these Bills to you as an alternative form of 1470  
banking if you will. Consumers do not have to participate in 1471  
this type of banking activity. It's left up to them. They're 1472  
not monopolized by this type of activity as they might be if 1473  
you happen to be one who opposes branch banking. If you 1474  
believe that branch banking may bring about a monopoly then I 1475  
suggest to you that you look at these Bills because these Bills 1476  
give each banking house the same abilities to deploy terminals 1477  
and to deploy automatic teller machines. I would point out 1478  
with regard to the remark by Representative Mautino as I did in 1479  
the Committee, make no mistake here. The Bill does not allow a 1480  
monopoly on the transition...transmission facilities either, 1481  
but provides both for local transmission facilities and for 1482  
state-wide networks. There could and in fact would be, if this 1483  
is implemented into law, many facilities not one. I've 1484  
indicated to you that there are the federal consumer protection 1485  
guidelines written into the Bill. I indicate to you again I 1486  
think it is a good Bill and I indicate to you again this Bill 1487  
is supported by the Association for Modern Banking in Illinois, 1488  
by the Illinois Savings and Loan League and importantly I point 1489



out to you most vigorously supported by the two groups which 1486  
 have consistently opposed holding companies which have 1487  
 consistently opposed branch banking, that being Illinois 1488  
 Bankers Association and the independent community banks in  
 Illinois and I would ask you for a favorable Roll Call on 1489  
 Senate Bills 905 and 906." 1490

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' Those 1491  
 in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative O'Brien 1492  
 to explain his vote." 1493

O'Brien: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Members. I see that 1494  
 these Bills are going to get the same amount of time to be 1495  
 debated on the House floor that they were given in the 1496  
 Financial Institutions Committee. I'd like to point out to the 1497  
 Members on the floor that these Bills are branch banking and 1498  
 that the industry has agreed and the Parliamentarian has made  
 a ruling and it does take 107 votes as of the Constitution from 1499  
 1970. Some of the questions that I had, I wanted to ask, have 1500  
 an answer by Representative Stuffle were related to the privacy 1501  
 question that was brought up by Representative Mautino in 1502  
 relation to privacy from 'Big Brother' for your financing,  
 privacy from your family in relation to financial matters that 1503  
 you may have, privacy basically for the people that stand right 1504  
 behind you in line with these electronic transfer machines, 1505  
 electronic teller machines. At best I don't think that these 1506  
 Bills are in the form that we can pass on to the consumer with 1507  
 enough protection for the consumer in the State of Illinois and 1508  
 I'd encourage everybody to vote present. Automatic means loss 1509  
 of jobs and moving of funds and transferring of funds without  
 proper records. In my estimation, these Bills, quite frankly 1510  
 and especially 906 are going to be in court and are against the 1511  
 anti-trust provisions just like the Nebraska law is. I'd 1512  
 encourage everybody to vote present at this time." 1513

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle." 1515

Stuffle: "Yes, I should've explained the anti-trust question because 1516  
 I knew that Representative O'Brien would raise it. The 1517  
 Nebraska anti-trust question centered upon the issue of the 1518

fact that there was only one transmission facility and only one switch and therefore a monopoly. This is not the case here. As I indicated there would be many transmission facilities, both local and state-wide. The anti-trust question does not pertain in the sense of the Nebraska issue at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, if this gets the...enough votes, I'd like to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote I want to ask what Mr...Representative Stuffle has already said, this legislation is supported strongly by the Illinois Bankers Association, the Independent Bankers Association and I, as far as I know, the 'AMBI' people are not objecting to it. It's also been amended to where it suits the retailers in the State of Illinois and to my knowledge there's very little opposition to the legislation as it's been amended and now stands. Therefore I would hope we would give it the required number of votes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen...Piel."

Piel: "There is a difference, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To reiterate what I said when we were discussing the Amendments on this Bill, this is not a hairbrained scheme that they thought up overnight. This is the brain child supposedly of the Committee that worked on this for over a year and a half. As has been reiterated by many of the Speakers, this is supported by the complete, I use the word complete, financial industry, including ICBI, AMBI and IBA. It's also the work of Electronic Funds of Illinois. This is a Committee that was set up for this purpose, to study this. This is something that is really needed. It is not branching. Unfortunately the opponents are leading everybody to believe that this is a form of branching. It has nothing to do with branching. It gives every bank in the State of Illinois equal opportunity. They can put these teller machines right next to each other in the same place to give everybody equal

opportunity and it's definately something that is needed by the 1556  
consumer in Illinois and I ask for your green votes on this." 1557

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff." 1559

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1560  
In explaining my 'aye' vote, I don't think anyone would deny 1561  
that no one's more against branch banking than I. But I can 1562  
tell you in looking at this Bill and it's intent that it's 1563  
anything but branch banking. It may be called alternative 1564  
banking and banking by convenience. It may be that, but what 1565  
it doesn't do, as I understand branch banking is to aggressively 1566  
seek control of other banks by transfer of stock, nor does it 1567  
attempt to have anything to do with altering any individual 1568  
banking monetary policy. It's a banking concept. It's new 1569  
based on convenience and I think, competitiveness, in which the 1570  
consumer decides how to use it and in most cases based purely 1571  
on logistics and convenience. It's a good Bill." 1572

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen." 1573

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, it's very doubtful that I would be able to do 1574  
anything really effective in trying to get some of those 'yes' 1575  
votes off the Board considering how many there are, but I would 1576  
like to suggest to those in this chamber who have expressed 1577  
concern in the past on the rights of privacy that they're 1578  
voting pretty inconsistently with their previous concern. This 1579  
Bill will allow anybody that has a terminal to tap into your 1580  
bank account and find out what you've got and in my opinion 1581  
there's really no way that it can be safeguarded against 1582  
computer theft which is already costing the people of Illinois 1583  
a hundred million dollars a year. A court has declared that 1584  
electronic funds transfer is branching and that is why it's not 1585  
being allowed now without this change in the law. Those of you 1586  
who are against branch banking, it's a funny way to show it. 1587  
And those of you who are for privacy, it's a funny way to show 1588  
it. I urge you to really think about this a little bit harder. 1589  
This bill has really serious implications. It's not just an 1590  
alternative in banking, it's something that's really good for  
all the banks and that's why they're all for it. But it's not

so good for the banking customers. It's not so good for the people who elect us. I urge you to please change your vote to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 22 'no'. The Bill having... Is there a request for a verification? Somebody said they were going to. This Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority of those voting is hereby declared passed. 942. Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 942. A Bill for An Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record, the Sponsor isn't here. 950. Representative Taylor. Out of the record. 971. Out of the record. 1331. Representative McPike, you want to go with that one. 1331. McPike. 1331. Out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Request has been made of the Chair, to permit...pardon me? T.V. camera. Permission is granted. On page 4 of the Calendar, there's Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bill 157."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "157, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "...157. A Bill for An Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. VonBoeckman. Amends Senate Bill 157, on page 4, by striking all of line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Satterthwaite: "I believe there was an error. There was a motion filed which I planned to table, but there had been one filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to check and see if there's a motion filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 157, by Representative Satterthwaite."

- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite." 1638
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have agreed 1639  
to table this motion. I believe that Representative Peters was 1640  
planning to be here in support of some successive Amendments 1641  
that are proposed." 1642
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady withdraws the motion. Any further 1643  
Amendments?" 1644
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, VonBoeckman." 1646
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman. 1647  
Gentleman's not on the floor. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 1648  
Barnes." 1649
- Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the 1650  
House. If I may, I would like to move this Amendment. This is 1651  
one of the Amendments that was in error, in error and left out 1652  
at the last Committee hearing. It was filed, we did have it 1653  
and...and in the pursuit of ending the business that day, it 1654  
simply got left out. This is the Amendment of \$150,000, for 1655  
the Vehicle Recycling Board. I know of no opposition to it. I 1656  
spoke with Representatives Peters..." 1657
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #6 1658  
be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', 1659  
opposed. Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 1661
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, VonBoeckman. Amends Senate Bill 1662  
157, on page 1, line 29..." 1664
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes." 1666
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm sorry, I've got 1667  
the list here. And please forgive me, we should go back to 6, 1668  
because 6 and 7 should have been tabled. There's a following 1669  
one..." 1670
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House reconsider the 1671  
vote by which Amendment #6 was adopted. All in favor signify 1672  
by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #6 is reconsidered. 1673  
Now the Gentleman withdraws Amendment #6..." 1675
- Barnes: "And 7." 1677
- Speaker Lechowicz: "...and 7. Any further Amendments?" 1679
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Satterthwaite. Amends Senate Bill..." 1680

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite." 1683

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #8 1684  
deletes two Sections with one appropriation from a Committee 1685  
Amendment. I believe Mr. Peters is in support of this 1686  
Amendment. And I ask your support." 1687

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters." 1689

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have 1690  
discussed this with the Sponsor of the Amendment in Committee 1691  
and with Representative Satterthwaite. And we are in agreement 1692  
with what she is doing here, by deleting these funds." 1694

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #8. All 1695  
in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #8 1696  
is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 1698

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Satterthwaite." 1700

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite." 1702

Satterthwaite: "Leave to withdraw Amendments #9 and #10." 1704

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady withdraws Amendments 9 and 10. Any further 1705  
Amendments?" 1706

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, VonBoeckman. Amends Senate Bill 157, 1707  
as amended, by..." 1708

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. 11." 1710

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members 1711  
of the House. As I indicated earlier, Amendment #11 is a 1712  
replacement for Amendment #6 and the same explanation prevails. 1713  
I would urge its adoption." 1714

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. 1715  
Macdonald." 1716

Macdonald: "I had my light on earlier for Amendment #8 and I would 1717  
like to have the Sections that were removed, it's too late now, 1718  
but I would like to know what those Amendments do and what 1719  
Sections they're striking." 1720

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's out of order, right now. Amendment #11. 1721  
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 1723

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1724  
House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?" 1726

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 1728

Totten: "The Amendment indicates \$50,000 for conducting an inventory 1729  
of abandoned and derelict motor vehicles. Is this additional 1730  
money to the vehicle recycling fund, for a purpose that hasn't 1731  
been done before?" 1732

Barnes: "Representative Totten, what was the exact 'vein' for that 1733  
\$50,000? I didn't quite hear you there." 1735

Totten: "Conducting an official inventory of the abandoned and 1736  
derelict motor vehicles throughout the state." 1738

Barnes: "That has never been done before, this is the first effort 1739  
made in this area." 1740

Totten: "Why do we want an inventory of abandoned vehicles?" 1742

Barnes: "Well, it is my understanding that there are numerous 1743  
numerous of those kinds of vehicles that are around the state 1744  
for whatever reasons. And as I understand and I am not on the 1745  
recycling board, I'm not on the recycling board, but it is my 1746  
understanding that the board is trying to bring this problem 1747  
into some conclusion and before they can do so, they are 1748  
attempting to find out the magnitude of it." 1749

Totten: "How much money is in the vehicle recycling fund?" 1751

Barnes: "It's estimated to be between a million to a million and a 1752  
half." 1753

Totten: "A million and a million and a half. And out of that million 1754  
and a million and a half they can't find a \$150,000 to do 1755  
this?" 1756

Barnes: "Not a \$150,000, a \$100,000 is the ordinary contingency 1757  
expense of the vehicle recycling board." 1759

Totten: "What happens to the money in the vehicle recycling fund, if 1760  
it isn't used?" 1761

Barnes: "To the best of my knowledge, Representative, it simply stays 1762  
in that fund. That's one of the many special funds that we 1763  
have." 1764

Totten: "Well, I'm going...Mr. Speaker, on the Amendment then. That 1765  
fund has, as the Sponsor has indicated, accumulated a large 1766  
amount of money. I see no reason for us to add additional 1767  
monies for an inventory of abandoned and derelict motor 1768  
vehicles throughout the state. The amount is \$50,000, in the 1769

Amendment and if they need money for OCE, that's fine we should 1769  
do that, but the additional monies are not warranted. And I 1770  
would oppose the adoption of Amendment #11, for those reasons. 1772  
This fund is well solvent to do this." 1773

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz." 1775

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?" 1777

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 1779

Leverenz: "Who will actually be doing that study, that the money 1780  
would be utilized for?" 1782

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes." 1784

Leverenz: "Or that inventory." 1786

Speaker Lechowicz: "The recycling board." 1788

Barnes: "As I understand, the recycling board lets contracts for that 1789  
purpose." 1790

Leverenz: "They would let contracts for \$100,000?" 1792

Barnes: "No no no...don't get it mixed now. \$100,000 is the ordinary 1793  
contingency expense of the board. The question has been raised 1794  
relative to the \$50,000 for the study and of ah..abandoned 1795  
vehicles. But, as I understand for the board to take the 1796  
necessary action, they will let contracts for that purpose. 1797  
And I just don't see of any way for them to be able to address  
that whole situation until they know conclusively what is 1798  
there. And this is the only manner, as I understand it, is 1799  
open and available to them to do so." 1800

Leverenz: "Thank you." 1802

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes to close." 1804

Barnes: "Well Mr. Speaker as I indicated, this is the ordinary 1805  
contingency expense of the board. The \$50,000 as I indicated, 1806  
is for the purpose of letting contracts, to be able to make a 1807  
clear determination of the magnitude and scope of the problems 1808  
relative to abandoned vehicles across the state. All of us 1809  
know of many many that we see. I think this is a proper  
appropriation, it is a proper request for the board to carry 1810  
out its function. It must first be able to identify what the 1811  
situations are. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment 1812  
#11." 1813



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 1814  
 #11. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. All 1815  
 in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who 1816  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1817  
 Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 71 1818  
 'ayes', 55 'nos' and the Amendment is adopted. Any further 1819  
 Amendments?" 1820

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #12, Younge. Amends Senate Bill 157, on page 1821  
 3, by inserting below line 32, the following." 1823

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge." 1825

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment 1826  
 #12 would appropriate to the Board of Trustees of Southern 1827  
 Illinois University for transportation for students from East 1828  
 St. Louis, to the Edwardsville Campus of SIU. And the amount 1829  
 of the Amendment is \$30,000. The President of SIU, has asked 1830  
 for this Amendment. The purpose of the Amendment is to keep 1831  
 from increasing the bus fare for students in East St. Louis 1832  
 from 90 cents a trip a day, to \$2.75 a trip a day. Which would 1833  
 mean, that the students would have to pay about \$50.00 a month 1834  
 additional. And this of course would come out of the food 1835  
 budget of most of the families that are being transported. 1835  
 There are some one thousand students being transported. There 1836  
 are some one thousand students involved. And I move for your 1836  
 favorable consideration of this Amendment." 1838

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 1839  
 Totten." 1840

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1841  
 House. I hope the Members of the House heard what the 1842  
 Amendment does. It adds \$50,000 out of the general revenue 1843  
 fund for the transportation of students from East St. Louis to 1844  
 Southern Illinois Campus at Edwardsville. \$30,000 to transport 1845  
 college students from East St. Louis to Edwardsville. It just 1846  
 seems that the Member from East St. Louis has gone one step 1846  
 farther. I suppose if we don't pass this, she'll come in with 1847  
 an appropriation to build a facility or a satellite of SIU in 1848  
 East St. Louis..." 1849

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten." 1851

Totten: "I am opposed to the Amendment and I would ask for red lights 1852  
on the Amendment." 1854

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten, it's for \$30,000 not 50." 1856

Totten: "I think I said 30." 1858

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk." 1860

Polk: "Mr. Speaker..." 1862

Speaker Lechowicz: "\$20,000." 1864

Polk: "...if I may speak on the Amendment." 1866

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed." 1868

Polk: "I think it's great we're trying to get more kids to go to 1869  
school, but I just think that this is the only area that this 1870  
seems to be proposed. I understand that there are some 1871  
depressed areas in that area, but we have depressed areas 1872  
throughout the state. And the idea to use from General 1873  
Revenue, \$30,000, for transportation, I don't...I'm really not 1874  
sure how this set out, whether this is going to be by taxi cab 1875  
or by bus. But, just the idea that students have an 1876  
independent way. We normally think of students when they run 1877  
away...when they take off for school, especially at Southern 1878  
Illinois, that they have some independence. I don't feel it's 1879  
the responsibility of the State of Illinois to transport these 1880  
students back and forth. We don't know whether they're going 1881  
to be doing it on a nightly basis or a weekly basis. This 1882  
would be a breakthrough if it happened, but I sincerely hope it 1883  
does not. And I would request a 'no' vote." 1884

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge to close." 1885

Younge: "These students board the bus in East St. Louis and are 1886  
transported by bus to the Edwardsville Campus. They are 1887  
students who go to school up there each day and many of 1888  
them...most of them come from poverty families in East St. 1889  
Louis. They pay 90 cents a day now and if this Amendment is 1890  
not put on, they would have to be charged \$2.75 a day to be 1891  
transported back and forth so that they can get an education. 1892  
These students come from families, many of whom have incomes of 1893  
\$350 a month. And we're talking about money being taken from 1894

their food budget, from the food budget of the families on 1893  
 public aid. If we do not assist them in their efforts, to get 1894  
 an education and therefore improve their status in life. And  
 for these reasons, I ask you to support this measure to...and 1895  
 it would mean the fact that many of them would not be able to 1896  
 go to school in Edwardsville. And for those reasons I ask you 1897  
 to support this matter." 1898

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #12 be adopted? 1899  
 All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted 1900  
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1901  
 Clerk will take the record. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge." 1902

Younge: "Would you poll the absentees, please?" 1905

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk will poll the absentees. Kindly record Mr. 1906  
 Jaffe as 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Dawson as 'aye'. Lechowicz 1907  
 as 'aye'. Patrick as 'aye'. Doyle as 'aye'. Laurino as 1908  
 'aye'. You are recorded. Domico as 'aye'. What's the count 1909  
 now, Mr. Clerk? ...as 'no'. Stuffle as 'aye'. Schneider as 1910  
 'aye'. Preston as 'aye'. Ralph Dunn as 'no'. To announce to  
 the Membership, I think there's 41 Amendments on this Bill. 1911  
 Count, Mr. Clerk. Oh, I'm sorry, 31 Amendments on this Bill. 1912  
 We're on Amendment #12. On this question there are 75 'ayes', 1913  
 71 'nos' and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?" 1914

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #13, Rea-Winchester. Amends Senate Bill 157, 1916  
 as amended, by inserting immediately after..." 1918

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea." 1920

Rea: "Amendment 13 provides \$25,000 to the SIU budget, for the 1921  
 preparation of a detailed proposal for the demonstration of a 1922  
 coal-alcohol fuel blend. And I would move for its adoption." 1923

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall 1925  
 Amendment #13 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 1926  
 'aye', opposed. Amendment's adopted. Are there any further 1927  
 Amendments?" 1928

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #14, McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 157, as 1929  
 amended, by inserting..." 1931

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew." 1933

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 1934

the House. This is a hundred and fifty-two and a half million 1935  
dollars for a nursing program at Western Illinois University. 1936  
It's a program that has been greatly discussed and has gone 1937  
through the system. Unfortunately, the BHE at this point, has 1938  
said that they would...did not have enough money to go that far 1939  
down in priority. I ask for an 'aye' vote." 1940

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf." 1942

Wolf: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?" 1944

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 1946

Wolf: "Say, I'm just curious, did you...why didn't you have this in 1947  
when the Bill was in Appropriations II Committee?" 1949

McGrew: "Sir, it was in Appropriations Committee. It was voted out. 1950  
It did not get a hearing, due to the deadline. It was a Bill 1951  
that I introduced before." 1952

Wolf: "Appropriations II approved it?" 1954

McGrew: "Yes Sir." 1956

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 1958

Totten: "I'm getting a signal, they're saying no." 1960

McGrew: "As a separate Bill now, not as an Amendment." 1962

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1963  
House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #14. The Amendment 1964  
would appropriate an additional \$152,000 for a nursing program 1965  
that has never been approved by BHE. To support the Members 1966  
proposal, would of course, support his initiative to do it. 1967  
BHE doesn't think it's a top priority, neither do I. And 1968  
pretty soon we'll have these colleges teaching everything but 1968  
reading and writing. And I would ask for a 'no' vote on the 1969  
Amendment." 1970

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew to close." 1971

McGrew: "Just to say that we have researched it thoroughly. We have 1973  
vacancies in every hospital in west central Illinois. And I 1974  
ask for an 'aye' vote." 1975

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #14 be adopted? All 1976  
in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Question is, shall 1977  
Amendment #14 be adopted. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed 1978  
vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1979

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 73 'ayes', 55 'nos' and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?" 1980  
1981  
1982

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #15, McPike. Amends Senate Bill 157..." 1984

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 1986

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #15 is technical. Suggested by our staff, so that monies appropriated can go direct to a parkway commission instead of through the Illinois Tourism Promotion Fund." 1987  
1988  
1989  
1990

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #15 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #15 is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 1991  
1992  
1993

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #16, VanDuyne-Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 157..." 1995  
1996

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 1997  
1999

Leinenweber: "Now this is a good...lets see what it is first." 2001

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's Amendment #16." 2003

Leinenweber: "It's a mere \$500,000 for the city of Lockport, for partial costs of remodeling the Lockport Central Grade School. I urge its adoption." 2004  
2005  
2006

Speaker Lechowicz: "\$500,000 for the remodeling of the Lockport Central Grade School. It's a new provision. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf." 2007  
2008  
2009

Wolf: "All I wanted to say was, oink oink. I wonder if...got some money in there for a hog pen to store all this pork?" 2010  
2012

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leinenweber." 2014

Leinenweber: "Was that a question for the Sponsor?" 2016

Wolf: "Yes." 2018

Leinenweber: "I think there is." 2020

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 2022

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am absolutely surprised that the Representative from Joliet, who comes forward with this proposal. He's been one Member who's consistently opposed most pork and has one of the more conservative voting records. But this will certainly do

him in, especially as a Sponsor of such a proposal. Now the  
proposal purports to give \$500,000 out of General Revenue to  
the Department of Local Government for a combined project  
between Lockport Township, Lockport Park District and the City  
of Lockport for remodeling a grade school that has been I  
imagine deserted by the school district because it's no longer  
a usable or needed facility. We have already defeated a  
similar proposal and this apparently is one of those cats who  
has nine lives. I would suggest that the second time around,  
we give it the same treatment we gave it the first time, unless  
the Sponsor wants to keep his integrity by withdrawing the  
Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe we have a problem with some of these  
Amendments. I would hope that the Appropriations Committee  
Chairman and the staff would review the Amendments. I believe  
that there's a problem on some of these. Let's take this Bill  
out of the record. We'll take it out... Mr. Barnes. Mr.  
Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We will have the staff  
review all of the Amendments in relationship to the Bill. And  
we will go back to it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I point out to the Chairman as well though, I  
think you should review some of the Amendments that were  
adopted. I believe some of those are out of order as well."

Barnes: "We will do so, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 389."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 389. A Bill for An Act making  
appropriations to the Board of Governor's of state colleges and  
universities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee  
Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 389, by  
inserting after the last line in Section 4, the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew. Mr.  
McGrew. Gentleman is not on the floor? Take... Withdraw the  
Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments." 2068

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 587. The Gentleman 2069  
from Cook, Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you seek 2070  
recognition?" 2071

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I believe your on the Order of Appropriations. 2072  
If...there are intervening appropriations before the Bill you 2073  
just called. If your on the Order of Priority, the Bills 2074  
intervening have precedence and priority. So, under the rules, 2075  
you must proceed now to the next Bill." 2076

Speaker Lechowicz: "587. I am. It's the intent of the Chair, to try 2077  
to get to all of those Bills today. The Gentleman from 2078  
Kankakee, Mr. Ryan." 2079

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'll ask you the same question I asked the 2080  
Gentleman that was in the Chair yesterday, by what authority do 2081  
you skip over these Bills? Where is it in the rules that gives 2082  
you the authority to do that?" 2083

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe that what we're trying to do, is 2084  
expedite the work load of the House, Mr. Ryan." 2086

Ryan: "Well, the Sponsor of those Bills...the Sponsors of those Bills 2087  
would like to have them called in order according to the rules, 2088  
Mr. Speaker." 2089

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, fine." 2091

Ryan: "...And I don't think that's out of line at all. I wish you 2092  
would quote the authority that you just forget about the 2093  
rules." 2094

Speaker Lechowicz: "We never forget about the rules, Mr. Ryan." 2096

Ryan: "Well would you please follow the rules and call the Bills in 2097  
order?" 2098

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. We'll go to the Order of 2099  
Concurrences. Page 6. House Bill... Mr. Terzich. Terzich. 2100  
Gentlemen I ask leave to consider on page 8, House Bill 1306. 2101  
It's an emergency nature. The Bill has to be on the Governors 2102  
desk today, due to federal funds. I believe we cleared it with 2103  
the Minority Leader. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich on 2104  
House Bill 1306. It's located on page 8 of the Calendar." 2105

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1306. Senate Amendment #1 2106

provides that the Board of Trustees of Chicago Municipal Employees' Retirement Fund, the Chicago Labor's Fund may by Resolution exclude CETA participants from membership, if such persons become employees after June 30, 1979. Also, this includes the ...the Amendment includes participation under the downstate teacher's retirement system. This is all it does and I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1306." 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about Senate Amendment #2?" 2115

Terzich: "I believe there's just one Amendment on 1306." 2117

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Clerk, what's...how many Amendments are there? The Calendar says 1 and 2. There are two Amendments on the Bill Mr. Terzich. What's the second Amendment? Read Amendment #2, Mr. Clerk. The underlined portion." 2118 2119 2120 2121

Terzich: "That's another CETA exemption, Mr. Speaker. And I would also move for adoption of Amendment...Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1306." 2122 2123 2124

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House bill 1306. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed voted 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1306. This having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay. House Bill 79. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich." 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2133

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is one of the law revision Bills on House Bill 79. The Bill as it passed the House would have eliminated any requirement to make any one spouse a party with respect to the others property. The reason was, that if until now, the wife had not been a necessary party to the taking of his wives property. And there's no point now, in requiring the husband in the reverse situation. And I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1." 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. 2142



Leinenweber." 2143

Leinenweber: "The Amendment amends the Eminent Domain Act, is that 2144  
correct?" 2145

Terzich: "That's correct." 2147

Leinenweber: "It provides that the proceedings seeking to protect the 2148  
property of persons under guardianship, the guardian 2149  
conservators shall be made parties. Isn't that really the 2150  
law?" 2151

Terzich: "Right now from what I understand, it requires that in 2152  
eminent domain proceedings to take a married mans property, the 2153  
wife may be a party. And it states that the law already 2154  
requires that the husband be made a party when his wifes 2155  
property is being taken. And the Bill as it passed the House,  
would have eliminated any requirement to make one spouse a 2156  
party with respect to the others property. The reasoning was 2157  
that if until now, the wife had not been a necessary party to 2158  
the taking of his wifes property, there's no point in now 2159  
requiring the husband in the reverse situation." 2160

Leinenweber: "I don't see what....is this a substantive change in the 2161  
law?" 2162

Terzich: "Well, I couldn't tell you that, Representative Leinenweber. 2163  
You seem to have problems with it. We'll take it out of the 2164  
record and take a look at it." 2166

Leinenweber: "I think we ought to." 2168

Terzich: "All right." 2170

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 89. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 2171  
Terzich." 2172

Terzich: "Yes, on House Bill 89, it amends the law revision 2173  
commission Bill on the Supreme Court Act. Leaves as is, the 2174  
provision that the courts actions are final and conclusive on 2175  
the parties. The original Bill would have changed the final 2176  
and conclusive to binding and the recognition of the fact that 2177  
the decisions are subject to the reversal by the U.S. Supreme  
Court. And I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1." 2179

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, 2180  
Mr. Brummer. Brummer." 2182

Brummer: "Yes, I'm sorry I didn't understand what I'm sure was an excellent explanation." 2185

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Terzich, you want to explain the ah concurrence again?" 2187

Brummer: "I have the Amendment in front of me and it doesn't refer to any of the things that I heard in the explanation. All it does is delete certain lines and..." 2189

Terzich: "Well, according to the analysis, it leaves as is the provision that the court actions are final and conclusive on the parties. The original Bill would have changed final and conclusive to binding, in recognition of the fact that decisions are subject to reversal by the Supreme Court." 2192

Brummer: "Which act are we amending with this Bill?" 2198

Terzich: "Amends the law on the Supreme Court Act." 2200

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 89. 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's 143 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 89. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 326. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes." 2202

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would move that the House do concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 326. There are two Amendments. Amendment #1, is strictly a technical Amendment that makes clerical corrections. Amendment #2, is the recommendation of the Auditor General and the Cost Control Task Force, which recommends that the special purpose trust fund within the Department of Aid...Public Aid, would go into...would now be paid into the general fund and the General Assembly would appropriate these dollars by line item. I would solicit the support of the House to concur in Amendment 1 and 2, to House Bill 326." 2210

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 326. All in 2222

favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 2222  
 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 2223  
 question there's 153 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 2224  
 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 2225  
 to House Bill 326. This Bill having received the  
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2226  
 380. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich." 2227

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker. House Bill 380, extends the life of the law 2228  
 revision commission for four years. The Senate Amendment #1 2229  
 reduces it to a two. And I move that we concur with Senate 2230  
 Amendment #1." 2231

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 2232  
 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 380. All in favor 2233  
 vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 2234  
 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 2235  
 question there's 142 'ayes', 5 'nos', 4 recorded as 'present' 2236  
 and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House 2237  
 Bill 380. This Bill having received the Constitutional  
 Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 437. 2238  
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton." 2239

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2240  
 House. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3, 2241  
 on House Bill 437. Senate Amendment 1 clarifies the provisions 2242  
 relating to the reporting of complications from an abortion, to 2243  
 the Department of Public Health, providing that a physician 2244  
 treating any complication report only the name and location of 2245  
 the facility where the abortion was performed, if he or she  
 knows this information. Senate Amendment #2 further amends the 2246  
 new Section concerning the reporting of abortion complications. 2247  
 Changing the penalty, for not reporting this information, from 2248  
 a Class C misdemeanor to professional discipline, possibly 2249  
 involving the revocation of the physicians license under the  
 Medical Practice Act. This Amendment was recommended by the 2250  
 Illinois State Medical Society and it conforms to the existing 2251  
 requirements of the Medical Practice Act. Senate Amendment #3, 2252  
 makes another technical change. It clarifies the Section 2253

concerning penalties for failure to file reports to the 2253  
 Department of Public Health, to insure that the filing of an 2254  
 incomplete report is subject to penalty only if the violation 2255  
 was intentional. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 2256  
 and 3." 2257

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the motion... The Gentleman from Will, Mr. 2258  
 Leinenweber." 2259

Leinenweber: "Yeah. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?" 2261

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 2263

Leinenweber: "We had a rather lengthy discussion yesterday in the 2264  
 Speaker's office about this Bill and it is my understanding you 2265  
 were going to move to nonconcur and ask for a Conference 2266  
 Committee." 2267

Cullerton: "Well the...you may recall we had three Sponsors to this 2268  
 Bill, Representative Kelly, myself and Chapman and we made a 2269  
 decision to ask to concur. If its not the will of the Body to 2270  
 concur, then I would ask to nonconcur." 2271

Leinenweber: "All right. Then, Mr. Speaker, on the motion I would 2272  
 certainly rise in wholehearted opposition to this motion. 2273  
 This Bill is a rather comprehensive reform of the abortion law 2274  
 and it will be directly in conflict in a number of areas with 2275  
 Representative Kelly's Bill, which is House Bill, I believe 47, 2276  
 or Senate Bill 47. The...all of the major right to life groups 2277  
 would oppose this motion, because they don't want to have this 2278  
 particular Bill in the shape it is on the Governor's desk. 2279  
 They prefer the provisions of House Bill 47, where they're 2280  
 inconsistent. There are some provisions in this Bill, which 2281  
 are good. And it was my understanding yesterday that the 2282  
 motion would be to put it in the Conference Committee. So, I 2283  
 would certainly ask all of those who certainly look for some 2284  
 guidance from Representative Kelly and some of his people to 2285  
 oppose this motion, so that a substitute motion could be to 2286  
 nonconcur would be brought." 2287

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman." 2288

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is the main Bill in a five Bill series, 2289  
 which this House overwhelmingly approved back at the beginning 2290

of the session. The Human Resources Committee held hearings on 2291  
the expose of the Chicago Sun Times and came up with a package 2292  
of five Bills to improve the regulation of abortion clinics. 2293  
These Bills did not and do not speak in regard to the 2294  
philosophy of pro-life or pro-choice. These Bills simply deal  
with the regulation of abortion clinics in a constitutional 2295  
rational reasonable manner. And I believe the fact that this 2296  
Bill and the other four Bills in the series, did not speak on 2297  
the philosophy of the matter, but rather spoke to the issue of 2298  
regulation, is best demonstrated, not only by the Sponsorship,  
Cullerton-Chapman-Kelly, but also, both of you who follow the 2299  
various newsletters, the various organizations, noted that both 2300  
pro-life and pro-choice organizations were in favor of this 2301  
Bill and of the other Bills in the series. All of you in this  
House, almost without exception, voted 'yes' on this Bill and 2302  
should vote 'yes' on the concurrence to put on the Governor's 2303  
desk a Bill that will improve the regulation of abortion 2304  
clinics. If you vote 'no' on this Bill, on this concurrence, 2305  
what you are affectively saying, is that you would prefer to 2306  
have an unconstitutional Bill which would immediately be 2307  
enjoined, which would never become effective, pass. Rather  
than one which is constitutional, one that will better regulate 2308  
abortion clinics, pass, one that will help women, one that will 2309  
help pregnant women. There is a very good counseling provision 2310  
in this Bill that almost every single person in this House 2311  
voted 'yes' on. A counseling provision that might encourage 2312  
some woman with doubts to refuse the abortion that she had been  
contemplating. Those of you who are deeply pro-life should 2313  
vote for this Bill, because the counseling provisions in this 2314  
Bill, which are constitutional may assist women in deciding to 2315  
refuse abortions, whether what would this procedure conflict 2316  
with their own deep emotional feelings. A 'yes' vote is a vote 2317  
to combat abortions, scandals. A 'yes' vote is a vote to  
better regulate abortion clinics." 2319

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom. Mrs. 2320  
Hallstrom please." 2321

Hallstrom: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker." 2323

Speaker Lechowicz: "Its all right." 2325

Hallstrom: "We just leaned on the button, excuse me." 2327

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger." 2329

Oblinger: "May I ask the Sponsor a question?" 2331

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield, ma'am." 2333

Oblinger: "Representative Cullerton, as I sat on the Human Resources Committee, was this Bill not supported by Representative Kelly and the pro-life group?" 2334  
2335  
2336

Cullerton: "Representative Kelly, is the Co-sponsor of this Bill." 2338

Oblinger: "That's right, I'm asking was he not in favor of it?" 2340

Cullerton: "But, you see what's happened is the pro-life groups have changed their mind and they want this Bill..." 2341  
2343

Oblinger: "That's my question then, why have they changed their minds?" 2344  
2345

Cullerton: "Well, there's a number..." 2347

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Amendments. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly." 2348  
2349

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In response to your question, yes, I am a Sponsor on this Bill, but no I do not want to concur. There is...since this legislation was introduced, while we also introduced a Bill which was known as House Bill 1202 and also Senate Bill 47, which will be coming before us shortly. And there are areas of covering this counseling that this Bill would come in conflict with. And as the feeling of the right to life groups in Illinois, that Senate Bill 47 does a much better...it addresses the question much better than House Bill 437. Also, under Senate Bill 47, for instance, it specifies that the physician will do the counseling. Under this Bill, under House Bill 437, there isn't any provision who will do the counseling. And I really think that there is a question of constitutionality on that alone. And therefore, I think that Senate Bill 47 has a much better opportunity to hold up under the constitutional tests. And that is why I am in opposition to the concurrence motion." 2350  
2351  
2352  
2353  
2354  
2355  
2356  
2357  
2358  
2359  
2361  
2362  
2363  
2365

Oblinger: "I just wish that the groups would get together on one 2366

Bill, instead of having us come before a Committee and to get  
me to vote on something, that now they don't want." 2367  
2369

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." 2371

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well,  
there's nothing wrong it seems to me, with voting for this Bill  
as it passed the House and voting against concurrence. When  
the Bill passed the House it was acceptable. As it appears  
before us now, it is not acceptable. And as I understand the  
objection of the various right to life people, it is that the  
twenty-four hour waiting period provided in the Bill is changed  
from as it passed here, dealing with the informed consent  
provisions, it started then when the women..." 2372  
2373  
2374  
2375  
2376  
2377  
2378  
2380

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Walsh. The Gentleman from Cook,  
Mr. Cullerton for what purpose do you seek recognition?" 2381  
2383

Cullerton: "Mr. Walsh, I believe you're referring to House Bill 440." 2384

Speaker Lechowicz: "...437, Bill." 2387

Cullerton: "There's no 24 hour waiting period in 437." 2389

Walsh: "Okay." 2391

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton to close." 2392

Cullerton: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call." 2395

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate  
Amendments 1, 2 and 3. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed  
vote 'no'. Permission has been requested for a still  
photographs. Permission is granted. The Gentleman from Cook,  
Mr. Piel, to explain his vote." 2396  
2397  
2398  
2399  
2400

Piel: "I have some questions to ask Mr. Speaker. My light's been on  
for about the last five minutes. Can I ask some questions,  
seeing as we're explaining our vote?" 2401  
2402  
2404

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed." 2406

Piel: "I don't question Mr. Cullerton and Mr. Kelly, I'll throw this  
at both of you. Mr. Cullerton stated, that after he talked to  
Mr. Leinenweber, he conferred with Mrs. Chapman and Mr. Kelly  
and they wanted to go with concurrence. And then Mr. Kelly  
comes back up and says he's going for nonconcurrence. Now I'd  
like to have the explanation." 2407  
2408  
2409  
2410  
2411  
2412

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Cullerton, first." 2414

Cullerton: "It's a position of Representative Chapman and myself, 2415 150  
that we wish to concur. It's the position of Representative 2416 151  
Kelly to nonconcur." 2417 152

Piel: "That's not what you said to the floor. You said, after 2418  
talking to the other two Co-sponsors." 2420 153

Cullerton: "No after talking to one of the three Co-sponsors." 2422 154

Piel: "So in other words, two out of three are for concurrence and 2423 155  
one is for none. Okay. Thank you." 2425

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 2426 156  
wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 2427 157  
48 'ayes' and 100 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. The 2428 158  
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton. He now moves that we 2429 159  
nonconcur. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', 2430  
opposed. The House does nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 160  
and 3 on House Bill 437. The Gentleman asks for a Conference 2431 162  
Committee. House Bill 440. House Bill 440. The Gentleman 2432 164  
from Cook, Mr. Cullerton. Cullerton please." 2433 165

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2434 166  
House. The Amendment, Senate Amendment #1 is a technical 2435 167  
Amendment. It just insures that a woman may obtain a pregnancy 2436 168  
test and diagnosis from a personal physician or a physician in 2437 170  
her home area and then travel to Chicago or anywhere else to 2438 172  
obtain an abortion, if this is her chosen method for dealing 173  
with a problem pregnancy. The issue in this Bill is that this 2439 174  
is the 24 hour waiting period. This was a part of the package 2440 175  
of 5 that Representative Chapman referred to earlier. There is 2441 176  
a difference of opinion, a difference of legal opinion among 2442 177  
the right to life groups on this issue. This 24 hour waiting 2443 178  
period, is a 24 hour waiting period between the time of the 2444 179  
initial diagnosis of a pregnancy and the actual abortion. It's 2445 180  
my position that this is a constitutional 24 hour waiting 2446 181  
period. One that will not be enjoined by a court and one that 2447  
will be signed by the Governor. There's a second 24 hour 2448 182  
waiting period contained in Senate Bill 47. That 24 hour 2449 184  
waiting period starts from the time a woman receives printed  
material and the time of the abortion. So there's two



more so as being not only striking down one, but striking down 2485  
 both. And therefore we would lose the entire area protection. 2486  
 Under...in its present condition, the right to life 2487  
 organization in the State of Illinois, the Illinois citizens 2488  
 concerned for life and the Americans united for life are very  
 much opposed to concurrence on House Bill 440. And I will 2489  
 encourage your 'no' votes." 2490

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman." 2492

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very clear cut issue. The question 2493  
 is, do we want to provide a waiting period between the time 2494  
 that a woman finds out that she is pregnant and the time that 2495  
 she has an abortion. If we do, vote 'yes' on this concurrence. 2496  
 Or would we prefer to have legislation that everyone knows is 2497  
 unconstitutional. The day that this other legislation would 2498  
 become effective, there would be an injunction issued by the  
 court. There would never be any waiting period at all. Do we 2499  
 want to do something about this issue by voting for this Bill? 2500  
 Or do we want to pass a Bill that the Governor will veto and 2501  
 this Body will probably override and the courts will enjoin, 2502  
 that will never become effective. In other words, do we just 2503  
 want to talk about this issue of regulating abortion clinics, or  
 do we want to do something about it. Do we care about women? 2504  
 If we do vote 'yes'. But if you don't care about what happens 2505  
 to pregnant women, then vote 'no' on this and vote for a Bill 2506  
 that is unconstitutional, that will be struck down and there 2507  
 will be the appearance of action on our part, but we will each 2508  
 one of us know in our hearts, that those people who took that  
 action really don't care about the problem, really aren't 2509  
 pro-life. And that the leaders of this pro-life movement are 2510  
 blatantly disregarding the need of women and prefer to issue 2511  
 public relation statements and lead a movement that is doomed 2512  
 to failure." 2513

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh." 2515

Walsh: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know my light was on. Mr. 2516  
 Kelly made the statement pretty well for me, I agree absolutely 2517  
 with him." 2518

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer." 2520

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Spes...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2521

Representative Chapman is absolutely correct and I would only 2522  
 say to her, I know how dispirited she is over this change, 2523  
 because of all the hard work that went into these Bills, to do 2524  
 something about the abortion clinics scandal. I suspect this 2525  
 is going to carry overwhelming, because the marching orders 2526  
 have been given. And they don't care, I mean, they've been 2527  
 very frank, I seen letters to the editor, I've talked to 2528  
 pro-life people. They know, I use to think they didn't realize 2529  
 what they were doing, that they were drafting legislation 2530  
 that's unconstitutional. They know, they don't care. They 2531  
 feel this is a Holy War and so, damn the Constitution, full 2532  
 speed ahead. I also think there's another factor entering into 2533  
 this, about abortion clinics, because I heard it from some 2534  
 pro-life people when the abortion clinics scandals broke and 2535  
 there were hearings being held. It sort of goes like this, 2536  
 well we better clean up this mess, because they are people, 2537  
 these women. But you know, if you go to have an abortion, you 2538  
 really shouldn't be too surprised at what happens here, you 2539  
 don't really deserve that much sympathy, because you're you 2540  
 know, committing murder and that's a mortal sin. And so, I 2541  
 guess we better clean up the abortion clinics. But there's not 2542  
 really that concern for the woman in an abortion clinic and 2543  
 let's be frank about it. So we can play around like this, go 2544  
 for Senate Bill 47, which is going to end up in the courts and 2545  
 be stricken as unconstitutional. We end up with no reform in 2546  
 abortion clinics and I don't think you'll feel that bad about 2547  
 it. I really don't. This is a scandal. It really is, but 2548  
 it's going to go ahead I'm sure." 2549

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton to close. 2550  
 Cullerton please." 2551

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2552  
 House. For those Legislator's here who are pro-choice, I ask 2553  
 you to vote 'yes' to concur with this legislation. This 2554  
 legislation was recommended by a Sub-committee of the Human 2555

Resources Committee, which was mainly composed of pro-choice 2553  
 Legislator's. They recommended this 24 hour waiting period, 2554  
 because it would help control the health of a woman. It would 2555  
 help a woman not make a rash decision to get an abortion, that 2556  
 rather she would have a period of time between the diagnosis 2557  
 and the actual abortion as in any medical procedure. Now for 2558  
 the pro-life Legislator's, I want you to understand exactly 2559  
 what this means. If we don't enact this 24 hour waiting 2560  
 period, there will only be one enacted. That will be the one 2561  
 that's in Senate Bill 47. If that is declared unconstitutional 2562  
 and it will certainly be enjoined, but if it's also declared 2563  
 unconstitutional, there will be no 24 hour waiting period. Now 2564  
 although it's not the intent of this legislation, it will 2565  
 certainly have the same...the effect, if this passes of perhaps 2566  
 making one woman decide not to have an abortion after she waits 2567  
 that 24 hours. So you will in affect have passed a law which 2568  
 will make one woman decide not to have an abortion. If you 2569  
 vote against it, you're putting all your hopes on another 24 2570  
 hour waiting period and if that's struck down, then there will 2571  
 be no 24 hour waiting period. And that's one woman and many 2572  
 more will get the abortion. So for that reason, I want you to 2573  
 realize, this is a difference of opinion between the pro-life 2574  
 Legislator's. I've talked to the lawyer for the pro-life 2575  
 people yesterday. I am a lawyer also. We have a difference of 2576  
 opinion as to the legal affect. And I would ask you to concur 2577  
 in this Amendment. Thank you." 2578

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in 2579  
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 440. All in favor vote 2580  
 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have 2581  
 all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 2582  
 question there are 45 'ayes' and 100 'nos'. Now, the Gentleman 2583  
 from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves that we nonconcur to Senate 2584  
 Amendment #1. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', 2585  
 opposed. The House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on 440. 2586  
 House Bill 524. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff. 2587

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2588

I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 524. 2584  
 What it does, Ladies and Gentlemen, is provide that auto 2585  
 windshields and auto windshields only, be included in the 2586  
 comprehensive, initial comprehensive coverage." 2587

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from 2588  
 Cook, Mr. Walsh." 2589

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I 2590  
 rise to oppose this concurrence. The concurrence as the 2591  
 Gentleman said, places automobile windshields in a different 2592  
 class than any other part of an automobile for purposes of 2593  
 determining deductible on comprehensive insurance. The 2594  
 justification for this is, that the windshield is an important 2595  
 of course item in a car for purposes of safety. But, it is not 2596  
 the only part of the car that is important for purposes of 2597  
 safety. There can be for example, damage done to the brakes 2598  
 that ah...wherein there would be a deductible provision, 2598  
 whatever the deductible provision within the policy would apply 2599  
 to that. Or damage done to some other integral part of the car 2599  
 that is...has its purpose for safety. Now I suggest to you, 2600  
 that this has appeared before...has come before the Legislature 2601  
 in several other sessions and it was pretty well determined it 2602  
 seems to me, that the reason for it is that the glass 2603  
 manufacturers want it. The glass manufacturers make this big 2604  
 pitch about safety, but what in fact they want to do, is they 2605  
 want to replace more windshields. There's no justification for 2606  
 removing the deductible for this anymore than there is for any 2606  
 other part of the car. May I suggest too, that this does not 2607  
 address the situation where there is no comprehensive at all, 2608  
 or no insurance on the car, no coverage. Presumably there, a 2609  
 person could ride around with a broken windshield regardless of 2609  
 the safety aspect. So, I urge that you vote 'no' on this 2610  
 concurrence." 2611

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff to close." 2613

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Trying to follow Representative 2614  
 Walsh's rationale as best as I could, the purpose of this Bill, 2615  
 quite simply Ladies and Gentlemen, is to increase safety 2616

highways for the motorist. As it presently stands today, the windshield replacement costs is a separate deductible. And for that reason Ladies and Gentlemen, many motorists will forego paying the original \$50.00 for the replacement of an item that would cost as much as 400 to 700 dollars to replace. What this Amendment attempts to do and recognizes full well that there would be a rate increase involved, but what we need to point out here, is that rate increase is very very nominal. In several of the states, including Florida and New York, where they have tried in affect make new glass policy, new glass insurance classifications including comprehensive coverage with the present deductibles of 50, 100 or 200. The cost per average, the increase per average in premiums has never been more than \$7.00 for a motorist in the city and \$2.00 for suburban drivers. What this Bill attempts to do, is to correct a rather myopic position of the insurance companies who don't realize that these windshields that go for the lack of repairs, are on the highway with impaired vision for the motorist and has resulted in horrendous accidents that have generated claim losses in totalities of cars, far in excess of what it costs to replace the replacement costs of windshields if they were included in the deductible. That cost comes down to about \$3.79 for each insured car. When you compute this on this \$50.00 deductible, it reduces that to about \$1.62 per insured car making the premium, as I stated, the average premium cost of about \$7.00 a year on the deductible. I think that this is a small price to pay to make sure that a motorist, when ever he has a broken or a damaged windshield to have immediate replacement done, rather than to drive in that condition until he can scrap up the money himself. I think it's a good Bill, it's a Bill that any prudenced insured motorist wouldn't mind paying the additional rate that this would generate. It's very nominal and I request your 'aye' vote to this Amendment and continue to move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 524? All in favor vote 'aye', all

opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman 2648  
to explain his vote. Timers on." 2649

Schuneman: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 2650  
the House. We should not concur in this Amendment. This 2651  
Amendment is the same Bill that this House rejected last term. 2652  
It's the same Bill that the Senate rejected in Senate Bill 234 2653  
and what it does, is say that when you buy insurance on your 2654  
automobile, you cannot have an option as to whether you have a 2655  
deductable on your glass insurance coverage or not. Now the 2656  
insurance companies don't care what we do with this Bill. If 2657  
you pass this Bill, they simply will raise your cost, pass 2658  
along the cost to you. I completely reject the cost figures 2659  
that have been submitted by the Sponsor of the Bill and the 2660  
glass industry. We should send this Bill back and ask the 2661  
Senate to take the Amendment off the Bill. We should not 2662  
approve the Bill in its present form. If it's a good idea 2663  
to..." 2664

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones to 2665  
explain his vote. Timers on." 2666

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Senate 2667  
Amendment and I urge the Members to concur in the Senate 2668  
Amendment. The previous speaker spoke about costs, but the 2669  
costs would be no more than about \$1.62 per annum. So, it's a 2670  
very good Amendment. If we are talking about safety on the 2671  
highways, we are talking about having drivers drive on our 2672  
highways with broken windshields and they can't have these 2673  
windshields replaced, but if we have this included in the 2674  
insurance policy, individuals with insurance policies would get 2675  
those windows repaired. So, it's a very good Amendment. I 2676  
can't see why we have so many red votes up there, because we're 2677  
always concerned about individuals having insurance and at the 2678  
same time we have insurance companies that is taking away the 2679  
privilege of the people. So, it's a very good Amendment. 2680  
There should be more green lights up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel to explain his 2681  
vote. Timers on." 2682

- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my minute to Mr. Schuneman." 2681  
2682
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from...that's out of order on explanation of vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz to explain his vote. Timers on." 2683  
2684  
2685
- Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to direct your attention to another aspect of the Bill. The previous speakers have spoken about the merits of this Amendment. I want to talk about the procedure for a minute, of this Amendment. What has taken place here, is that the Senate has added as an Amendment to the House Bill something that was not really within the scope of the original Bill. They have taken a Bill that never made it out of the Senate, that never got to the House, that no Committee hearings were ever held in the House and they purpose to attach it in this way to the House Bill. Now, I submit to you, that we have had Committees operating all session that the Constitution of the State of Illinois provides that the public has the right to notice, that they have a right to appear before Committees and that the process that has here been undertaken, undermines the Constitutional..." 2686  
2687  
2688  
2689  
2690  
2691  
2692  
2693  
2694  
2695  
2696  
2697  
2698  
2699
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote. The timer's on." 2700  
2702
- Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah..In response to one of the speakers that spoke previously, he made reference to rate in a very oblique way. He does it every time. I've tried to be concise in what that rate increase would be. It would be nominal. I think it's crazy for us to force a driver to go around with broken windshields because of the prohibited costs, when it could be put into the original comprehensive coverage at a very nominal fee. So that you would have timely replacement of the damaged windshield and would not force a motorist to drive in the city or on the highway with impaired vision. I think this is a good Bill. It speaks to the safety of the highway and it's a Bill whose time certainly has come. I would like to see some more green votes up there if possible." 2703  
2704  
2705  
2706  
2707  
2708  
2709  
2710  
2711  
2712  
2713  
2714

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 2715  
 The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 63 2716  
 'ayes' and 87 'nos' and the House does not concur in Senate 2717  
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 524. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 2718  
 Huff. Now moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2719  
 #2 to House Bill 524. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', oppose. 2720  
 The House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2721  
 524. House Bill 666. Kempiners. Out of the record by request 2722  
 of the Sponsor. House Bill 676, Mr. Sam Wolf. Sam Wolf. Out 2723  
 of the record. House Bill 692, Mr. Marovitz. We're on page 7 2724  
 of the Calendar. The next Bill that will be called is J. J. 2725  
 Wolf's. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz." 2726

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2727  
 House. This Bill was up yesterday and Representative Ebbesen 2728  
 asked me for the courtesy to take the Bill out of the record 2729  
 for something technical. I did and there is no problem, as 2730  
 Representative Ebbesen has cleared with me. I would ask that 2731  
 the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 692.  
 This was an amendment that was offered by the insurance 2732  
 companies and with the agreement of the Department of Insurance 2733  
 and the Senate Insurance Committee. It says that attempt of 2734  
 rehabilitation may be determined by a certificate from a 2735  
 licensed contractor or architect and such rehabilitative 2736  
 efforts shall be in compliance with local municipal building 2737  
 codes and I would ask for concurrence with Senate Amendment 2738  
 #1." 2738

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 2739  
 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 692. All in favor, 2740  
 vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 2741  
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 2742  
 this question there's 146 'ayes', 5 'nos', 5 recorded 2743  
 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 2744  
 House Bill 692. This Bill having received the Constitutional 2745  
 Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 828. Out of 2746  
 the record, request of the Sponsor. House Bill 843. Mr. Dave 2747  
 Jones." 2748



Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We passed a Bill out of here that crutches a little flaw in the original Senior Citizens Homestead Act. It amended the Revenue Act to provide that when the \$1500 senior citizen homestead exemption had been granted, and the person qualifying subsequently becomes a resident of a nursing home, the exemption continues as long as the house continues to be occupied by his spouse, and the Senate put on a very good amendment that says 'and the spouse is 65 years of age or older' and I move for the concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill...The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow. The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 843. 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 is 153 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 843. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 905, Mr. McGrew. Out of the record. House Bill 991, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate added Amendment #1 to House Bill 991...they added two non-substantive technical changes, relating to definitions. All they did was replace the term 'city council or board of trustees' with the term 'corporate authority'. They replaced the word 'city or village' with the word 'municipality'. It has no substantive effect at all. I would urge concurrence with the..this amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 991. 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 154 'aye', there's 1 'nay', 2 recorded 'present' and the House does concur in Senate

- Amendment #1 to House Bill 991. This Bill having received the  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The  
 Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." 2781  
 2782  
 2784
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement. In the  
 back gallery are the 4-H'ers. Their club is called the Green  
 Machine from Litchfield, represented by the 50th District,  
 Representatives Kane, Jones and Oblinger in the back gallery." 2785  
 2786  
 2787  
 2788
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. House Bill 1019. Mr.  
 Mahar." 2790  
 2791
- Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.  
 I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1  
 to House Bill 19 (sic). All that the Senate Amendment does is  
 it changes one word, and that is change the word 'rebuilt' and  
 replace that with the initials SV, which means salvage title.  
 This is one of the chop shop Bills that's passed through the  
 General Assembly and is an agreed amendment. I urge that we  
 concur." 2792  
 2793  
 2794  
 2795  
 2796  
 2797  
 2798
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty." 2800
- Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?" 2802
- Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 2804
- Getty: "Representative Mahar, would you explain why SV is better than  
 rebuilt..on the title?" 2805  
 2807
- Mahar: "Well, ah, I don't think that SV is better than rebuilt, but  
 the legitimate body shop rebuilders objected very strongly  
 throughout the state to the word 'rebuilt' and upon agreement  
 with the Secretary of State's office and myself and the  
 industry, we agreed that we would substitute the initials SV,  
 which the Secretary of State's office certainly can publicize  
 so the it is an understanding as to what we mean by the  
 initials SV." 2808  
 2809  
 2810  
 2811  
 2812  
 2813  
 2814
- Getty: "Is there going to be a program to educate the public on the  
 meaning of SV?" 2815  
 2816
- Mahar: "There will be a program...a, by the Secretary of State's  
 office on the meaning of SV for those people who get involved  
 in laundered titles or titles that deal with rebuilt  
 automobiles." 2817  
 2818  
 2819  
 2820

Getty: "Thank you." 2822

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones." 2824

Jones: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I recall this Bill being heard 2825  
in the Motor Vehicles Committee and I supported it very 2826  
strongly because those words rebuilt will be placed on the 2827  
title, but when you change and have the initials SV, am I 2828  
correct, on there, I don't think that the average consumer is 2829  
going to know what's going on when he gets ready to purchase 2830  
that car, irrespective to the program that the Secretary of 2831  
State may conduct. I think this really takes away the effect 2832  
of the legislation and I would urge the Sponsor to nonconcur in 2833  
this amendment, so that we could really get the Bill back to 2834  
the intent and with the initials SV, I believe the Bill loses 2834  
its impact and it could mean safe vehicle as I was just pointed  
out. So, I mean, the purpose of the Bill originally was for 2835  
the consuming public to know what they are purchasing and 2836  
I...there is no way they are going to know when they have on 2837  
there simply SV and I would urge the Sponsor to nonconcur." 2839

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer." 2841

Griesheimer: "Will the Sponsor yield?" 2843

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 2845

Griesheimer: "Bill, the original concept was to mark a vehicle that 2846  
had in fact been rebuilt, is that right? Mr. Speaker could we 2847  
have the mike on for the Sponsor, please?" 2849

Mr. Speaker: "I'm sorry, turn the mike on Mr. Mahar." 2851

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The original concept was to do 2852  
something about the laundered titles that are going through the 2853  
chop shops. It was found that in the process that there are a 2854  
lot of legitimate rebuilders throughout the state who rebuild 2855  
automobiles and sell them on the market. Their complaint was 2856  
the word rebuilt would materially decrease the value of their 2857  
vehicles. Upon conference with the Secretary of State's Office  
and the group of people, it was felt that a public relations 2858  
program with the initials SV would accomplish the fact of 2859  
letting people know that there was some kind of a problem with 2860  
that particular title, when it was reissued, and it seems to me 2861

that originally, of course, I felt the word rebuilt is more obvious, but in an effort to satisfy the complaints and the feelings of legitimate auto body rebuilders, we agreed that we'd use the initials SV which could be stolen vehicle or salvage vehicle."

Griesheimer: "Well, as I understand it, this would be a complete rebuilding. For instance if they took an existing body and put a new engine in it, would that be considered a rebuilt vehicle?"

Mahar: "Ah, the auto body rebuilders that buy legitimate wrecks turn these cars over to rebuilders. Now maybe a new engine or maybe new parts of a body and they put them back on the market and they sell them. What we're concerned, what we were originally concerned about, was first of all, consumer protection, but being sure that the ...numbers wouldn't be used on a stolen vehicle. And, this will indicate on the title that for those who buy the vehicle, for the insurance companies who might insure the vehicle, and for the banks who might loan money on the vehicle, that they might want to question it and there may be something in the background that would cause them not to go through with the deal."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Griesheimer: "It would seem to me that the original intent of this Bill is very, very valid. A car can be involved in a wreck. It can have any number of things materially wrong with it. When it came from the factory, it was subject to federal controls and inspection. Certainly inspection at the site where the factory was constructing the vehicle, probably in Michigan, but in any case, it was subject to a great deal of control. The current concept arose out of the fact that a number of people make money in this State by taking parts of various vehicles, reconstructing them and these people are subject to absolutely no control whatsoever. I think that the consuming public has a right to know that this vehicle has in

fact been constructed by a rebuilder and it would seem to me that by the amendment in the Senate, by substituting the word rebuilt on the title and putting SV, just as Representative Jones has suggested, completely dilutes the Bill. In fact, it makes the Bill almost annulity. I don't think that there will be one out of 10,000 people that will know what SV stands for and without some sort of note attached to the title to alert the buyer, you will go for naught. And, even though, I understand the Sponsor's desire to have the Bill through, I agree with his concept. I would certainly urge this House not to concur with the Senate. Vote 'no' on the motion to concur."

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

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "What does the SV represent?"

Mahar: "Salvage vehicle or stolen vehicle."

Leverenz: "Why then, would you not spell out salvage vehicle or stolen vehicle?"

Mahar: "Well, the Secretary of State wouldn't know, for example, what category that title might be in. As I stated initially, the purpose of the change in the amendment in the Senate was to indicate to those people who deal in this type of thing throughout the State, and your seat mate, Representative Brummer, was one of the people who was concerned about this. In order that they might not suffer some financial loss in the movement of legitimately rebuilt vehicles. Now, if it is the wishes of this House that we nonconcur, then, of course, we'll go back and take the SV out of the Bill."

Leverenz: "Do you think any person in the general public would understand what SV meant?"

Mahar: "I have been assured in discussion with the Secretary of State's Office that there would be an extensive campaign if this Bill were passed and signed into to law to let the general public know what this designated title would be and what SV stood for. So those people who got this type of title would

- have an opportunity, if they so desired, to question the SV and  
determine what it really meant." 2936 2937
- Leverenz: "So that if we would not agree for concurrence, we could  
save an extensive campaign, both in dollars and people power,  
in the Secretary of State's office by spelling out on the title  
rather than just putting initials. Is that correct?" 2938 2939 2940 2942
- Mahar: "Well, Representative Leverenz, I agreed that I would ask to  
have the word rebuilt taken out of the Bill so that those  
people could have their particular grievance satisfied and  
that's why I asked that it be changed. Now, if it is the will  
of the House not to go along with that, then so be it." 2943 2944 2945 2946 2948
- Leverenz: "Well an alternative might be to put the initials JUNKER." 2949
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan." 2952
- Ronan: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 2954
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.  
All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', oppose...the previous  
question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar to  
close." 2955 2956 2957 2958
- Mahar: "I move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill  
1019." 2959 2960
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur with  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1019. All in favor, vote  
'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The  
Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk to explain his vote. The  
timer's on." 2961 2962 2963 2964 2965
- Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I understand the  
Secretary of State wants to put on a big campaign to a..so  
everyone will understand what the initials mean. However, if  
we just put rebuilt on, it appears that we could save the  
Secretary of State a tremendous amount of time and money.  
Rather than a cost, a savings by putting rebuilt on it, it  
would appear that a 'no' vote would be more practical this  
time." 2966 2967 2968 2969 2970 2971 2972
- Speaker Lechowicz "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?  
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 56  
'ayes', 80 'nos' and the House does not adopt Senate Amendment 2973 2974 2975

#1 to House Bill 1019. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar 2976  
 moves that House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 2977  
 Bill 1019. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', 2978  
 oppose. The House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to 1019.  
 House Bill 1025, Mr. Kempiners." 2980

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2981  
 1025 makes a technical change to correct its drafting error. 2982  
 It makes no substantive change. There is a board that is 2983  
 called the Board for Opinions in the Practice of Nursing and 2984  
 they had in the Bill that was drafted 'Boards of Opinion' and 2985  
 this changes it from of to for, because it is the title of the  
 board." 2986

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall 2987  
 the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1025. 2988  
 All in favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted 2989  
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 2990  
 record. On this question, there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', none 2991  
 recorded 'present'. The House does concur with Senate  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1025. This Bill having received the 2992  
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2993  
 1039. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. Mrs. Braun. Carol. 2994  
 Mrs. Braun. House Bill 1039. There are three Senate  
 Amendments, 1, 2, & 3." 2996

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2997  
 The amendments in the Senate to House Bill 1039 were by in 2998  
 large, technical in nature and requested by the Illinois 2999  
 Association of Realtors. This Bill clarifies part of the 3000  
 existing Illinois Condominium Law and defines specifically what 3001  
 is entailed in common element. It was passed by a large margin  
 by the House and passed by the Senate with the addition of the 3002  
 two amendments and I urge concurrence." 3004

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall the 3005  
 House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, & 3 on House Bill 1039. 3006  
 All in favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'." 3008

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, my button is broken, I think." 3010

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your light's working now. No, 1, 2 and 3. Have 3011

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will 3013  
 take the record. On this question, there's 152 'ayes', 2 3014  
 'nos', 4 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with 3015  
 Senate Amendments 1, 2 & 3 to House Bill 1039. This Bill  
 having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. 3016  
 House Bill 1047. Donovan. Donovan, please." 3018

Donovan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House 3019  
 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1047. The 3020  
 amendment states that it will provide that park districts may 3021  
 acquire land for airport expansion, as well as for 3022  
 establishments of airports. It also states that the interest  
 rate has been raised 1 point to 8, so the interest rate limit 3023  
 will be 8% for the revenue bonds authorized in this Bill. It 3024  
 makes House Bill 1047 identical to Senate Bill 402, which 3025  
 passed the House earlier this year and it does not change the 3026  
 concept or the intent of the Bill, so I would ask for favorable  
 support in the concurrence of Senate Bill #1 to House Bill 3027  
 1047." 3028

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. 3029  
 Leinenweber." 3030

Leinenweber: "Does this involve an expansion of the power of eminent 3031  
 domain or clarification, or what?" 3033

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Donovan." 3035

Donovan: "No, it doesn't change anything, Representative Leinenweber. 3036  
 The...it adds the word expansion for clarification, quite 3037  
 frankly is what it does. The eminent domain..." 3039

Leinenweber: "In other words, they already have power to acquire land 3040  
 by eminent domain." 3042

Donovan: "They certainly do." 3044

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate 3045  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1047. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3046  
 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3047  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 3048  
 there's 133 'ayes', 8 'nos', 8 recorded as 'present' and the 3049  
 House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1048  
 (sic). This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority 3050



is hereby declared passed. 1047, I'm sorry. House Bill 1048. 3051  
The Lady from Cook, Mrs. MacDonald." 3052

MacDonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move 3053  
we do concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1048. The 3054  
House Bill originally included trustees and aldermen of cities 3055  
and villages to be exempt from jury duty. That was because of 3056  
the extreme necessity of Home Rule Unit, of course, to have 3057  
full compliment in the areas of zoning and the other important 3058  
decisions that they made. The pharmacists, apparently had 3059  
appeared in the House and were not able to get their Bill out, 3060  
so in the Senate, they did put this amendment on the Bill, and 3061  
I would move for concurrence." 3061

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow." 3063

Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3064  
Let's take a look at what we're doing here. Originally, every 3065  
member of the population, every citizen, had to serve on a 3066  
jury. We took great pride in our trial by juries. We slowly 3067  
have exempted quite a few people out, we start with the 3068  
governor and the lieutenant governor. Now, we go all the way 3069  
down in this Bill to exempt out the alderman of cities and 3070  
village trustees. Now, we all know those are not full-time 3071  
jobs. There's no reason why these people can't serve on 3072  
juries. And now we go a step farther and we're exempting out 3073  
from jury duty, practicing registered pharmacists. So, pretty 3074  
soon, you're going to end up with a jury of people who are on 3075  
the welfare rolls, who have nobody down here to speak for them, 3076  
no one down here to go and get an exemption for them. And let 3077  
me leave you with one last comment. You know over the years a 3078  
number of former Legislators and...have been indicted on 3079  
various charges. Some have been found innocent, others guilty. 3080  
Well, would you rather have a jury made up of aldermen and 3081  
trustees who have run for office, who are in the public 3082  
spotlight, who knows what it's like to serve in a capacity such 3083  
as this, or would you like to have them exempted? That's  
exactly what this Bill does. If you want some of your peers on 3084  
that jury, you would vote against this. Thank you." 3085

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk." 3085

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?" 3087

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will." 3089

Polk: "I see Representative Ronan on his feet. I just wanted to 3090  
clarify something. Did we say that we have the pharmacists 3091  
back in this Bill again? That very same Bill that we defeated 3092  
on this floor less than a month ago?" 3093

MacDonald: "They are in the Bill at this point. I don't know what 3094  
the original Bill that came before the Judiciary II Committee 3095  
was, but in the Senate they did add pharmacists on this Bill of 3096  
exemption for jurors." 3097

Polk: "Well, we indeed did have a Bill before this House that 3098  
exempted pharmacists from serving in this capacity and as I 3099  
indicated in the debate about a month and a half ago, I was 3100  
contacted by the state-wide pharmacists group and they did not 3101  
wish to be included in this. They felt that they had the 3102  
responsibility to serve on juries, as does everybody else. 3103  
They felt with the different types of court cases going on 3104  
today that they wanted to have an opportunity to serve. And 3105  
they are as concerned about seeing that we have justice carried 3106  
out. They feel they are knowledgeable and intelligent and they 3107  
would like...my indication from my district was, that they 3108  
wanted to serve and I would concur with the Gentleman from Rock 3109  
Island, who spoke just before me and I would like to see...have 3110  
you change this to nonconcurrency." 3111

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan." 3111

Ronan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'll have to 3112  
disagree with Representative Polk and his analysis. The 3113  
Illinois Pharmacists Association is in favor of this amendment. 3114  
The Bill was not killed. We put it on the Spring calendar 3115  
because it could not garner 89 votes, but the Bill is still 3116  
alive. However, Representative MacDonald was generous enough 3117  
to allow her Bill to be amended in the Senate. The 3118  
pharmacists...this does not mandate that they don't serve on 3119  
juries. It just gives them the opportunity where they don't 3119  
have to serve on juries. This is a good government Bill. What

it does is it's going to provide decent health care for the people of our state, and that's my number one priority is health care. And that's the reason we got this amendment here, and that's why I move so vigorously for concurrence. To protect the people of our state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "From what? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley."

Stanley: "Yeah, I would like to respectfully ask the concurrence in this motion. Ah..in deference to Representative Darrow and Representative Polk, it is important to point out, that if you have a small pharmacist, especially in the downstate area, if he's required to serve on jury duty, he's got to close down. And the other important point is to make is that if you're a lawyer today here exempts it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Polk, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Polk: "If I may respond very quickly. We already went through this. We've checked with the Circuit Clerk and the Clerk of the Courts and he indicated that if it's a one man operation or a two man operation and they wanted to be exempt, all they had to do was write their letter and request it and it would be granted. They did not know of one example where a pharmacist had requested to be exempted and he was not exempted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley. Please continue."

Stanley: "I will respectfully yield to someone who is a pharmacist, Representative Williams. Maybe he can clarify that point."

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

Williams: "Yes, I was going to pick up on the very point that Roger Stanley there was making. It is true, when you have the small store there and you have one pharmacist, perhaps two, I think the possibility might exist that you have to shut down the store for a week or two or however long it would take to get off the jury duty. Ah..ah..and as Representative Ronan says, this is a very important part of the health services to all the



stay open if they get a long jury duty. I think that this Bill  
is important and I would ask for your concurrence." 3198

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1048. All in favor, vote 'aye', all  
oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted to  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there  
are 71 'ayes', 75 'nos'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. MacDonald." 3199 3200 3201 3202 3203

MacDonald: "It's obvious that this concurrence is not going to pass,  
so I would move now not to concur." 3205 3207

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady moves not to concur in Senate Amendment #1  
to 1048. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose.  
Lady moves that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to 1048.  
House Bill 1042. 1052. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz.  
Marovitz." 3208 3209 3210 3211 3212

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
House. I would ask that the House do concur with Senate  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1052, which deletes everything that  
would make any changes in the Council on Aging and a..a..just  
remains the main purpose of the Bill, to set up the Legislative  
Advisory Committee on Aging. It was an agreed amendment on  
both sides of the aisle. And I would ask for concurrence with  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1052." 3213 3214 3215 3216 3217 3218 3220

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House  
concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1052. All in favor  
vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?  
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On  
this question, there's 149 'ayes', 5 'nos', 5 recorded as  
'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to  
House Bill 1052. This Bill having received the Constitutional  
Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1060. Lady  
from Cook, Mrs. MacDonald." 3221 3222 3223 3224 3225 3226 3227 3228

MacDonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.  
This indeed is a noncontroversial concurrence and I would ask  
that you concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. The  
Bill itself granted an additional 90 days to respond to  
application for permits. The Senate amendment merely says that 3229 3230 3231 3232 3233

unless there is a federal law or state regulation, that unless 3233  
 the Environmental Protection Agency responds within the 90 days 3234  
 that the permit is automatically issued. I would ask for 3236  
 concurrence on this amendment." 3237

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 3238  
 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. All in favor 3239  
 vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 3240  
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 3241  
 this question, there's 147 'ayes', 10 'nays', 2 recorded as 3242  
 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 3243  
 House Bill 1060. This Bill having received the Constitutional 3244  
 Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1063. Mr. 3244  
 Woodyard." 3245

Woodyard: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 3246  
 House. I move for concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House 3247  
 Bill 1063. The Bill itself was requested by the Department of 3248  
 Transportation to remove obsolete Sections of an Act relating 3249  
 to the Illinois waterway. It was discovered in the Senate that 3250  
 the repeal of these Sections would also curtail some of the 3251  
 activities of the Joliet Sanitary District of Chicago." 3252

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall the 3253  
 House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1063. All in 3254  
 favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Marco. Have all voted 3255  
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3256  
 record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', none 3257  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate 3258  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1063. This Bill having received a 3259  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3259  
 1070. Mr. Friedrich. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. 3260  
 Friedrich. Oh, I'm sorry, the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Frederick." 3260

Frederick: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3262  
 I move concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1070, 3263  
 which permits normal traffic engineering standards exceptions 3264  
 on requirements for left turning arrows. I move concurrence." 3265

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall 3267  
 the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1070. 3268

All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted 3269  
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3270  
 record. On this question, there's 141 'ayes', 7 'nays', 2 3271  
 recorded as 'present'. This Bill...the House does concur with 3272  
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1070. This Bill having  
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3273  
 House Bill 1071. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Frederick." 3275

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to 3276  
 House Bill 1071, which changes the phrase 'related green 3277  
 movement' to 'respective green movement' and providing for the 3278  
 use of yellow arrows on traffic control signals. I move 3279  
 concurrence." 3280

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall the 3281  
 House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1071. All 3282  
 in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 3283  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3284  
 record. On this question there's 157 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 3285  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1071. This Bill having received the 3286  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3287  
 1079. Mr. Swanstrom. Swanstrom." 3288

Swanstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3289  
 I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 3290  
 Bill 1079. This Bill changes the language of the Livestock 3291  
 Dealer Licensing Act to fit in with the new consolidated 3292  
 federal agency, within the Department of Agriculture, which is 3293  
 called the Agricultural Marketing Service. There was an error 3294  
 in the original draft of the Bill, which would have allowed 3295  
 foreign corporations to be granted a license under the Act  
 without being authorized to do business in this State by the 3296  
 Secretary of State. The effect of Senate Amendment #1 restores 3297  
 the provision that no foreign corporation shall be granted a 3298  
 license under this Act until it has been authorized by the 3299  
 Secretary of State to do business in this State. I move for  
 concurrence." 3300

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. 3301

Mulcahey." 3302

Mulcahey: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?" 3304

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 3306

Mulcahey: "Representative Swanstrom. What is the position of the 3307  
Department of Agriculture with this amendment?" 3309

Swanstrom: "They fully support this amendment." 3311

Mulcahey: "Thank you." 3313

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 3314  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1079. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3315  
oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3316  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 3317  
there's 160 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present' and the 3318  
House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1079. 3319  
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
declared passed. House Bill 1080. The Gentleman from Rock 3320  
Island, Mr. Bell." 3321

Bell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3322  
I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1080. 3323  
1080 amends the Illinois Feeder Swine Dealer Licensing Act and 3324  
all the Senate Amendment #1 does is it says that no out of 3325  
state corporation shall receive a license under this Act, until 3326  
it has been authorized to do business within the State of 3327  
Illinois." 3328

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House 3329  
concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1080. All in 3330  
favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who 3331  
wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3332  
record. On this question, there's 155 'ayes', 2 'nays', 2 3333  
recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate 3334  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1080, and this Bill having received 3335  
the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House 3336  
Bill 1084, Mr. Robbins." 3337

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on this so that people who 3337  
sell their products to a foreign corporation will be assured 3338  
that they will be paid. If they are not filed with the 3339  
Secretary of State, why then they will...they do not have the 3340



assurance that they will be paid and do not have the right to  
 sue to collect their..for whatever they sell." 3341  
 3342

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 3343  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1084. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3344  
 oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 3345  
 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 3346  
 there's 156 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present' and the 3347  
 House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1084. 3348  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
 declared passed. House Bill 1086. The Gentleman from McLean, 3349  
 Mr. Ropp." 3350

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with 3351  
 Amendment..Senate Amendment #1 and 2 on House Bill 1086. And 3352  
 what Senate Amendment #1 actually does, it adds the Section 3353  
 that commercial structural test operators are not a part of 3354  
 this particular Bill, in that they are already covered under 3355  
 the Illinois Structural Test Control Law currently. Senate  
 Amendment #2 is actually a word change and correction in 3356  
 verbage in some of the other areas. I move for support of this 3357  
 correction." 3358

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House 3359  
 concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1086. All in 3360  
 favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 3361  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3362  
 record. On this question, there's 153 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 3363  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate  
 Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1086. This Bill having 3364  
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3365  
 House Bill 1098. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl. Out 3366  
 of the record. House Bill 1123. The Gentleman from DuPage, 3367  
 Mr. Daniels. ...Mr. Daniels." 3368

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to 3369  
 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1123." 3371

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 3372  
 Getty." 3373

Getty: "Is there an appraised value on the..on the property to be 3374

conveyed under the Senate Amendment?" 3376

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels, the question is if there is an 3377  
appraised value." 3378

Daniels: "I don't have the appraised value. All I can tell you is 3379  
that it adds the authority for IDOT to convey to the Illinois 3380  
Central Gulf Railroad Company by quitclaim deed at not less 3381  
than the fair market value. The right, title and interest it 3382  
has in a triangle parcel of land approximately 1600 square feet 3383  
in area, located in the City of Chicago. While it's been the 3384  
policy, I thought of this House, to require that we have the 3386  
appraised value before hand." 3386

Getty: "It says not less than fair market value, Representative. It 3387  
doesn't say it just to convey it at the appraised value. It 3388  
says not less than fair market value, so you'd need an 3389  
appraisal. It's an amendment for property in Chicago, and 3390  
frankly, I could care less what happens to the amendment, but 3392  
I believe we ought to concur in it." 3392

Daniels: "While, I just wonder if a...I'm sure one would be on file 3393  
under the rules before it could be conveyed." 3395

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further..." 3397

Getty: "I wonder if you'd like to take it out of the record for just 3398  
a couple of minutes. I'd like to just..." 3400

Daniels: "I'll take the Amendment off if you want me to. It's a 3401  
Chicago amendment. I'll take it out of the record. It's the 3402  
Speaker's Bill. I'll take it out of the record." 3404

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1130. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 3405  
Williams." 3406

Williams: "I thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 3407  
House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3. 3408  
Amendment #1 just corrects a typographical error. There was a 3409  
misspelling of the word 'extension', so that makes that change. 3410  
The Amendment #2 is a change from the original. The Bill 3411  
originally actually provided that in addition to a special 3412  
assessment and general taxation, the river conservancy district 3413  
may finance activities by what is called a special service 3414  
area, actually taxation, which is very much the same as what 3414

municipalities or counties may have. Now the change in the 3415  
 Senate Amendment #2 would provide that a special service area 3416  
 can be created by the river conservancy district only after a 3417  
 petition of a majority of the owners of the land in the 3418  
 proposed special service area, or the owners of a majority of 3419  
 the land within the proposed area. It's actually a contrast of 3420  
 then to what the special service areas, you know, in a 3421  
 municipality would be in so far as it can only be objected to 3422  
 by a petition of more than 51% of the owners of the land or the 3423  
 owner of more than 51%. Ah..Amendment #3, ah..it relates to 3424  
 the financing of the construction land acquisition and the 3425  
 local improvements for the river conservancy districts, and 3426  
 what it really does, and I think rightly so, it takes it and it 3427  
 makes the changes from the municipal code and it puts it into 3428  
 the code of the..of the river conservancy districts. And it 3429  
 takes out then the reference to the mayor and the board of 3430  
 trustees and it puts it into the hands of the commissioner..you 3431  
 know, of the river conservancy district. I think this is an 3432  
 excellent change. The Bill has been supported by the..all of 3433  
 the Illinois Council of Watersheds and the Illinois Land 3434  
 Improvement Contractors Association and I move for concurrence 3435  
 on the Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3." 3436

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk." 3437

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions. Will he 3438  
 yield?" 3439

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he yields." 3440

Polk: "I noticed on the top line. It says, this requires a petition, 3441  
 and I wonder what..what is a difference between a petition and 3442  
 a referendum, or is this not referendum?" 3443

Williams: "The original Bill, and the way the special service 3444  
 district areas for municipalities go, it would be, I suppose it 3445  
 might be referred to as a back door referendum. This would 3446  
 actually eliminate the back door referendum and it would be a 3447  
 direct..a petition by those who would be actually affected by 3448  
 the improvement." 3449

Polk: "51%, 3/4 or..." 3450

Williams: "51% and it makes the change that if 51% or it would be the majority of the owners of the acreage or a majority of the acreage in the area that is actually to be improved."

Polk: "Will they then have bonding power for construction?"

Williams: "Ah, the way a special service district area goes, is when you then agree on the area that is to be designated for the improvements, then the actually extension for the bonds. In other words, those people in that specific area, are the only ones then who choose..you know..let's see, that only they in the special service area are going to be taxed for that improvement."

Polk: "So the property within that specified area is taxed."

Williams: "Right. They're the only ones actually to consent, and they usually do because that improvement is going to actually affect them and the people who are outside of that special service district area are not actually paying for the improvement within that special service district area."

Polk: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 1130. All in favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 143 'ayes', 7 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill 1130. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1139. Mr. Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill...Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1139 changes the methods of payment of bills incurred by the State. As the House Bill went out of here, it provided that those bills that were due in 60 days would be paid in 30 days and the 90 day period reduced to 60 days. Amendment #...Senate Amendment #2, because of conversations with the administration, asked that certain bills...certain moneys contained in revolving funds be changed and that's what the amendment did. It provided for

payment of bills to be paid within 60 days of approval. The revenues that came from the office supply revolving fund, the paper and printing revolving fund, the communication revolving fund, state garage revolving fund and that's the content of Senate Amendment #2. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1139."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Yourell. What's the purpose for the delay? Is there a problem with those funds?"

Yourell: "Yes, because of their peculiarity in that they are revolving funds, sometimes that money is not there in that particular fund at the time the period called for in the original Bill comes due."

Getty: "Very good."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 in House Bill 1139. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 156 'ayes', 1 'no', none recorded 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1139. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1156. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea. Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move for concurrence with Amendment 1 on House Bill 1156. This amendment clarifies the use of community health funds, as being subject to approval of local government. It also has some technical and house cleaning provisions. This came out of the Senate 49 to 2 and I would move for a concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1156. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to explain his vote."

Kane: "For a question. Do I understand that now no elected body will  
have to approve the tax levy authorized by these local health  
commissions." 3529 3530 3531

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea." 3533

Rea: "The local governing body would have to approve that  
appropriation." 3534 3535

Kane: "But not an elected body, as under present statute." 3537

Rea: "Yes." 3539

Kane: "Meaning that provision is now being withdrawn if we adopt this  
amendment?" 3540 3541

Rea: "It now has to be approved by the elected body, as it reads  
now." 3542 3543

Kane: "And if this amendment is adopted, they would have to approve  
it also?" 3544 3545

Rea: "Yes. That is correct." 3547

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question  
there's 154 'ayes', 2 'nos', none recorded as 'present' and the  
House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1156.  
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
declared passed. House Bill 1160. The Gentleman from  
Sangamon, Mr. Jones." 3548 3549 3550 3551 3552 3553

Jones: "Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that  
we concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 of 1160. 1160 is a  
Bill that allows state employees to re-enter the system on a  
payment plan, but the Senate made some improvements, I believe  
that in the line that says remarriage or death, they added  
'before the age 55' and then they..in the line that has to do  
with examination for disability, they a written certificate by  
one or more licensed and practicing physicians and Amendment #3  
does the same thing for the surviving spouse or parent. I move  
this adoption." 3554 3555 3556 3557 3558 3559 3560 3561 3562

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the  
House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill  
1160. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all  
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take 3563 3564 3565 3566

the record. On this question, there's 154 'ayes', no 'nays', one recorded 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill 1160. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1184. Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1184. House Bill 1184 establishes the agricultural areas for conservation and protection of high grade farmland in Illinois. The first amendment, put on in the Senate, provides that before the establishment of such an area that if it's within one and one-half mile area of a city or village that that city or village must be given notice of the intentions of establishing such a district. If there is no objection from the city or village, they may go ahead and proceed to establish the district. If there is objection from the elected governmental body of that city, then the land must be removed from the proposed agricultural area's district. Senate Amendment 2 provides that in the definition of county committee, the word 'advisory' is taken out. This is a technical amendment. In Amendment #3, it adds several technical points, but the most important is that in the definition of the land that's included that no land within an agricultural area shall be used for other than agricultural production, as described in the Act. I would move for the adoption of these three amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill 1184. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney to explain his vote."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it looks like we're rather late in the game to try to head this one off. I think this Senate amendment rather severely limited the effect of the Bill. I think it was a reasonably good Bill when it left the House. The only problem is now, we've taken out the part that pertains to cities and I think probably they could cause more problems

in an agricultural area really than anyone else. So, I'm  
rather disappointed to see that the Sponsor is asking for  
concurrence on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question,  
there's 121 'ayes', 34 'nays' 8 recorded as 'present' and the  
House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 on House  
Bill 1184. This Bill having received the Constitutional  
Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1187. Mr.  
Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr...Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen  
of the House. Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1187 makes  
several changes to the Bingo Act. As you recall, 1187 as it  
passed out of here was a response to the Department of Revenue,  
as it presented rules to the Joint Committee on Administrative  
Rules. And what we tried to do with House Bill 1187 was to  
adopt statutory provisions to the Bingo Act in lieu of the  
rules proposed by the Department of Revenue and that's exactly  
what they wanted. Senate Amendment #2 currently...rather the  
Bingo Act currently provides that licenses may be issued to  
charitable, educational, religious, fraternal, veterans or  
labor organizations. The amendment, Senate Amendment #2  
provides standard definitions of each of these kinds of  
organizations. It includes the provider of premises for the  
conducting of Bingo in the Section dealing with licensing and  
permits such provider the right to collect reasonable expenses  
for the use of such premises. I move to concur in Senate  
Amendment #2 to House Bill 1187."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House  
concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1187. All in favor  
vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?  
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On  
this question there's 132 'ayes', 9 'nos', 6 recorded as  
'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to  
House Bill 1187. This Bill having received the Constitutional  
Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1193. The



Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon." 3632

Leon: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Senate 3633  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1193 is a technical correction and I 3634  
move for its adoption." 3635

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 3636  
concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1193. All in favor 3637  
vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 3638  
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 3639  
this question there's 151 'ayes', 1 'nay' 3 recorded as 3640  
'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 3641  
House Bill 1193. This Bill having received the Constitutional 3642  
Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1196. Mr. 3643  
Reilly. Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. House 3644  
Bill 1223. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton." 3644

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3645  
This original Bill was one that took 8 years in passage. The 3646  
guaranty fund for life, health and accident, and for which we 3647  
are justly proud of. When the Bill went over to the Senate, 3648  
although there were some exclusions provided, they thought it 3649  
best to specifically mention them in this Bill. In addition, 3650  
they provide that the Board of Directors must be notified or 3651  
the Directors of the insurance company, must be notified by the 3652  
Director of Insurance not later than three days after 3653  
determination is made of the existence of an impaired or 3654  
insolvent insurer. This has been cleared with the Chairman of 3655  
the Committee...Insurance Committee of the House and has the 3656  
approval of the Senate and House Sponsors and I move the 3656  
adoption of Senate Amendment #1." 3657

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. 3658  
Kane." 3659

Kane: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?" 3661

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 3663

Kane: "Could you tell us why certain kinds of insurance, as for 3664  
example, burial societies and Article 17 of the Illinois 3665  
Insurance Code, why these were excluded from the Act." 3667

Epton: "Yes, they are not per se, actually insurance companies. They 3668

are generally fraternal organizations of a smaller nature. 3665  
 They do not operate as insurance companies and they have a 3670  
 small...only a small number of shareholders and to maintain a 3675  
 possibility of assessing them would be manifestly unfair. In 3672  
 our original Bill, we did exclude them, but the Senate in their 3673  
 wisdom, thought it best to specifically mention them. These 3675  
 are not insurance companies per se." 3675

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 3676  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1223. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3677  
 opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 3678  
 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 3679  
 there's 158 'ayes', 2 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and 3680  
 the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3681  
 1223. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is 3682  
 hereby declared passed. House Bill 1228. The Gentleman from 3683  
 Cook, Mr. O'Brien." 3683

O'Brien: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Members, I move to concur with Senate 3684  
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1228." 3686

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion. Question is, what does it do?" 3687

O'Brien: "It merely puts in an amendment which makes the individual 3688  
 who owns the company, in addition to the truck driver who is 3690  
 disposing the liquid waste, liable for the criminal offense." 3691

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 3693  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1228. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3694  
 oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 3695  
 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 3696  
 there's 161 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded 'present' and the 3697  
 House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1228. 3698  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby 3699  
 declared passed. House Bill 1233. Mr. Reilly." 3701

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker. The Senate amendment to 1233 itself dealt with 3702  
 putting a date in the statute to determine when the 3703  
 probationary period for teachers began. Everyone agreed that 3704  
 we needed to put such a date in the statutes. The School Board 3705  
 Association felt that the date in the original proposal was too 3706  
 late in the year, so they suggested an amendment, which was put

on in the Senate to make it November 1st. I think that's a reasonable proposal. They're happy with it and I'm happy with it. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 1233."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1233. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 8 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1233. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1244. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Bill establish the office of appraisals to operate in the DLGA to furnish appraisal assistance to local governments, in connection with commercial and industrial properties. The amendment in the Senate excludes the county of Cook. I suppose the justification for that is if he's county assessor of Cook County, he has enough expertise and talent to appraise all these properties, but this would still be a great assistance to 101 other counties. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Surely you jest. Cook County is left out? Is that correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It excludes Cook County. That is correct Sir."

Skinner: "Are you the Sponsor of the Bill, or did you write the amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Listen to the explanation."

Skinner: "That's fascinating. Maybe the Sponsor could answer the question. Under what justification besides the fact that Cook County is doing everything correct is this left out?"

Mugalian: "Mainly because we probably couldn't pass the Bill without the amendment."

Skinner: "Well, I yield my diatribe against the bad assessment

practices in Cook County and will vote for the Bill under those 3744  
circumstances." 3745

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell." 3747

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3748  
I am a Cosponsor of this Bill too. There is really no thrust 3749  
to the Bill and it simply sets up within the Department of 3750  
Local Government Affairs, anyone who wants to request help from 3751  
those appraisers to appraise commercial industrial property. 3752  
Now, if Cook County doesn't want in, I see no reason for it and 3753  
there's no penalty for anyone, but nevertheless, we want people 3754  
there to give them assistance if they want it. So, I would 3754  
ask...go along with the Sponsor and move to concur in Senate 3755  
Amendment #1." 3756

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 3757  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1244. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3758  
oppose vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners to 3759  
explain his vote. The timer's on." 3760

Kempiners: "Yes Mr. Speaker, I'm voting for this, but perhaps the 3761  
Gentleman who is sponsoring this could explain his vote and 3762  
indicate whether or not there would be some contribution by the 3763  
unit of government that uses the services of this and if not, 3764  
if he would introduce legislation to provide that type of 3765  
contribution or sharing in the cost." 3766

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian." 3768

Mugalian: "I hadn't planned on it, but the Department has known about 3769  
this Bill and has not opposed it since it was first introduced. 3770  
I think they will try to pay for this within their budget." 3772

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3773  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 3774  
there's 136 'ayes', 13 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the 3775  
House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1244. 3776  
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby 3777  
declared passed. House Bill 1253. Gentleman from Effingham,  
Mr. Brummer. Mr. Brummer." 3779

Brummer: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3780  
1253. It is merely a technical amendment adding back in some 3781

language that was inadvertently left out by the Legislative 3782  
Reference Bureau in the original drafting of the Bill." 3784

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen." 3786

Pullen: "Could the Sponsor possibly tell us what the original Bill 3787  
did, since this is final passage and is his explanation that 3788  
this is just a technical amendment" 3790

Brummer: "It's a technical amendment and as I can understand it is 3791  
that it adds some dots back in." 3793

Pullen: "What does the Bill do?" 3795

Brummer: "The Bill provides that the certificate of magistracy, which 3796  
is attached to an out of state consent on an adoption, shall 3797  
either be a certificate of magistracy or such other proof of 3798  
the notary public as is satisfactory to the court." 3799

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 3800  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1253. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3801  
oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3802  
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 3803  
there's 152 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and 3804  
the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3805  
1253. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is  
hereby declared passed. House Bill 1260. Mr. Bradley. Out of 3806  
the record, request of the Sponsor. House Bill 1261. The Lady 3807  
from Cook, Mrs. Currie." 3808

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3809  
1261 established performance standards in the Department of 3810  
Public Aid for the operation of the emergency aid program and 3811  
closed loop holes that will keep abuses in the Uses Funds in 3812  
the Emergency...Public Aid Emergency Revolving Trust Fund from 3813  
being made. The Senate Amendment merely deletes extraneous 3814  
references to Public Aid use of the petty cash fund. I urge 3815  
our concurrence in the Senate amendment to House Bill 1261." 3817

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 3818  
concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1261. All in 3819  
favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 3820  
wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3821  
record. On this question there's 149 'ayes', 6 'nays', 2 3822

recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate 3822  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1261 and this Bill having received 3823  
 the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House 3824  
 Bill 1269. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman. 3825  
 Schlickman, please." 3826

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Amendment #1 3827  
 to House Bill 1269 authorizes fire protection districts to 3828  
 establish an addressing system to enable them to provide for 3829  
 more efficient fire protection service. I would move that we 3830  
 concur with this Amendment to House Bill 1269." 3831

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 3832

Leinenweber: "Is there any need for this amendment? I can't believe 3834  
 that a fire protection district couldn't have an addressing 3835  
 system now." 3836

Schlickman: "The Attorney General has stated an opinion that fire 3837  
 protection districts do not have statutory authority for 3838  
 engaging in addressing systems and that statutory authority is 3839  
 required." 3840

Leinenweber: "Did anybody ever contest that? Any district that 3841  
 practices..." 3842

Schlickman: "The Department of Local Government Affairs concurred 3843  
 with the Attorney General and recommended that this amendment 3844  
 be adopted." 3845

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall 3846  
 the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1269. 3847  
 All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted 3848  
 who wish? Have all voted wish. The Clerk will take the 3849  
 record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 3850  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1269. This Bill having received the 3851  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3852  
 1272. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3853  
 1290. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty." 3854

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in 3855  
 the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1290. The amendment would 3856  
 provide that a person has the right...licensee has the right to 3857

show compliance with all lawful requirements for retention of 3858  
 the license. Secondly, that notice may be sent by certified 3859  
 mail. Third, it restores the language, has not demonstrated 3860  
 reasonably sufficient character relating to honesty and  
 integrity to warrant operation or continuing operation of the 3861  
 facility and fourth, it provides that in the event there is a 3862  
 hearing and the person does not appear, that the hearing will 3863  
 still go forward, although it would be a default hearing. I 3864  
 would move again, for concurrence." 3865

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen." 3867

Pullen: "Could the Sponsor please tell us something about what the 3868  
 Bill does." 3869

Getty: "Yes, this is a Bill, Dangerous Drug Commission Bill. The 3870  
 intent of the Bill is to clean up several parts to redefine 3871  
 addict. To provide that investigators for the Department may 3872  
 investigate not only on premises, but in the area of the 3873  
 premises to clean up certain requirements under the Illinois 3874  
 Administrative Procedures Act for the Commission." 3875

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 3876  
 Amendment #1. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. 3877  
 Vinson." 3878

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?" 3880

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 3882

Vinson: "Could explain in some more detail, Representative Getty, 3883  
 what the provision does that deletes the application of the 3884  
 Administrative Procedure Act?" 3885

Getty: "As the Bill passed the House, it would have deleted the 3886  
 provision that a licensee has the right to show compliance with 3887  
 other rules and regulations in a hearing. That is the way the 3888  
 Administrative Procedures Act is drawn. The way the Bill 3889  
 passed the House, we had deleted that provision. This would 3890  
 now restore that provision." 3891

Vinson: "So, the licensee can make that showing." 3893

Getty: "That is correct." 3895

Vinson: "Thank you." 3897

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 3898

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1290. All in favor vote 'aye', all 3899  
 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3900  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 3901  
 there's 152 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present' and the 3903  
 House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1290.  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby 3904  
 declared passed. House Bill 1307. The Gentleman from Cook, 3905  
 Mr. Meyer." 3906

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 3907  
 #1 to House Bill 1307. House Bill 1307 amends...amended the 3908  
 School Code and permitted funds from the Chicago Board of 3909  
 Education to be invested in Savings and Loans. Senate 3910  
 Amendment #1 expanded it and permitted and permits any school 3911  
 treasurer to deposit school funds in Savings and Loans and it  
 further tightens up the requirements. I urge its adoption." 3913

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House 3914  
 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1307. All in 3915  
 favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 3916  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3917  
 record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 3918  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1307. This Bill having received the 3919  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3920  
 1324. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton." 3921

Cullerton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 3922  
 House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3923  
 1324. The language in this amendment is basically the language 3924  
 that was contained in House Bill 1131, sponsored by 3925  
 Representative Sandquist. House Bill 1131 passed the House 3926  
 Insurance Committee 13 to nothing, passed out of the House 128  
 to 10 and then it was killed in the Senate Insurance 7 to 3. 3927  
 Then they changed their mind and decided they didn't want the 3929  
 Bill and they used my Bill as a vehicle. Basically, what it 3930  
 does is presently insurance companies are prohibited from  
 contributing to political campaigns. The amendment retains 3931  
 this prohibition, but it defines insurance companies in such a 3932



way that companies that own insurance companies, but do not themselves engage in the business of insurance, are exempt from the prohibition. I would ask for concurrence. Thank you." Speaker Lechowicz: "Question...any discussion? Question is, shall the House concur. Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman." Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker." Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he yields." Schuneman: "John, I'm sorry. I didn't hear all of your explanation. This is the...this is the Bill that would permit companies who own insurance companies to make contributions to political campaigns?" Cullerton: "That's right." Schuneman: "And what was the amendment please? Was there a Senate Amendment to change that?" Cullerton: "No." Schuneman: "That was the amendment that was put on this Bill?" Cullerton: "Right." Schuneman: "Okay. Thank you very much." Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz." Katz: "Well, it does seem to me that that really does gut the law that prohibits insurance companies from making contributions. If the parent is permitted to do it, obviously, there's no real difference between the parent and the subsidiary in that situation and it seems to me maybe we ought to take the approach either of eliminating insurance companies...there was a Bill that removed the limitation on the ability of insurance companies to make contributions. I opposed the Bill and I think it didn't become law, but it does seem to me that this kind of amendment really does gut the prohibition against insurance companies that are regulated industries are making contributions and I do entertain real doubts about that kind of amendment." Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney." Stearney: "Will the Speaker yield, I mean the Sponsor." Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor will." Stearney: "As it is, present law prohibits insurance companies from

making contributions."

3982

Cullerton: "Correct."

3984

Stearney: "And the affect of Senate Amendment #1 would allow a company who owns an insurance company to in turn make contributions."

3985

3986

3987

Cullerton: "For example, like, Sears Roebuck."

3989

Stearney: "They're in power to make contributions as it is now, are they not?"

3990

3991

Cullerton: "Perhaps Representative Epton could explain that. I believe that they are prohibited because they own an insurance company and that's the reason for the amendment."

3992

3993

3995

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

3997

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. That question has troubled both the Board of Elections of Campaign Expenditures for some time. Better than someone like Sears, for example, you have someone like Lowes' which is not a major force in the insurance business. They could contribute. When they bought C&A however, they were then, a question of whether or not they could contribute. So, although some of my colleagues may object to insurance companies contributions, the fact is companies which do own as a subsidiary, a insurance company, which who have been contributing, should be given that right. I have no conflict of interest in this case and I might add that in response to Representative Stearney's question, there has been some doubt as to whether Sears should or should not be allowed to contribute today, because of their ownership of Allstate. This Bill would allow Sears to contribute, but would not allow Allstate to do so."

3998

3999

4000

4001

4002

4003

4004

4005

4006

4007

4008

4009

4010

4011

Stearney: "Question to Mr. Epton. Do you know now if Allstate has made political contributions over the last few years?"

4012

4014

Epton: "Of my own knowledge, I know that Allstate not only has not made, but has come down to Springfield to explain to some of us why it would refuse to buy tickets."

4015

4016

4018

Stearney: "Not only that. Has Sears Roebuck made contributions?"

4020

Epton: "Not to me."

4022

Stearney: "To anyone here of your knowledge."

4024

Epton: "To my knowledge, no I don't know that." 4026

Stearney: "And of your own knowledge, you do not know of the State 4027  
Board of Elections prohibiting Sears Roebuck from making 4028  
contributions." 4029

Epton: "No, but I do know that the State Board of Elections raised 4030  
the question rhetorically, as to whether or not an outfit like 4031  
Lowe's would be allowed to and I say when they raised the 4032  
question, they failed to answer it." 4033

Stearney: "One final question. Would the affect of this amendment 4034  
not be to circumvent the present law, which would prohibit 4035  
insurance companies from making contributions?" 4037

Epton: "I don't believe so. I believe that it could be utilized, but 4038  
when you think that there are approximately 2800 insurance 4039  
companies doing business in Illinois, and of the 2800, less 4040  
than 200 are owned by outside industries, what you're actually 4041  
doing is allowing 200 industries to continue contributions 4042  
while still preventing 2600 insurance companies from making any 4043  
contributions." 4043

Stearney: "But, nevertheless, 200 companies would be allowed to make 4044  
contributions." 4045

Epton: "You are quite correct." 4047

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff." 4049

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We 4050  
heard this Bill in the Insurance Committee and all during the 4051  
duration of the debate, I had reservations about this. I think 4052  
that as long as the State of Illinois has exhibited the rather 4053  
loose and liberal containment of the insurance industry, that 4054  
it is shown by the Department of Insurance the ability to 4055  
enforce anything. I think that it would be a good idea to 4056  
perhaps vote 'no' on this amendment. Because if we don't, I 4057  
agree with Mr...Representative Katz, that what we're talking 4058  
about is interest and I see no difference between the home 4059  
company or the subsidiary that the difference is homogenized as 4060  
far as I'm concerned and could lead to some kind of serious 4061  
conflicts of interest in the future. I would urge a 'no' vote  
on this." 4061

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson." 4063

Vinson: "Yes Sir, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On the Bill. I 4064  
 think people ought to think very seriously about this because 4065  
 the provision that we're talking about along with a like 4066  
 provision that affects the liquor industry are the best to my 4067  
 knowledge, the only two restrictions we have in the law in 4068  
 Illinois on campaign contributions by regulated industries. 4069  
 The problem with that concept is that it presupposes that there 4070  
 is an unregulated industry and that the conflict of interest 4071  
 that the regulated industry has or potentially has, or that 4072  
 somebody who accepts a contribution from them potentially has, 4073  
 is much worse than the conflict of interest that somebody that 4074  
 who obtains a campaign contribution from what is theoretically 4075  
 an unregulated industry. The problem with that theory is that 4076  
 in the modern world with the range of regulations that 4077  
 government imposes on business, environmental, OSHA, EELC, the 4078  
 whole range of regulations that we impose on businesses of a 4079  
 wide variety, there is no such thing as an unregulated 4080  
 industry. Any industry that makes a contribution can have..the 4081  
 person that receives it, can have a conflict of interest and 4082  
 very practically could, given the conflict between government 4083  
 and business today. And so what we ought to do is deal 4084  
 straight up with the question whether business of any kind 4085  
 should be allowed to make a campaign contribution. We should  
 not continue this obsolete provision. We ought to deal 4086  
 straight forward with the issue and I would urge an 'aye' vote 4087  
 on concurrence." 4088

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig." 4089

Hannig: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question." 4090

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. 4091  
 All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose...The 4092  
 previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 4093  
 Cullerton to close." 4094

Cullerton: "It has been indicated that this...perhaps I can have 4095  
 Representative Sandquist close." 4096

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist to close." 4097

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. This Bill...this amendment is the same Bill which passed out of this House 128 to 10. Now let me say. Two years ago, there were two industries that could not make political contributions. The liquor industry and the insurance industry. Those of you who were here know that I had the two Bills and we passed them both out of the House. Unfortunately, the Senate put amendments on the one on the insurance industry and it did not get through, where the one with the liquor industry did get through. We're operating under a different system now than we were when these Bills were first put...laws were first enacted. We now have the Campaign Disclosure Act, and that's where all these things are taken into account. They have to be reported. So you know who's contributing and who's not. There's no reason why one business should be different than any other. Contractors make contributions and I could go on and on on who makes contributions. Now what this Bill does is just to clarify so that at least those companies who are not directly in the insurance business can make contributions. I think it's a step in the right direction. Some of us think the whole prohibition should have been eliminated, but this is what we...how far we can go. It's worked out with the Department of Insurance and I think it's something needed and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 1324. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a sincere question and that is whether the contributions that Sears Roebuck & Company made to the RTA campaign, which amounted to something like 10, 20, or \$30,000 were legal. And I resent very much your failure to allow me to ask a question so I could get an answer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you ask your question now? Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne. Timer's on."

VanDuyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was just going to suggest to Mr.

Sandquist that really on nonconcurring, I'm going to vote for it and I'll do so right now, but I think though the proper procedure would have been for you to nonconcur and go back to a conference committee and put the tavern keepers on. I really subscribe to the position that there should be no prohibition at all." 4132  
4133  
4134  
4135  
4136

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Timer's on. Your lights on Ma'am. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff. Timer's on." 4137  
4138  
4139

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The notion that was put forth that there's no such thing as an unrelated industry, which certainly wouldn't apply to the insurance company which is a \$430,000,000,000 industry that's not even subject to federal control in terms of the anti-trust laws, because those controls are supposed to be made at the state level. Here in Illinois, we've shown ample evidence that there are no controls at the state level. What you're going to do is let out a monster of a money bag that will control its vested interest with bucks...job detriment." 4140  
4141  
4142  
4143  
4144  
4145  
4146  
4147  
4148

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 29 'nos',..Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff..wants a verification?" 4149  
4150  
4151  
4152

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, wants a poll of the absentees. Kindly record Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. Mrs. Breslin as 'aye'. Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. Poll the absentees please." 4153  
4154  
4155  
4156  
4157  
4158

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E. M. Barnes." 4160

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes is 'aye'." 4162

Clerk Leone: "Capparelli. DiPrima. Doyle. Ewell. Dwight Friedrich. Hoffman. Kelly. Kozubow..." 4163  
4165

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kelly as 'no'." 4167

Clerk Leone: "Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. McGrew. O'Brien. Pierce. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Terzich. Sam Wolf. Younge. and Mr. Speaker." 4168  
4169  
4170

- Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters wants to be 4171  
 recorded as 'aye'. Abramson as 'no'. Mr. Rea as 'aye'. Mr. 4172  
 Schoeberlein as 'aye'. What's our count, Mr. Clerk? Excuse 4173  
 me. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge as 'no'. Mr. Johnson. 4174  
 How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Johnson?" 4175
- Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 4177
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'no'. Mr. Anderson, for 4178  
 what purpose do you seek recognition. He wants to be changed 4179  
 from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Kucharski as 'aye'. Mr. Dawson as 4180  
 'aye'. What's the count? There's 102 'ayes', 32 'nays'. Does 4181  
 the Gentleman persist in the verification? Mrs. MacDonald 4182  
 wants to be recorded from...she wants to be recorded as 'aye'.  
 Was there 103, Tony? Mrs. Dyer for what purpose do you seek 4183  
 recogni...?" 4184
- Dyer: "I would like to change my vote to 'aye'." 4186
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Dyer as 'aye'. Mr. Huff 4187  
 withdraws the verification? Gentleman withdraws his 4188  
 verification request. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this 4189  
 question, there's 104 'ayes', 32 'nays' and the House does 4190  
 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1324. This Bill 4191  
 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared  
 passed. House Bill 1325. Mr. Robbins." 4193
- Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask 4194  
 for concurrence of this Bill. This Bill gives the road 4195  
 commissioner the right which they thought they already had, but 4196  
 an attorney refused to enforce the Act to control the waste and 4197  
 operations on the road in time of bad weather. In..with the 4198  
 use of the blacktops and the oil roads, which cost a great deal 4199  
 of money, if they can't put a load limit on...I had the  
 privilege of following a truck down the road here awhile back 4200  
 that cut..was cutting ruts about 4 foot in the oil and gravel 4201  
 whenever the freeze went out of the road. So, this gives them 4202  
 the right to post the roads and the right to enforce the 4203  
 posting of it." 4204
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape." 4206
- Slape: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Sponsor would 4208

mind removing this Bill from the record. It's an identical 4209  
 Bill to House Bill 666 and has many of the same problems that 4210  
 that Bill has in it..in it's Senate Amendment." 4212

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Robbins." 4214

Robbins: "I can't see any reason to remove it from the record. I 4215  
 think we should let it go ahead and fly and then if something 4216  
 happens to Senate Bill 666, then they have the right." 4218

Slape: "Well, Mr. Speaker and the Sponsor to the Bill. This Bill has 4219  
 some of the same problems in giving police authority to the 4220  
 road commissioner and it is...House Bill 666. It goes way 4221  
 beyond the weight limit and there's other factors of it that 4222  
 are imperfect. There is an effort now with the Senate step to 4223  
 try to work out a compromise on these two Bills and I think it 4224  
 would be better, really, if Clyde would take it out of the 4225  
 record." 4225

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Robbins, why don't you take it out of the 4226  
 record for a while? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman." 4228

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all, it's an inquiry. It 4229  
 is still in the record?" 4231

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's up to the Sponsor. Mr. Robbins." 4233

Bowman: "Cause I have a question, if we're still proceeding with this 4234  
 Bill." 4235

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Robbins, do you want to proceed with the Bill 4236  
 or take it out of the record temporarily?" 4238

Robbins: "I guess I'll take it out of the record." 4240

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman takes the Bill out of the record. 4241  
 House Bill 1345. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian." 4243

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Bill was the one that created 4244  
 the Land Resources Management Study Commission. The Senate 4245  
 Amendment creates the Ethnic Heritage Commission. I move that 4246  
 we concur in the Senate Amendment." 4247

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Will, Mr. 4248  
 Leinenweber." 4249

Leinenweber: "Yeah, the amendment..I would ask first of all, is it 4250  
 germane?" 4251

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian come up to the podium 4252



please? Want to ask some other questions while we're waiting 4253  
 for the Parliamentarian to arrive?" 4254

Leinenweber "No, well, I'll speak against it while we're waiting, if 4255  
 you want." 4256

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed." 4258

Leinenweber: "The Land Resources Study Commission was a concept that 4259  
 I could and did support when we passed it out some time ago. 4260  
 Unfortunately, apparently the Senate took liberties with the 4261  
 Bill and have added the Ethnic Heritage Commission, which is to 4262  
 consist of twenty members. The purpose of the Commission 4263  
 apparently is to promote heritage festivals in the various 4264  
 neighborhoods of the state. There's going to be some cost 4265  
 involved. I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us if he knows 4266  
 what the cost would be in this commission. I see the members 4267  
 are to serve without compensation, but to be reimbursed for 4268  
 their actual expenses. Is there to be an appropriation?" 4268

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leinenweber, the amendment is germane." 4270

Leinenweber: "Is there to be an appropriation? Do you know? And if 4271  
 so, how much?" 4272

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian." 4274

Mugalian: "Ah, the analysis suggest that there is an appropriation of 4275  
 \$35,000. That doesn't seem to be comport with what the Sponsor 4276  
 told me. As I understand it, there will be no salaries or 4277  
 staff for the Ethnic Heritage Commission, but that they will be 4278  
 reimbursed for expenses. I would suggest that is probably for 4279  
 travel. Since most of the Commission members will be from the 4280  
 Chicago area, I would think that that might be somewhat 4281  
 minimal." 4281

Leinenweber: "Unless they would go to the original home lands of the 4282  
 various ethnic..." 4283

Mugalian: "That's true, then I don't think \$35,000 would be enough." 4284

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Question is shall the 4286  
 House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1345. All in 4287  
 favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 4288  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 4289  
 Sandquist to explain his vote." 4290

- Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 4291  
 I would urge some more 'aye' votes on for this good Commission. 4292  
 This was really the brain child of my former seat mate who was 4293  
 with us two years ago, Boris Matonovich and that Commission 4294  
 with Senator Lemke...I think really are ready to go on it now 4295  
 and this was the only vehicle we could use to get it back and 4296  
 for good ole Boris' sake, let's give it a few more green votes 4297  
 up there." 4298
- Speaker Lechowicz: "From what I understand, Mr. Kulas is supposed to 4299  
 be the Chairman. Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, 4300  
 Mrs. Currie to explain her vote. Timer's on." 4302
- Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Explaining my 4303  
 'yes' vote which has much more to do with the substance of the 4304  
 Bill than of the amendment. It seems to me that a Land 4305  
 Resources Management Study in Illinois is long overdue. It's a 4306  
 project that Representative Mugalian, my seat mate has been 4307  
 encouraging this Legislature to undertake for some years. The 4308  
 Bill introduced this year was actually introduced by former 4309  
 Representative Mike Brady. It's certainly an idea whose time 4310  
 has long since passed and I would urge us to look at the Bill 4311  
 itself to try to distinguish it. Those of us who are not 4312  
 perhaps not so fond of the Ethnic Heritage Study Commission, 4313  
 part of the operation. It seems to me that it's little enough 4314  
 price to pay for those of you who don't...who are not 4315  
 enthusiastic about that particular Commission, in order to have 4316  
 the kind of the Land Resources Management operation in Illinois 4317  
 that we need to have. I'd like to see more green votes 4318  
 please." 4319
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to 4320  
 explain his vote." 4321
- Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker I join such ethnics as LeRoy Lemke and 4322  
 Boris Matonovich in supporting the amendment and I urge other 4323  
 ethnics to hop on." 4324
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The 4325  
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine, to explain his vote." 4326
- Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 4327

House. I noticed in looking at the Republican staff analysis 4327  
 it says 'Ethnic and cultural groups, neighborhoods and clubs in 4328  
 the Chicago area and elsewhere, shall be assisted by the 4329  
 Commission in the preparation and presentation of cultural 4330  
 activities in their local areas'. I think it's presumptuous of 4331  
 us to think that we can go into local ethnic neighborhoods and 4332  
 regional areas in our cities and villages and tell them how to 4333  
 put on a cultural event. I think this is a classic case of 4334  
 Springfield sticking its nose where it has no business and I 4335  
 recommend a 'no' vote. Incidentally, this Bill originally 4336  
 created the Land Resources Study Commission. The amendment 4337  
 adds the Ethnic Heritage Commission. You can nail two at once 4338  
 if you vote against this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 4339  
 wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. 4340  
 Timer's on." 4341

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I understand 4342  
 the necessity for this Bill, but it seems to me that we can 4343  
 nonconcur in this amendment and still preserve a good Bill. 4344  
 I'm all for ethnic heritage, but I think this Commission is 4345  
 silly and I urge a 'no' vote." 4346

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 4347  
 record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 62 'nos', 10 4348  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate 4349  
 Amendment #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten wants a 4350  
 verification. Do you want a poll of the absentees? John Dunn 4351  
 as 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Ebbesen as 'no'. What's the 4352  
 count, Mr. Clerk? 97 'ayes', 63 'no'. Mr. Totten. Mr. 4353  
 McBroom, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" 4354

McBroom: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Some of 4355  
 us enjoy Roll Call Verifications and I would encourage 4356  
 Representative Totten to go ahead with it." 4358

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 97 'ayes', how many 4359  
 'nos'? 63 'nos' and the House does concur with Senate 4360  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1345. This Bill having received the 4361  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4362

1350. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider." 4363

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House 4364  
 Bill 1350 is actually a combination of School Problems 4365  
 Commission and Illinois Office of Education transportation 4366  
 questions. They..it does two things basically. It seeks to 4367  
 evaluate school efficiency in transportation and to provide 4368  
 in-service training and technical assistance at the request of 4369  
 local school districts. As many of you know, we had done some 4370  
 work on revising transportation, but found that data collection 4371  
 was inadequate. This Bill and 1351, the appropriation are 4372  
 directed toward collecting data and hopefully becoming more 4373  
 able to determine an effective transportation formula. I would 4374  
 solicit an 'aye' vote." 4374

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall 4375  
 the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1350. 4376  
 All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted 4377  
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 4378  
 record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', 7 'nos', 2 4379  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1350. This Bill having received the 4380  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4381  
 1355. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty." 4382

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1355 basically 4383  
 is a Bill which prohibits the use of preprinted prescription 4384  
 blanks. This Bill is supported by the Dangerous Drugs Advisory 4385  
 Council and the Dangerous Drug Commission. It would close 4386  
 loopholes by to amendments which were put on in the Senate. 4387  
 The first would require a physician who is dispensing drugs, 4388  
 which are required to be on triplicate forms, if they are  
 filled by a pharmacist also to be put on triplicate form by the 4389  
 physician when he dispenses it, in order to combat the misuse 4390  
 of these drugs by certain dispensing physicians. Secondly, it 4391  
 reschedules preluden as a schedule to triplicate drug in line 4392  
 with almost all of the rest of the United States. It is so 4393  
 scheduled by the FDA and I would move for concurrence in  
 Amendments # 1 and 2." 4394

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House  
concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1355. All  
in favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. The Gentleman  
from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I wonder in explaining his vote if the Sponsor would  
explain whether this applies to all prescription drugs, no  
pre-printed prescription forms, whether it applies to all  
prescription drugs or only the certain types of amphetamines  
that are referred to?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Getty."

Getty: "The basic Bill itself prohibits the use of pre-printed  
forms."

Marovitz: "On all prescription drugs?"

Getty: "Any pre-printed form for prescriptions. I mean..that are  
required to be on prescription, yes."

Marovitz: "Would that be pre-printing of the drug name, pre-printing  
of the doctor's stamp...?"

Getty: "No, No, No, the drug."

Speaker Lechowicz: "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', 4 recorded as 'present' and the  
House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill  
1355. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is  
hereby declared passed. House Bill 1357. The Gentleman from  
Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to nonconcur  
in House Bill 1357. The Senate Amendment #1 was misunderstood  
in the Senate and it attempted to correct an error, which was  
not needed. I discussed it with the Senate Sponsor and he will  
recede."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves not to concur. On that  
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would take  
it out of the record. There's technical problems with the  
Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House nonconcur with

Senate Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 4437  
 'aye', oppose...The House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to 4438  
 House Bill 1357. House Bill 1401, Mr. McGrew." 4440

McGrew: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Bill 4441  
 #1(sic) to House Bill 1401. Basically, the purpose of the Bill 4442  
 was that the State of Illinois Department of General Services 4443  
 would have to survey the existing leases and property in the 4444  
 area. If there was not a...they had to use those in 4445  
 consideration of additional space before they could sign any  
 new leases or purchase any new property. Senate Amendment #1 4446  
 simply added the multi-year lease possibility to the Bill. 4447  
 We've got a great deal of information showing that the State of 4448  
 Illinois is paying a very high premium because of the fact that 4449  
 we can only sign single year leases. However, we did put a  
 provision in the Bill to protect us that in any case the 4450  
 Legislature did not appropriate the fund for the second, third, 4451  
 fourth, or fifth year, then the lease would be null and void 4452  
 automatically, so the Legislature would still have control over 4453  
 the Bill." 4454

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. 4455  
 Pullen." 4456

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please." 4458

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield." 4460

Pullen: "Is there anything in this Bill that would require that when 4461  
 the state writes a lease with an option to buy, the amount of 4462  
 money the state pays on the lease would be used toward the 4463  
 principal of the purchase?" 4464

McGrew: "It does not address that particular problem in any way, 4465  
 shape, or form, though I agree with you, Representative." 4467

Pullen: "I wish it did. Thank you." 4469

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman." 4471

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor." 4473

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield." 4475

Greiman: "Okay. Would...under...if this Amendment were now the law 4476  
 and the Department of Corrections wanted to buy...or wanted to 4477  
 lease Concordia, what would have happened?" 4479

McGrew: "What they would have done, Sir, was to survey the area to, 4480  
 first of all, see if the State of Illinois owned or leased any 4481  
 property that could be used in lieu of buying or leasing 4482  
 Concordia. If they did not, then we continue to go ahead with 4483  
 it. The only...the...the change in the Senate Amendment that 4484  
 I'm moving concurrence would allow us to sign a multi-year 4485  
 lease for...if...in examples such as this." 4486

Greiman: "Well, to...to who would they make their report available?" 4487

McGrew: "Well..." 4490

Greiman: "I mean, once they...once they make the decision, what do 4491  
 they do...make this survey, what do they do with it?" 4493

McGrew: "That's in the original Bill, not in the Amendment, 4494  
 but...okay. Well...I would assume..." 4496

Greiman: "...it passes..." 4498

McGrew: "Yeah. I would assume that it would be made at...at the time 4499  
 and...and presented to Appropriation when it came forward. I 4500  
 did not specifically have...set up more paperwork for them to 4501  
 say, 'Here it is.' It was not an economic advantage, but they 4502  
 would have to have that information before they..." 4503

Greiman: "So...well...so the...every lease then we would have 4504  
 some...some place...somebody would've made such a report then 4505  
 or a survey, is that right?" 4506

McGrew: "Yes." 4508

Greiman: "I see." 4510

McGrew: "From here on out." 4512

Greiman: "Can you make it retroactive last year? Okay." 4514

McGrew: "Sorry, Sir. I can't." 4516

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner." 4518

Skinner: "Do I understand, Mr. Sponsor, that the Concordia lease can 4519  
 be enter...can be entered into even though it is more than two 4520  
 years before this legislation is signed?" 4522

McGrew: "The Bill does not address the Concordia situation 4523  
 whatsoever. In fact, it would have prevented it. In my 4524  
 opinion." 4525

Skinner: "This Bill would have prevented it, but at the present time, 4526  
 how many years may the state lease the property for it?" 4528

McGrew: "One." 4530

Skinner: "One? One year?" 4532

McGrew: "I'm sorry. It's two and...and I think as also in case of 4533  
federal monies, we can sign a multi-year contract, and that's 4534  
where we've gotten the...those figures to show how much...that 4535  
we have cases side by side that this federal multi-year lease 4536  
was a great deal cheaper than the state single or a dual year 4537  
lease. This, incidentally, was recommended by the Auditor 4538  
General." 4539

Skinner: "Well, I'm sure it was. I believe that the language that's 4539  
in the law right now may prohibit the Concordia lease, because 4540  
it's more than two years." 4541

McGrew: "You...you can take that to court or do anything you want to 4542  
with it, Sir. This Bill does not address that, good, bad, or 4543  
indifferent." 4544

Skinner: "Well, I'm not sure you're right. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure 4545  
he's right." 4546

McGrew: "Trust me, Cal." 4548

Skinner: "Because the language...turn his microphone off, will you? 4549  
Because the language here..." 4551

McGrew: "Turn off yours." 4553

Skinner: "Such lease shall in no event extend beyond June 30th of the 4554  
second year following the adjournment of the General Assembly 4555  
and making such appropriation, except that the lease may 4556  
contain a renewal clause subject to acceptance by the state 4557  
after that date. I rather think perhaps the present language 4558  
may be better than the language you're suggesting, if the state 4559  
doesn't want to spend more money than it ought to." 4560

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McGrew to close." 4562

McGrew: "Well, I'd just remind you that the...in the language of the 4563  
Bill or the Senate Amendment, there is a specific provision 4564  
that says that if the Legislature does not appropriate money 4565  
for that specific lease, then the lease is null and void, and I 4566  
ask for a concurrence." 4567

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur with 4568  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1401. All in favor vote 4569



'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have 4570  
all voted who wish? Vote, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the 4571  
record. On this question there's 141 'ayes', 8 'nays', 7 4572  
recorded as 'present'. The House does concur with Senate  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1401. This Bill having received the 4573  
Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4574  
1272. Mr. Beatty." 4575

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, there's an error in the Senate Amendment. We'd 4576  
like to nonconcur until we can go into a Conference Committee 4577  
and put an amendment on that to make it correct." 4579

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with 4580  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1272. All in favor signify 4581  
by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose..The House nonconcur with 4582  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1272. House Bill 1457. Mr. 4583  
Stearney. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney." 4584

Stearney: "Ready?" 4586

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're waiting for you Sir." 4588

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 4589  
I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1457. 4590  
What it does is change the interest rate from 9 1/2% down to 4591  
9%. I ask for a favorable Roll Call." 4592

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question 4593  
is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 4594  
Bill 1457. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. 4595  
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk 4596  
will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', 1 4597  
'nay', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with 4598  
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1457. This Bill having 4599  
received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 4600  
House Bill 1459. Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland." 4601

Friedland: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 4602  
House Bill 1459 would permit local jurisdiction to decrease the 4603  
speed limit to 25 mph on their own residential streets. The 4604  
Senate...I would ask your concurrence in the Senate Amendment, 4605  
which clarified the definition of a residential district. The 4606  
legislation as pending, is supported by the Municipal League, 4607

the Department of Transportation and the Superintendent of the Highways and I urge for concurrence to this measure." 4607  
4609

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1459. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1459. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1461. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman." Amendment #1. Hoffman. Out of the record. House Bill 1510. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton." 4610  
4611  
4612  
4613  
4614  
4615  
4616  
4617  
4618  
4619

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This original Bill encouraged further segregation activity by insurance companies. When it went over to the Senate, the Senate added an amendment. Senate Amendment #1, which provides that the Director of Insurance shall investigate the feasibility of authorizing the establishment of group self-insurance programs for both workman's compensation and unemployment insurance benefits for the purpose of enabling small businesses to participate in such group self-insurance programs. The Chairman of the House Insurance Committee feels that perhaps they're not in a position to do this, but nevertheless, since they can do no harm by making inquiries, he joins me in asking for the approval of Senate Amendment #1." 4620  
4621  
4622  
4623  
4624  
4625  
4626  
4627  
4628  
4629  
4631

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1510. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'ayes', no 'nays', and none recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1510. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1593. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty." 4632  
4633  
4634  
4635  
4636  
4637  
4638  
4639

Getty: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1593 4640

jointly sponsored by Representatives Grossi, Piel and myself, 4641  
 basically adds the village of Thoraton, which wants to join the 4642  
 Metropolitan Sanitary District. Metropolitan Sanitary District 4643  
 has no objections thereto. In addition to that, in the Senate, 4644  
 additional tracts of land were added to this and I would move 4645  
 for concurrence in the Senate Amendment." 4646

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 4647  
 Bullock." 4648

Bullock: "I was wondering if Mr. Getty might take this out of the 4649  
 record. I have a few technical questions I would like to ask." 4650

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur with Senate 4652  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1593. All in favor vote 'aye', all 4653  
 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 4654  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 4655  
 there's 155 'ayes', 3 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the 4656  
 House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1593. 4657  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
 declared passed. House Bill 1754. The Gentleman from Cook, 4658  
 I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster." 4660

McMaster: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your correcting that 4661  
 error in location. And, the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4662  
 1754 corrected an error in spelling. I move that the House 4663  
 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1754." 4665

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House 4666  
 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1754. All in 4667  
 favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all 4668  
 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take 4669  
 the record. On this question there's 157 'ayes', no 'nays', 4670  
 none recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with  
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1754. This Bill having 4671  
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 4672  
 House Bill 1847. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey." 4673

Mulcahey: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate 4675  
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 1847 does three things. Number one, 4676  
 it changes temporary license to temporary permit. Number two, 4677  
 it requires the holder of a temporary permit to work with a 4678

specified veterinarian. Number three, if a temporary permit is 4679  
 revoked, the Department of Registration and Education shall 4680  
 notify the employing veterinarian and the holder of the 4681  
 temporary permit, and I would move to concur with Senate 4682  
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 1847."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the House 4683  
 concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1847. All in 4684  
 favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who 4685  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Marco. What's the matter with 4686  
 Dawson? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 4687  
 there's 156 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and 4688  
 the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4689  
 1847. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is 4690  
 hereby declared passed. House Bill 1921. Gentleman from 4691  
 Adams, Mr. McClain. McClain. Out of the record. The 4692  
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek 4693  
 recognition?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can 4693  
 appreciate you trying to move this out expeditiously here, but 4694  
 just a few minutes ago we passed a Bill that added a few more 4695  
 parcels on to three Sponsors from the Southside of Chicago, 4696  
 ah...the Southside of Cook County. I wish that they would give 4697  
 you a better explanation. Now, I understand that you... 4698

Speaker Lechowicz: "The point's well taken. House Bill 1945. Mr. 4699  
 Peters. Mr. Peters. Out of the record. House Bill 1951. Mr. 4700  
 Huskey."

Huskey: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House 4702  
 Bill 1951 is practically the same Bill that..it includes most 4703  
 of the original language of 1951, however it strengthens..." 4705

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will you give the Gentleman some decorum please. 4706  
 And your point's well taken, Elmer. Please continue, Sir." 4708

Huskey: "Ah, it strengthens the language a little bit, and that's all 4709  
 it does. I move for it's favorable consideration." 4711

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from 4712  
 Cook, Mr. Yourell." 4713

Yourell: "Well, will the Gentleman explain the amendment?" 4715

- Huskey: "I did explain Mr. Yourell, if you had been listening. All it does is clarify and strengthen the language. It is the original Bill. It's approved by the Motor Vehicle Commission and it doesn't change the context of the Bill whatsoever. Strengthens and a...."
- Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for an explanation of the amendment or the Bill. I don't care which. All he does is says that something strengthens something."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "As a matter of courtesy, Mr. Conti, he's absolutely correct. He should re-explain the Bill as to how the amendment affects the Bill."
- Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly do that. I just didn't want to take the time of the House is all. It authorizes the use of strobe lights on school buses under certain conditions. It deletes the body of the Bill and totally rewrites the Bill. The Senate does that. No person shall drive or move any vehicle or equipment upon any highway with any lamp displaying a red light...Actually, what the Bill is, is a strobe light on a school bus and it's to be used under certain conditions when visibility is poor. They're using them now, but they don't have the authority. This gives them the authority to do that without getting a ticket from the police. It can be used under...when atmospheric conditions restrict visibility so severely as to require the strobe light to alert motorists to the presence of a school bus, And the school bus was actually being operated as a school bus, and that the school bus is stopping or stopped for the purpose of loading or discharging pupils on a highway outside of an urban area. Or, the school bus is bearing pupils in the interest of safety, moving at a speed of less than the posted minimum speed or less than 30 mph on a highway outside of an urban area. Mr. Speaker, that's all the Bill does."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."
- Yourell: "Well then it's true that the Senate amendment completely rewrites the Bill and just doesn't strengthen it as you

indicate. One final question. Do you sell strobe lights? Do 4751  
you sell strobe lights?" 4752

Mr. Speaker: "Mr. Huskey." 4754

Huskey: "I don't know, Mr. Yourell. That isn't the purpose. The 4755  
Bill was requested under the Department of Transportation. 4756  
Whether I sell strobe lights or not, I don't know, Mr. Yourell. 4757  
I'll find out and let you know though." 4758

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 4760

Kane: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?" 4762

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 4764

Kane: "How much will this cost school districts?" 4766

Huskey: "Actually, it isn't any cost. This is a Bill that worked out 4767  
by the Department of Transportation and the Motor Vehicle Laws 4768  
Commission. It's not a mandate. Some of the school buses were 4769  
using this light and all they wanted to do was clarify the law 4770  
so they don't violate the law in using this strobe light. And, 4771  
it's not a mandate that they use this light." 4772

Kane: "That's next year's Bill." 4774

Speaker Lechowicz: "Request for TV cameras. Request is granted. 4775  
Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich." 4777

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I read the Bill, it drastically 4778  
changes the law in lights and lamps. Will the Gentleman yield 4779  
for a question, please, or two?" 4780

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 4782

Matijevich: "Could you...could you tell the Membership for example, 4783  
what the definition of a rooftop is under your Bill...under the 4784  
amendment. The definition of a rooftop." 4786

Huskey: "Well, the definition of the rooftop is in the Bill, but it 4787  
would be on top of the bus, on the very...on the...the top side 4788  
of the bus, Mr. Matijevich." 4789

Matijevich: "Oh, well, that's very...How many flashes per minute are 4790  
emitted by this strobe lamp?" 4792

Huskey: "I have no idea." 4794

Matijevich: "Well, you didn't evidently..." 4796

Huskey: "Wait a minute. Yes, I can tell you. 60 to 120 flashes per 4797  
minute, Sir, Representative..." 4799

Matijevich: "Not bad. Alright, I think it..even though it does 4800  
 drastically change the law in lights and lamps, I'm going to 4801  
 support it anyhow and urge the Members to do so." 4803

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti." 4805

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman, I rise for purpose of 4806  
 introduction. We're proud to have with us the President of the 4807  
 10th Ward Republican Women's Organization. Pat Hansen and her 4808  
 son Frank, sitting in the back. Represented by Phil Collins, 4809  
 Miriam Balanoff and Glenn Dawson." 4810

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Will, 4811  
 Mr. Leinenweber." 4812

Leinenweber: "Yeah, this is a...probably the most typical Senate 4813  
 amendment that you can ever come up with, because it does in 4814  
 fact once and for all establish what a rooftop is and I would 4815  
 say that a rooftop is the major uppermost portion of a bus body 4816  
 that is flat in a fore and aft direction." 4817

Huskey: "Thank you Mr. Leinenweber. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this is 4818  
 a safety measure if the operators of a school bus so desire to 4819  
 use it, so I move for its favorable consideration." 4821

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 4822  
 Amendment #1 on House Bill 1951. All in favor vote 'aye', all 4823  
 oppose vote 'no'. Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne." 4825

VanDuyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to support the Bill, but 4826  
 I can't..if it's true that he says you can only use this when 4827  
 atmospheric visibility is very bad, I wonder why it should say 4828  
 in here that the lamps should be of sufficient brightness to be 4829  
 visible in normal sunlight. From a mile away besides." 4831

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Huskey, did you hear the question? Have all 4832  
 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take 4833  
 the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', 7 'nays', 2 4834  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate 4835  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1951. This Bill having received the 4836  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4837  
 1945. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters." 4838

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would 4839  
 move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1945. 4840

House Bill 1945 extended the authority of the Department under 4841  
the Temporary Caretaker Placement Act of Abandoned Children for 4842  
a period of two years. Senate Amendment 1 was an amendment 4843  
which was discussed in the House Human Resources Committee and 4844  
because of the time frame, we could not get it on until the  
Senate, and what that would do would authorize the Director to 4845  
make advance payment to those organizations and agencies that 4846  
the Department contracts with to perform the services of 4847  
temporary homemaker." 4848

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock 4849  
Island, Mr. Darrow." 4851

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?" 4853

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 4855

Darrow: "Didn't Representative Barnes have a similar Bill earlier in 4856  
the Session dealing with this subject?" 4858

Peters: "I don't believe so. We had a Bill on the temporary 4859  
homemaker last year and that was kind of a pilot kind of 4860  
program, Representative Darrow, and what this Bill does is to 4861  
extend that program for another two years." 4862

Darrow: "Thank you." 4864

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz." 4866

Leverenz: "Just a quick question to...what extent are these advance 4867  
payments? How much can they be?" 4869

Peters: "The amendment itself, does not address itself to the amount 4870  
of the amendment. That is left to the discretion of the 4871  
Department, but the contractor or the agency that contracts 4872  
with the Department does have to post a surety bond." 4874

Leverenz: "Did we ever lose any money on an operation that closed 4875  
that received advance payments?" 4877

Peters: "I would say not, Representative Leverenz. There are a 4878  
number of agencies, when we're talking a placement of children 4879  
or temporary homemakers. Some of the agencies added some extra 4880  
startup money." 4881

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 4882  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1945. All in favor vote 'aye', all 4883  
oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 4884



wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 4885  
 there's 149 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the 4886  
 House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1945. 4887  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
 declared passed. House Bill 1990. Gentleman from Anderson, 4888  
 Mr. Neff." 4889

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 4890  
 I move to adopt Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1990. Now, 4891  
 originally House Bill 1990 was a clean up Bill requested by the 4892  
 Department of Agriculture in relation to repealing the Nursery 4893  
 Products Labeling Act, which is no longer used. And the Senate 4894  
 wisely so, and this has been agreed to by the Department of 4895  
 Agriculture, there are three others that they acted...asked 4896  
 us...to put in this...have put in this, and that's the one 4897  
 relating to farm machinery implement and equipment pertaining 4898  
 to serial numbers on them, which hasn't been used for many 4899  
 years. It's been on the books for quite a few years, but never  
 been in use. Then another Act in relation to the supervision  
 of inspection of the weighing of grain and other property. 4900  
 Now, this Act is unnecessary now by the recent amendment of the 4901  
 Federal Grain Standard Act and so that's done away with. And 4902  
 then the third Act pertains to paints and oils, which is not 4903  
 used any more because of the introduction of latex and other 4904  
 types of paint and oil paints are very seldom used. I would  
 recommend the adoption of the Senate Amendment #1. 4905  
 Concurrence." 4906

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino." 4908

Mautino: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?" 4910

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will." 4912

Mautino: "Representative Neff, I'm not involved in the agricultural 4913  
 business, but I find it interesting that an amendment would 4914  
 repeal the identification number on farm machinery. My 4915  
 question to you would be this..Let us assume that I was in the 4916  
 agricultural industry and I wanted to buy a plow. Okay. How  
 do I know that that plow for example, if you had told me that 4917  
 it was a 1975 plow..How do I know it was a plow if there are no 4918

identification numbers on it. How do I know what I'm going to receive for my money with no identification on farm machinery?"

Neff: "There's no question, that for the last several years, most of them have serial numbers on it, but reporting them in is important to the Department of Agriculture and enforcing this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly speak in the microphone? We can't hear you."

Neff: "We've had this on the books for over 30 years and never had one call on the enforcement of it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Mr. Neff, we couldn't hear you."

Neff: "Ah, this legislation has been on the books for over 30 years. They've never had a call for the enforcement of it, and even though most machinery does have a serial number on it and so forth, as far as the Department of Agriculture administrating it, they've had no reason to ever administrate it."

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

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. After that explanation, I rise in support of the concurrent motion. This is probably the best Bill of the Session. It repeals four Acts all at once and if this Bill will enable us to go back to four volumes in the statutes instead of the five that we've been nearing due to our action for the last six months, so I would heartedly recommend a 'yes' vote on this...on concurrence."

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

Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. Is this amendment germane?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian come up to the Speaker's rostrum please? We'll try to get that answer to you. Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I thought we adopted rules that said that the House doesn't have the authority to question the germaness of Senate amendments, not withstanding the Speaker's ruling two years ago on House Bill 1500."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we'll see what the Parliamentarian has to say. Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

- Darrow: "Mr. Johnson should understand that that's only if the Senate has ruled on the germaness of an amendment. Then we are bound by that decision. This has not been ruled on by the Senate." Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we'll let the Parliamentarian explain that. Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne. Mr. Parliamentarian, would you kindly come up to the..."
- VanDuyne: "Yes I would like to ask Mr. Neff a couple of questions." Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he yields."
- VanDuyne: "Representative Neff, you never did really answer Representative Mautino, at least audibly in the microphone, as to whether or not this would have any bearing on the serial number that they put on the tractor or any other made by the manufacturer. Would it alter that?"
- Neff: "LeRoy, it's been on the books for over 30 years. They've never had a call on it. And, for that reason, they do not feel it should be kept on because most...when you go to buy any piece of equipment, you can check the serial number on it yourself."
- VanDuyne: "That's right, but when you say that it is not used. You mean that there's no necessity for it. Now, I had the opportunity to buy a tractor myself, last year, it was a cub lowboy and there was no differentiating marks on the tractor, other than the serial number implanted in the chasis and I called the international dealer in my home town and threw that number on the chasis. He was able to tell me what year that tractor was, which as far as I was concerned, was important to me as to the price I was going to pay for it. So, that at least justifies the need for it. Now, I'm asking you the question again. Does it alter it, and I'm presuming that you're saying yes it does alter it."
- Neff: "Ah, I'm sorry LeRoy. This really doesn't affect the machines with serial numbers on it and I made the error on that. It affects the machines that do not have serial numbers on it. It has no changes whatsoever with the serials on it."
- VanDuyne: "They will alter it and from now on, if we pass this, they will not have to put that labeling on there?"

- Neff: "No. It affects those back there that did not have serial numbers on it." 500
- VanDuyne: "Well, yeah, but how does it affect it? Does that mean that they are forced to put it on?" 500
- Neff: "No, the manufacturers all put 'em on, LeRoy and you can go just like you did on buying that tractor. Any implement dealer, if you come into one place and don't get the serial number right, well we all have them on and that's true for any maker." 501
- VanDuyne: "Okay, so in other words what you're saying is that it's not incumbent upon the Department of Agriculture and the state or whoever is supposed to enforce that as far as state is concerned. It will still be put on there by the manufacturer." 501
- Neff: "Right, yes, absolutely. We don't take anything off." 502
- VanDuyne: "Okay, thank you very much. But, my most important question I had was related to the second one and that is the labeling of scales of measurement. As I understand it now, anybody who runs a grain elevator is obligated periodically to have his scales tested as to their accuracy by a certain agency of the state. Now, and they must label them that they have been tested on such and such a date and they have been subscribed to..or they are subscribing to their accuracy. Now, will that obviate that or would it change that?" 502
- Neff: "That particular law is pre-empted by the recent amendment to the Federal Grain Standards Act that still covers that." 503
- VanDuyne: "Then they would still have to have them inspected?" 503
- Neff: "Yes, that is covered by that." 503
- Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 503
- Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?" 504
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 504
- Kane: "Alright. It's unclear from the description whether the original Bill that went out of here is still included on the Acts that are repealed." 504
- Neff: "Yes, I'm sorry, I mentioned that Act was repealed. That was the labeling of the Nursery Products Labeling Act, so called, and yes, that's in there and three more have been added. And 504

these have been approved by the Department of Agriculture. Of course, I say, they are not used and I might add the Adjutant General's Office has also been involved in this and recommend that they be taken out."

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

Bowman: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he yields."

Bowman: "I'm not familiar with the Acts being repealed, I would like to inquire, however, with regard to an Act in relation to the supervision of the section of the weighing of grain and other property. Does that have any connection at all with load limits for trucks carrying grain?"

Neff: "No, none whatsoever. This is the inspection of grain, as I say, then by a federal law, this pre-empts this law and we still have the same law in the books by the Federal Government there, and administrated by the State."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose...The Parliamentarian has not returned to the rostrum, so we'll have to wait for the ruling. Will the Parliamentarian kindly return to the rostrum. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins. What purpose do you seek recognition?"

Robbins: "Well, I've had my light on for a little bit and I would just like to say one thing. We have a problem of stolen machinery. The state has had some of their machinery stolen in Vandalia in the last month or two and if you remove all of the identification numbers from this machinery, how, then are you going to be able to identify it? Right now, we are in the process of using personal stamps in our area to cut into the metal, our identification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Henderson..Gentlemen from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "In answer to Mr. Robbins there. This does not change anything that we're doing now. This goes back to when they did not have

serial numbers on equipment and the manufacturers are still 5091  
 putting on serial numbers on them." 5092

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow. You 5093  
 want to restate your point Sir? Mr. Darrow." 5095

Darrow: "My point was that I questioned the germaness of the Senate 5096  
 Amendment." 5097

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony, want to give us the Bill and the Senate 5098  
 Amendment? Where's the Bill? We're going to take this Bill 5099  
 out of the record temporarily and we have to check with the 5100  
 Senate whether they ruled on the amendment or not. House Bill 5101  
 2023. Gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Vinson." 5102

Vinson: "Could you cite the rules under which you're doing that, 5103  
 please?" 5104

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me." 5106

Vinson: "Could you cite the applicable rule under which you're making 5107  
 that ruling?" 5108

Speaker Lechowicz: "Precedence of the House is that if the ruling was 5109  
 made by the presiding officer of the other House, we would not 5110  
 make a ruling on the matter." 5111

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker." 5113

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Vinson." 5115

Vinson: "Is there an applicable rule on the subject other than just 5116  
 precedence?" 5117

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, there is not. The Gentleman from Champaign, 5118  
 Mr. Johnson." 5119

Johnson: "That will take me a minute to find it, because I thought 5120  
 the Parliamentarian would recognize the obvious propriety of my 5121  
 statement, but I know that we adopted a rule that indicates 5122  
 that if...we don't have the ability to question germaness of 5123  
 any Senate Amendment whether it's been ruled on or presented or 5124  
 not presented in the Senate." 5125

Speaker Lechowicz: "We did not adopt that amendment. The amendment 5126  
 was offered, but was not adopted. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. 5127  
 Hallstrom." 5128

Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 5129  
 House. House Bill 2023..." 5131

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute ma'am." 5133

Hallstrom: "Sure." 5135

Speaker Lechowicz: "We..we'll just hold off on that for a second. 5136  
 How much time will that take you? Mr. Neff, we'll try to get 5138  
 back to you immediately after the Parliamentarian goes to the 5139  
 Senate to see if they ruled on it. House Bill 2023. The Lady  
 from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom." 5141

Hallstrom: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 5142  
 the House. House Bill 2023 authorized courses of instruction 5143  
 in instrumental as well as vocal music and other visual and 5144  
 performing arts as the local school board may prescribe. The 5145  
 reason for the Senate Amendment was there was some question as 5146  
 to whether this could be construed as a mandate. The Bill 5147  
 never did contain a mandate. The language was changed though.  
 It made the Senate comfortable and it does not appear at all to 5148  
 affect the purpose of the Bill and I would move that we do 5149  
 concur with the Senate Amendment." 5150

Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the 5151  
 House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2023. All 5152  
 in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who 5153  
 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 5154  
 record. On this question there's 149 'ayes', no 'nays', none 5155  
 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate 5156  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2023. This Bill having received the  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5157  
 2126. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar." 5159

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5160  
 I would move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 5161  
 House Bill 2126. It merely makes the proper numbering the 5162  
 three Sections of the Bill, that were improperly drafted in the 5163  
 Amendment and I ask for concurrence." 5164

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall...the Lady 5165  
 from Cook, Miss Pullen." 5167

Pullen: "Could the Sponsor please tell us what the Bill does." 5169

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mahar." 5171

Mahar: "Yes, the Bill amends the Municipal Code to allow 5172

municipalities and counties to enter into co-operative 5173  
 agreements with adjoining states in the case of emergencies." 5174

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 5177

Leinenweber: "In case of war with Wisconsin, would this apply?" 5179

Mahar: "No we come under Military Law in that case." 5181

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur...Gentleman 5182  
 from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 5184

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?" 5186

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 5188

Kane: "Is this the beginning of regional government?" 5190

Mahar: "No, I don't think it is. This allows co-operative agreements 5191  
 between municipalities and counties that are cited along our 5192  
 state boundaries that in case of accidents and that type of 5193  
 thing, which hasn't been clear in the municipal Chapter 24 of 5194  
 the Municipal Code at the present time." 5195

Kane: "Sounds like Nipsy is crossing state borders." 5197

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 5198  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2126. All in favor vote 'aye', all 5199  
 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 5200  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 5201  
 there's 135 'ayes', 8 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the 5202  
 House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2126. 5203  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby 5204  
 declared passed. Page 10 on concurrences is House Bill 2207. 5204  
 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt." 5206

McCourt: "House Bill 2207 pertains to teacher certification. Senate 5207  
 Amendment is designed to more clearly spell out, by statute, 5208  
 the rights a student has in a teacher educational program. The 5209  
 language of the Amendment is virtually identical to the 5210  
 existing rules and regulations governing how institutions 5211  
 operate, approved teacher educational program. As 5212  
 undergraduates must complete an approved teacher 5212  
 program..educational program in order to qualify for a 5213  
 certification, it's appropriate that the rights of these 5214  
 students be clearly spelled out by statute. I move to concur 5214  
 in Senate Amendment #1." 5215



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House 5216  
concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2207. All in 5217  
favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who 5218  
wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 5219  
record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', 3 'nays', none 5220  
recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate 5221  
Amendment #1 to House Bill 2207. This Bill having received the  
Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5222  
2287. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino." 5224

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5225  
I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5226  
2287. What this Bill does is correct lanuage...what this 5227  
amendment does is correct language. It eliminates the need for 5228  
producing reciprocity plates and allows the permit..or the 5229  
prorate decal to be used as a \$10 fee. That's basically what  
the Bill does and the amendment makes it \$10 in the both 5230  
portions of the Bill that it appeared in." 5232

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from 5233  
DeWitt, Mr. Vinson." 5234

Vinson: "Yes, is the amendment...the Senate amendment germane, Mr. 5235  
Speaker?" 5236

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it is." 5238

Vinson: "Why?" 5240

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Parliamentarian is in the Senate now." 5242

Vinson: "I'd like him to go back over there when he gets here to 5243  
check on whether this one's germane." 5245

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Any further discussion? The 5246  
question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 5247  
House Bill 2287. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 5248  
'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The 5249  
Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 5250  
'ayes', 8 'nos', 10 recorded as 'present' and the House does  
concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2287. This Bill 5251  
having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared 5252  
passed. House Bill 2328. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent." 5254

Kent: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is just substantive 5255

language really. It sort of corrects a few things that were 5256  
not added in the original Bill, by inserting 'purchaser 5257  
proposed' and those sorts of words in between. It makes no 5258  
change at all. I would concur in this Amendment. This is an  
Illinois Commerce Commission Bill." 5260

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, there are two amendments. One and two." 5261

Kent: "And, #2, I would urge you not to concur in that Amendment. I 5263  
believe that one still needs to be talked over." 5265

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. The Lady moves that the House do concur 5266  
with Amendment #1. All in favor, say 'aye', oppose... No, 5267  
we'll not concur with Amendment #2. Alright, the 5268  
Parliamentarian advises me that we should have a Roll Call vote 5269  
on Amendment #1. Question is, shall Amendment #1 be concurred 5270  
in. All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'nay'. Have all 5271  
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take 5272  
the record. On this question, there 153 'ayes', no 'nays', 2  
recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Amendment 5273  
#1 to House Bill 2328. Now the Lady moves that the House 5274  
nonconcur with Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman 5275  
from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 5276

Kane: "Would the Sponsor of the Bill inform the House as to whether 5277  
it is her intent to use this as a vehicle to increase weight 5278  
limitation and size limitation on trucks, in Conference 5279  
Committee." 5280

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent." 5282

Kent: "If you knew me very well, you'd know I wouldn't let that 5283  
happen. So, no way am I using this for a weight raise." 5285

Kane: "Okay, could you inform us what things still have to be talked 5286  
over." 5287

Kent: "Well, this Bill, this amendment that was added, is one that 5288  
would allow the wrecker to pick up a heavy truck or anything 5289  
and take it anywhere in the state. They do not have to take it 5290  
to the closest repair shop, and so I think it does add weight 5291  
to the highways and I would not want this to happen." 5292

Kane: "Thank you." 5294

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady moves that we nonconcur with Senate 5295

Amendment #2. All in favor, say 'aye', 'aye', oppose...the 5296  
House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2328. 5297  
House Bill 2485. Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. Mr. 5298  
Friedrich. Out of the record. House Bill 2637. E. G. 5299  
Steele. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele." 5300

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 5301  
move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2637. 5302  
Senate Amendment #1 corrects a drafting error and adds the 5303  
words 'or his designee' after the word 'marshall'. It's a 5304  
technical correction and I urge the adoption." 5305

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. 5306  
Robbins. No, it's 2637. Any discussion? Gentleman from Will, 5307  
Mr. VanDuyne." 5308

VanDuyne: "Yes, would the Gentleman be just a little bit more 5309  
explicit. You know what? If I didn't know better, I would 5310  
think you were handling Clarence Neff's Bill again. The 5311  
labeling of equipment and facilities for use in transportation 5312  
storage and manufacturing of hazardous materials. Could you 5313  
elaborate a little bit, E. G.?" 5314

Steele: "Yeah, I'd be glad to, Representative. This Bill involves 5315  
the denoting and the appointing of members of the Hazardous 5316  
Advisory Board. And in so doing, it says we appoint the 5317  
Director of Law Enforcement or his designee. We appoint the 5318  
Director of Public Health, or his designee, and it, through an 5319  
inadvertent error, it said we appoint the fire marshall and 5320  
this technical amendment says or his designee. So, it's 5321  
just... 'or his designee' is added to what was omitted in the 5322  
original Bill. It changes in no way the intent or the meaning 5323  
of the Bill as it was passed here and in the Senate." 5324

VanDuyne: "And as you say here, designee. Who's he? Well, if you 5325  
don't have a fire marshall, how can you have his designee?" 5327

Steele: "Well, his designee would be an authorized representative of 5328  
his office, just as it would be the Director of Public Health, 5329  
his designee, or whatever." 5330

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from 5331  
Madison, Mr. Steele to close. Question is, shall the House 5332

concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2637. All in favor 5333  
 vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 5334  
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 5335  
 this question there's 154 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 5336  
 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 5337  
 House Bill 2637. This Bill having received the Constitutional 5338  
 Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2671. 5339  
 Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster." 5340

McMaster: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 just corrects 5341  
 another error in spelling. The word 'filed' was inadvertently 5342  
 spelled 'filled' in the Bill and I would move to concur in 5343  
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671." 5344

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, 5345  
 Miss Pullen." 5346

Pullen: "Could the Sponsor tell us what the Bill does please?" 5348

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McMaster." 5350

McMaster: "No, we passed the Bill a long time ago. This is just a 5351  
 Senate Amendment Penny." 5353

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate 5354  
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. All in favor vote 'aye', all 5355  
 oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 5356  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 5357  
 there's 153 'ayes', 4 'nos', none recorded as 'present' and the 5358  
 House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. 5359  
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
 declared passed. Now back to House Bill 1990. The Gentleman 5360  
 from Henderson, Mr. Neff. The question was on the germaness 5361  
 of the amendment. House Bill 1990, Senate Amendment #1. This 5362  
 Bill was titled An Act to Repeal An Act to Require Labeling of 5363  
 Nursery Products Sold at Retail. We are informed that the  
 Senate has not ruled on the germaness of this amendment. The 5364  
 Senate Amendment adds three repealers of three unrelated Acts. 5365  
 The Amendment is not germane. So, I would move, Sir, that 5366  
 then, you should move not to concur with the Senate Amendment." 5367

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur." 5370

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with 5371

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1990. All in favor signify 5372  
 by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose...The House nonconcur with 5373  
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1990. On the calendar, page 5374  
 10, is title of nonconcurrences. Senate Bill 7. Mr. 5375  
 Cullerton. Dave, what is the amendment on 1990? Mr. Cullerton  
 on the noncurrence on Senate Bill 7." 5378  
 Cullerton: "Move to nonconcur." 5380  
 Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. We've got to correct the board 5381  
 first. Well, with leave of the House. We're having some 5382  
 difficulty with the board at the present time. I just want to 5383  
 point out to you that the next order of business is the order 5384  
 of nonconcurrence on Senate Bills and until we have the board 5385  
 corrected, with the leave, we'll proceed in that order and so 5386  
 you're all informed that we are considering Senate Bills.  
 Senate Bill 7. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton." 5388  
 Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 5389  
 refuse to recede. I ask for a Conference Committee." 5391  
 Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman refuses to recede to House Amendment 5392  
 #2. The Gentleman from Will, on that question, the Gentleman 5393  
 from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 5394  
 Leinenweber: "Yeah, I wonder if it would be helpful to the 5395  
 Membership, if a one line explanation of the Bill in the 5396  
 Amendment and why the decision made and not recede would be 5397  
 helpful." 5398  
 Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken, Sir. Would the 5399  
 Sponsors, kindly, briefly describe the Bill and the amendments 5400  
 that were nonconcurrent with?" 5401  
 Cullerton: "Yes, the Bill provides that no policy rider application 5402  
 blank may be issued or delivered in Illinois unless it's form 5403  
 of content had been filed, reviewed and formally approved by 5404  
 the Director of Insurance. The amendment, as requested by the 5405  
 Director of Insurance, which exempted group accident and health 5406  
 policy forms and the Senate wanted to take that amendment off 5407  
 and I'm refusing to recede." 5408  
 Clerk Leone: "Representative Monroe Flinn in the Chair." 5410  
 Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to do not concur in amendment..." 5412

Cullerton: "No, refuse to recede and ask for a Conference Committee." 5413

Flinn: "The motion to the House is to refuse to recede from House 5415  
 Amendment #2 is it?..7. Put the amendment up there so I can 5416  
 read it. The motion is that the House refuse to recede from 5417  
 Amendment #2 to Senate Bill #7 and request that a Conference 5418  
 Committee to be appointed. Requires a simple majority. All in 5419  
 favor, say 'aye', those oppose...the 'ayes' have it. Senate 5420  
 Bill 188. Out of the record. Out of the record by request of 5421  
 the Sponsor. Senate Bill 289. Getty, you're on deck. 289. 5421  
 Out of the record. Senate Bill 205..505, I'm sorry. 505. 5422  
 Representative Polk. Make your motion. Representative Polk." 5423

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to recede on 5425  
 Senate Bill 505. Senate Bill 505, as the Digest says, 5426  
 rennumbers and revises grandfather clauses and improper Sections 5427  
 and Section references, due to technical errors. Now, the 5428  
 amendment that we put on was the Skinner amendment, which would 5429  
 have mandated the Secretary of State to indicate on all 5429  
 licenses of leased automobiles that they were so leased. 5430  
 Senate took it off, because the Secretary of State said that at 5431  
 this time the short notice that he would be able to concur with 5432  
 that mandate and I concur." 5433

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? Representative Hahanan." 5435

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Gentleman is so timid to 5436  
 present an argument like this to the Senate, especially in view 5437  
 of the fact of what their statement was, there wasn't enough 5438  
 time. I recall very vividly over the last 6 or 8 years that 5439  
 this argument has been maintained both in the Senate and the 5440  
 House. It's not a new concept. It certainly is a consumer 5441  
 issue. It's worth fighting for. I don't think that the State 5442  
 Senate should very willy nilly just dismiss the argument that a 5442  
 leased vehicle before sold to the public, should be simply a 5443  
 hood winked the consuming public into buying a car that has 5444  
 been driven by hundreds of automobile leasers, especially those 5445  
 who would like to try and sell that automobile like it was 5446  
 driven by a little old lady from Pasadena on Sunday morning 5447  
 excursions. I think it's very important that today's society 5448

that with the high values of automobiles, that a automobile 5448  
 should have some reference to its usage, whether it be used as 5449  
 a police car or used as a taxicab, or used as a leased 5450  
 automobile by Hertz, and Avis and National and all these other 5451  
 rental agencies. These automobile leasing companies have hood 5452  
 winked the public too long. Too often, people go and purchase  
 a used automobile and after the purchase, find out that that 5453  
 automobile may have been driven by hundreds of leasers of that 5454  
 automobile. I think this amendment is a well thought of 5455  
 amendment. It passed the House of Representatives many times 5456  
 in the past. Somehow, it seems to have some reluctance over in 5457  
 the Senate and I'd like to see the motion to recede not  
 carried, so that we go to a Conference Committee and find out 5458  
 exactly what the trouble is over in the Senate. Why they can't 5459  
 accept a consumer oriented measure, such as this, that should 5460  
 be part of the law in Illinois, so that these leasing companies 5461  
 can't hood wink the public and sell these used vehicles as a 5462  
 little old lady driven car on Sunday morning." 5463

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk to close." 5465

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously, the Gentleman from...what county 5466  
 is he from?...McHenry wasn't here the day that we attempted to 5467  
 put this Bill through. I have no objection to the Bill. When 5468  
 the amendment came on, we supported it. Skinner's now back. 5469  
 He has a fresh Tab. He's ready to go. The question is, 5470  
 whether this Senate Bill 505 should pass. The Senate Bill, we  
 agreed originally, that we would not amend it, but due to the 5471  
 other Gentleman from DuPage, er McHenry County who wanted on, 5472  
 we tried to accept it. It was badly, badly defeated, 5473  
 unfortunately. I think the two Gentlemen from McHenry County 5474  
 very seldom seem to get along, but they both seem to agree that  
 this type of legislation should be passed by the House. I 5475  
 think that they should Cosponsor their own Bill and get it out 5476  
 of the House." 5477

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner." 5479

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we did get this out of the House two 5480  
 years ago, and for some reason the Senate seems to be in favor 5481

of corruption. They're in favor of allowing industries to pay 5482  
off Members of the legislature or to allegedly pay off Members 5483  
of the Legislature and to in an attempt to defeat good consumer 5484  
oriented legislation. Now, this is not one of my Lester Crown 5485  
Bills. The Senate has killed it also. But, this is a Bill 5486  
that has to do indeed with the legislation that put two of our 5487  
Members in jail and I just don't believe that we ought to allow 5488  
companies like the companies in this association to thwart good 5489  
legislative ideas. And this is a good idea. Avis now has a 5490  
car rental facility at which it sells used cars. Right next to 5491  
the Springfield Civic Center. And they're advertising used 5492  
cars. Well, if Avis is advertising them, why shouldn't we put 5493  
them on the title for those companies, which are not as out 5494  
front with their selling of used cars as is Avis. I see no 5495  
reason whatsoever. And, frankly, I'm getting a little tired of 5496  
the Senate thwarting every attempt of this House to make sure 5497  
that people who bribe legislators don't get what's coming to 5498  
them. And I would urge for a nonconcurrence on this Amendment, 5499  
so that we can give the Senate another chance to come clean 5500  
with the people of the State of Illinois." 5501

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Polk, do you persist in your 5502  
motion?" 5503

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I made an agreement with Representative Skinner 5504  
when he came over and I had this Bill on Third Reading. I 5505  
moved it back to Second. I gave him an opportunity. He was 5506  
incapable. They've been incapable in two years to get this 5507  
Bill passed individually. Now, they're trying to tack it on a 5508  
Bill that the Transportation Committee worked very hard on. 5509  
The Transportation Committee sent it over here. I think all 5510  
those who served on that Committee think Senate Bill 505 is a 5511  
necessity. The Secretary of State thinks it's a necessity and 5512  
they've convinced me. If this amendment...if they contend this 5513  
amendment must stay on, then we'll table the Bill." 5514

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to recede from House 5515  
Amendment #2 on Senate Bill...er Senate Bill...I'll say it in a 5516  
minute. I'll start all over. The Gentleman has moved to 5517



recede from Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 505. It takes 89 55  
 votes. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 55  
 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative 55  
 Totten to explain his vote. One minute." 55

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. On a parliamentary inquiry of the 55  
 Chair. The Sponsor indicated that he would table this Bill if 55  
 the amendment stayed on. It would now go to a Conference 55  
 Committee. Who is in control of a Conference Committee Report? 55  
 Is the Sponsor, or is the Conference Committee or is the 55  
 House?" 55

Speaker Flinn: "Parliamentarian come to the podium. Repeat the 55  
 question, Representative Totten." 55

Totten: "Yeah. The Sponsor indicated, Mr. Speaker, that he would 55  
 table this amendment if the amendment stayed on, which it looks 55  
 like it will. The Bill will now go to a Conference Committee. 55  
 When the Conference Committee comes out with their 55  
 deliberations, who is controlled...who is then in control of 55  
 the Bill? Is the House in control of the Bill or is the 55  
 Sponsor...can a Sponsor table a Conference Committee Report?" 55

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm advised by the Parliamentarian that it's a 55  
 Senate Bill and the Senate would be in charge of the Bill 55  
 itself, but so far as Conference Committee Reports that any 55  
 member of the Conference Committee Report can make a report to 55  
 their particular Houses. We'll move for the adoption of that 55  
 Conference Committee Report, once it's filed now. 55  
 Representative Totten." 55

Totten: "Okay, Can...the Sponsor loses control. Is that correct?" 55

Speaker Flinn: "When it goes in Conference Committee. Yes. We have 55  
 another problem you haven't faced up to yet. Is that if he 55  
 refuses to make another motion, then the Bill stays right 55  
 here." 55

Totten: "I know that, but it's not only on this Bill, but it would be 55  
 on other Bills, if these goes to Conference Committee, then we 55  
 lose all control or the Sponsor does lose all control of that 55  
 Bill then. That's what you indicated." 55

Speaker Flinn: "In that event, I would guess yes. Right." 55

Totten: "Thank you." 5556

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 5557  
 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 40 5558  
 voting 'aye', 116 voting 'no' and the motion to recede from 5559  
 Amendment #2 is lost. Further motions on it? Representative 5560  
 Polk. Senate Bill 563. Motion to recede failed, incidentally, 5561  
 for the record. Senate Bill 563. Out of the record, at the 5562  
 request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 636. Representative 5563  
 Reilly." 5563

Reilly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 5564  
 move that the House recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 5565  
 636. Let me give you the background on this and I'm sorry to 5566  
 take the time of the House with it, but I think it's important 5567  
 you understand where we are on this Bill. This is the State 5568  
 Fair Reorganization Bill that puts the State Fair back under 5569  
 the control of the Department of Agriculture. It is supported 5570  
 by the Department of Agriculture by both of the major 5571  
 agricultural groups in this State. Representative Kane, who 5572  
 had already passed out of the House his own Bill on the State 5573  
 Fair, which put the State Fair under an independent commission, 5574  
 added on to my Bill an amendment which requires that the State 5575  
 Fair be self sufficient by, I believe, it's 1983. Now, please, 5576  
 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, pay attention. I do 5577  
 not...nobody does, object to the idea that the State Fair ought 5578  
 to come as close or to be self-sufficient as possible. I just 5579  
 remind you of two things. First of all, the State Fair, just 5580  
 like county fairs, which we subsidize much more heavily than we 5581  
 subsidize the State Fair, and just like auditorium authorities 5582  
 and other kinds of institutions of that sort, promotes 5583  
 governmental functions in addition to its profit making 5584  
 functions. So, there is no special reason why it ought to make 5585  
 money. Second of all, I would remind you, as I said in the 5586  
 debate on this before, the testimony in the State Government 5587  
 Organization Committee was crystal clear. The fairs that break 5588  
 even do so in large metropolitan areas where they can rent out 5589  
 the fairgrounds for all kinds of other purposes. Now, there's 5590

no doubt that the State Fair could do better. It could charge, 5586  
 for example, veterans for coming in and it would have to do so 5587  
 under Representative Kane's amendment. It could charge every 5588  
 group. It could charge kids for coming into the fairgrounds. 5589  
 It could charge every group for coming in and it could do 5590  
 better. But, the record is incontestable in the hearings that 5591  
 we held. It could not break even. Even if you did all those 5592  
 things, because it does not have the potential that the fairs 5593  
 in larger metropolitan areas have. And, as I predicted when I 5594  
 put the amendment on, the amendment was unacceptable to the 5595  
 Senate. The Senate did not concur in it. Representative Kane 5596  
 has an opportunity to get his views to the Governor's desk 5597  
 anyway in his own Bill. I can't for the life of me understand 5598  
 why we cannot get this Bill out of here in the shape that I 5599  
 have asked that it be in. I would ask, and Representative 5600  
 Schisler, the Cosponsor with me in the House on Senate Bill 636 5601  
 would ask that the House agree and recede from Amendment #1." 5602

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to recede from House 5603  
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 636 and on the motion under 5604  
 discussion, Representative Kane is recognized." 5605

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would 5606  
 ask that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 on Senate 5607  
 Bill 636. What we're talking about here is a matter of policy 5608  
 for the state and not a matter of whose Bill is doing what. 5609  
 You've heard the Sponsor of this Bill say that the State Fair 5610  
 can do better. And he promises that in the future, the State 5611  
 Fair will do better. But, the problem is, is that the fact 5612  
 remains that the State Fair has not done better in the past, 5613  
 and in fact, if you look at this year's budget for the State 5614  
 Fair, the State Fair promises to do worse next year. And what 5615  
 we are saying with this amendment is State Fair, you have to 5616  
 break even in the kinds of services that you're providing to 5617  
 the people and that's basically recreation and those kinds of 5618  
 things. As far as a subsidy to other state enterprises, this 5619  
 amendment would still allow the state to support agriculture in 5620  
 this state and support it as an agricultural fair. In this 5621

year's budget, there's half a million dollars there for prizes 5620  
 and premiums and that goes to support the agricultural interest 5621  
 of this state. That will still be maintained if this amendment  
 goes on. If this amendment goes on, we're saying to the State 5622  
 Fair that in your entertainment kinds of functions, in your 5623  
 rides, in the kinds of things that you do to provide 5624  
 entertainment for the people in this area, you have to break 5625  
 even. I don't think that that's very much to ask. The State 5626  
 Fair needs this kind of discipline. If we don't give them this  
 discipline, they're just going to run more and more and more 5627  
 into debt and we're going to be subsidizing it more and more 5628  
 and more. And I would urge that the House refuse to recede." 5629

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion. If not, Representative Reilly to 5631  
 close. Oh, I'm sorry. Just a minute, Representative Reilly. 5632  
 Representative Mugalian. I've got you covered up here. 5633  
 Representative Mugalian." 5634

Mugalian: "Now that I'm uncovered, I'll speak. Thank you Mr. 5635  
 Speaker. Representative Kane points out that the subsidy that 5636  
 the state would provide would be for the entertainment portion 5637  
 or the circuses, if you will. The last society that I know of 5638  
 in history that subsidized circuses was the Roman Empire and 5639  
 you know what happened to them. I don't know why the State of 5640  
 Illinois is required to subsidize circuses in Illinois. If in  
 fact agriculture makes an important contribution and we do have 5641  
 premiums for that purpose, but not one dime for circuses. I 5642  
 think this is a poor Bill and I agree with Representative Kane 5643  
 that we should not recede." 5645

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners." 5647

Kempiners: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. Those of us who are on the 5648  
 State Government Organization Committee have had a number of 5649  
 these State Fair Bills presented to us. And I remember the 5650  
 first hearing we had. I sat and listened to the witnesses that 5651  
 Representative Kane had brought to Springfield from 5652  
 Minneapolis, from Milwaukee and the message was clear as  
 crystal that unless the State Fair is in a metropolitan area, 5653  
 you're not going to break even. It was that simple. And I 5654

suggested at that time that if we want a money making State 5655  
 Fair, we move it to the metropolitan area in Chicago. It's 5656  
 probably the first time I've ever been on television as a State  
 Representative because that was a controversial thing and I got 5657  
 all kinds of snide remarks from Springfield residents, but you 5658  
 can't have it both ways Doug. You know, I think all of us 5659  
 would like it to be a money making operation, but you've got to 5660  
 bring it where the people are and the people are up in the six  
 county, er the six county area in the northeast region of the 5661  
 state. Now if you want to move the fairgrounds up there, I've 5662  
 got a lot of area around my district in Will County, Kane 5663  
 County and Kendall County that we ought to negotiate about. 5664  
 But don't try to hang this on the Bill if you're going to keep 5665  
 the fairgrounds here in Springfield, because it aint going to  
 work." 5666

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman from Will, Representative VanDuyne." 5668

VanDuyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was just going to say the same 5669  
 thing. If they want to make it a profit making organization, 5670  
 bring it up to Will County. We have a lot of land and we'd be 5671  
 glad to have it. But, I do, seriously, that was kind of 5672  
 serious too, but another serious thing is just what do you do 5673  
 Doug in this prohibition. What if they operate for the first  
 seven days and they find they're going down the tube? Now do 5674  
 you raise the prices double? And if you don't do that, how are 5675  
 you going to fine them or what's going to be your penalty? 5676  
 It's completely unwieldy. I don't even know where the idea 5677  
 comes from." 5678

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly to close." 5680

Reilly: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. Representative VanDuyne was 5681  
 absolutely right. This is sort of an Alice in Wonderland 5682  
 amendment. It says thou shalt make money by 1983. It says 5683  
 nothing whatsoever about what happens if you can't or if you 5684  
 don't or if in any event it just doesn't happen. The point is 5685  
 if we want to end the subsidy, we've got a way to do that. We 5686  
 do that through the appropriations process and through the  
 management process, through the Governor's Office and through 5687

the Director of the Department of Agriculture. Again, not only is Representative Kempiners right that we can't do this in an area like Springfield, but it's also true that the passage of this amendment would require, would require the Director of the State Fair to charge veterans, charge every group that wanted to get in the fair. Every group that wanted to use the fairgrounds for a picnic or any other reason, because otherwise, they aren't operating in a business like manner. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the motion to recede from the amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 636. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 voting 'aye' and 22 voting 'no' and the House does recede on Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 36 (sic) and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 758. Representative Cal Schuneman on the motion."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House do not recede from House Amendment #1 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed on Senate Bill 758. That Bill is the Senate version of the Bill that creates the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Law. Very similar to the Bill that Representative Epton had here in the House. House Bill 1223, which I believe has also gone to Conference Committee. And, I would move for the adoption of the motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 758. All those in favor say 'aye', those oppose say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from the House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 758. A Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 769. Representative Peters. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 807. Representative Beatty is recognized for a motion on Senate Bill 807."

Beatty: "I refuse to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill

807." 5723

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves to recede...refuse to recede from 5724  
House..." 5725

Beatty: "I want to explain it briefly." 5727

Speaker Flinn: "Okay." 5729

Beatty: "House Amendment #1 actually provided the rate of increase 5730  
from 2% to 3% for members of the General Assembly and judges. 5731  
We want to go into a Conference Committee and try to work out 5732  
proper answer to this problem. Whether it's a contribution on 5733  
some part or not, we need a Conference Committee to do it." 5735

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5736  
recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 807. All those 5737  
in favor say 'aye', those oppose say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. 5738  
The House refuses to recede and a Conference Committee will be 5739  
appointed. Senate Bill 930. Representative Mahar is 5740  
recognized for a motion." 5741

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5742  
I move that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #...House 5743  
Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1930 (sic). We go to Conference 5744  
Committee. House Amendment #4 is technically incorrect. It's 5745  
the amendment that deals with the affidavits for 5746  
people...absentees to vote in the precinct within 30 days of  
the election. All it has is some technical defects and we need 5747  
to correct those. I move that we refuse to recede and have a 5748  
Conference Committee appointed." 5749

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5750  
recede on House Amendment #1 (sic) to Senate Bill 930." 5752

Beatty: "Number 4." 5754

Flinn: "4? Well, it had 1 up here. On Amendment #4. Any further 5755  
discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House refuse to 5756  
recede and a Conference Committee appointed. All in favor say 5757  
'aye', those oppose...the 'ayes' have it and a Conference 5758  
Committee will be appointed. I inadvertently passed up 807. 5759  
Representative Beatty...811, I'm sorry. 811. Representative  
Beatty is recognized on a motion to 811." 5761

Beatty: "I move to nonconcur...refuse to concur and ask for 5762

appointment of a Conference Committee. 811. There's one House 5763  
 amendment on there and that House Amendment deleted both of the 5764  
 Senate amendments. The Senate amendment...when I had this Bill 5765  
 in the Pension Committee, I agreed to delete Senate Amendments 5766  
 1 and 2 and that's what I did with the House Amendment and now 5767  
 I think we have to remain in that posture. The Senate 5768  
 Amendments, one of them allows judges to transfer credits from 5768  
 State Employees Retirement System. We've deleted that. 5769  
 Another one would allow a judge who is sitting on the federal 5770  
 bench to get a pension and we've deleted that, so we have to go 5771  
 into a Conference Committee to try to work with out." 5773

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5774  
 recede in House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 811. Any 5775  
 discussion? If not, that's the question. All those in favor, 5776  
 say 'aye', 'aye', those oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and 5777  
 the House refused to recede and a Conference Committee will be 5778  
 appointed. Senate Bill 932. Representative Bowman is 5779  
 recognized for a motion on 932." 5780

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 5781  
 move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 5782  
 932. House Amendment #2 was designed to put language into the 5783  
 Section of the School Code which pertains only to the City of 5784  
 Chicago to make sure that they have a smooth transition to a 5785  
 situation where they will not be able to issue tax and 5786  
 participation warrants against corporate personal property tax, 5786  
 which as you know, as been abolished. The Senate didn't like 5787  
 that one and I think we ought to get together and work out the 5788  
 differences. So, I ask that you support my motion." 5789

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5790  
 recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 932. And that is 5791  
 the question. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', those 5792  
 oppose...the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede and 5793  
 a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 955, 5794  
 Representative Skinner. Is he on the floor? Skinner. 955. 5795  
 Take that out of the record momentarily. We might get back to 5796  
 it. Senate Bill 1099. Representative Catania for a motion on 5797



1099." 5798

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Member of the House. The Senate 5799  
has moved to nonconcur with our Amendment to Senate Bill 1099 5800  
and I would respectfully ask that we refuse to recede from our 5801  
amendment, so that we can have a Conference Committee." 5803

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved that the House refuse to recede 5804  
from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1099. Further 5805  
discussion? If not, that's the question. All those in favor 5806  
say 'aye', 'aye', those oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and 5807  
the House refuses to recede and a Conference Committee will be 5808  
appointed. Senate Bill 1114. Representative Vinson. You're  
recognized for a motion on 1114." 5810

Vinson: "I move that the House nonconcur." 5812

Speaker Flinn: "Refuse to recede is your motion." 5814

Vinson: "Refuse to recede." 5816

Speaker Flinn: "All three amendments?" 5818

Vinson: "Yes, Sir." 5820

Speaker Flinn: "You might as well. They go into Conference Committee 5821  
anyway. The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5822  
recede on House Amendments #1, 2, and 3 on Senate Bill 1114. 5823  
All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', those oppose 'no'. The 5824  
'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede and the 5825  
Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1117.  
Representative Griesheimer is recognized." 5827

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move to refuse to recede from 5828  
the House Amendment and request a Conference Committee on 5829  
Senate Bill 1117." 5830

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5831  
recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1117. All...1 5832  
and 4. Senate Amendments...House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate 5833  
Bill 1117. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 5834  
'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede and a Conference  
Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1125. Representative 5835  
Beatty." 5836

Beatty: "I refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate 5837  
Bill 1125 and ask for an appointment of a Conference Committee. 5838

This is the Bill that deals with the CETA employees. This made 5839  
 it optional and would allow governmental units to terminate the 5840  
 pension and the Senate didn't like the optional basis and they 5841  
 have not concurred, so I ask for an appointment of a Conference 5842  
 Committee." 5843

Speaker Flinn: "This Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5844  
 recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1125. All 5845  
 those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', oppose say 'no'. The 'ayes' 5846  
 have it and the House refuses to recede and a Conference 5847  
 Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1202. Representative 5848  
 Leverenz is recognized for a motion." 5849

Leverenz: "I would move that we recede in the House Amendment #1. 5850  
 This is the Borcher illegal alien Amendment and the Senate 5851  
 found that it, they don't care for it in the Bill. And I don't 5852  
 care for it in the Bill. However, Borchers wants it in the 5853  
 Bill; I would move that we recede." 5854

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved, wait til I state the motion, 5855  
 Weber. The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from 5856  
 House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 1202. And on that motion, 5857  
 Representative Borchers is recognized." 5858

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House. The 5859  
 Senate just voted four votes short of okaying the whole Bill as 5860  
 it stands now. That is 1202. Now the Amendment that I put on 5861  
 has to do with illegal aliens. Now all I think we should do 5862  
 is, in every way, in every degree, and all agencies and all our 5863  
 licensing, we should begin to put on requirements that illegal 5864  
 aliens cannot receive licenses. They are often in the position 5865  
 and they do put in paid documents for one thing. I think it 5866  
 should be the policy of this State that illegal aliens should 5867  
 be recognized as people that are not citizens and have no 5868  
 rights to have licenses in the State of Illinois, or as far as 5869  
 that's concerned, in this country, for any business activity or 5870  
 anything that is controlled by our State Government. So I feel 5871  
 that we should not go along with the State of Illinois and I'd 5872  
 like to see a Conference Committee, at least one Conference 5873  
 Committee, in relation to this problem. I think we should 5874

refuse to recede. And I would like to have a vote on this matter, a registered vote on the matter." 5873 5874

Speaker Flinn: "There's no further discussion. Representative Leverenz is recognized to close on his motion. Representative Leverenz." 5875 5876 5877

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I thought I'd let Webber Borchers have his shot at his Amendment here to make it illegal to issue a private employment agency license to an alien and it is true that it fell a few votes short in the Senate. You need that many votes to concur. The Amendment, I believe, personally, is ludicrous. It should not be in the Bill, through I thought I'd let him have a shot at it. I think it also is a policy of an illegal alien not to try to get a license and I don't know that the Department of Labor would know what to do if someone came in and said that they were not an illegal alien. There's no way to check on everybody that comes in anyway. And they are not the immigration authorities. So, I would simply ask that the House recede in Amendment #1." 5878 5879 5880 5881 5882 5883 5884 5885 5886 5887 5888

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1202. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes to final action. I'm sorry Representative Borchers. You were discussed in the debate and I cannot recognize you. But, Representative Pullen is recognized. One minute to explain her vote." 5890 5891 5892 5893 5894 5895

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is the most appropriate place the Gentleman from Macon could have put his Amendment on illegal aliens. This Amendment that the Sponsor is asking us to recede from, says that employment agencies...illegal aliens should not be able to get a license to have an employment agency. And I certainly see nothing wrong with requiring applicants for employment agency licenses to show that they are legal aliens or United States citizens. I can imagine an illegal alien who owns an employment agency using it to refer a lot of his friends to businesses that don't necessarily want to employ them. This is the best illegal alien Amendment that we've 5896 5897 5898 5899 5900 5901 5902 5903 5904

seen. And I think we ought to uphold it and keep it on this 5905  
 Bill. I urge you to vote 'no' on the motion to recede." 5907

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 5908  
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 5909  
 this question there are 90 voting...Representative Ewing, Ewell 5910  
 votes 'aye'...91 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no'. And the House 5911  
 does recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1202, and 5912  
 this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby 5913  
 declared passed. 1335, Representative Griesheimer is 5914  
 recognized for a motion." 5915

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we refuse to recede from House 5916  
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1335." 5918

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to 5919  
 recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1335 and request a 5920  
 Conference Committee. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', 5921  
 those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House 5922  
 refuses to recede and a Conference Committee will be appointed. 5923  
 Senate Bill 1350, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie." 5924

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move the House refuse to recede 5925  
 from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1350 and that we appoint 5926  
 a Conference Committee." 5927

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved that the House refuse to recede 5928  
 from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1350. All those in favor vote 5929  
 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the 5930  
 House refuses to recede. A Conference Committee will be 5931  
 appointed. On page 2, on the Order of Senate Bills Third 5932  
 Reading Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 565.  
 Representative Marovitz has asked leave of the House to move 5933  
 this Bill back from Third to Second Reading for the purpose of 5934  
 an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no 5935  
 objections, the Bill is on Second Reading. Amendments from the 5936  
 floor." 5937

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Marovitz, amends Senate Bill 565 on 5938  
 page 1 by deleting lines 25 and 26 and so forth." 5940

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz." 5942

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 5943

of the House, um, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 565 is the 5944  
 Amendment which provides for a compromise to this legislation. 5945  
 It provides for a 21 day period for redemption of collateral 5946  
 that has been repossessed or surrendered voluntarily. It 5947  
 allows the purchasers to redeem the repossessed property by 5948  
 paying the unaccelerated amount due on the contract and the 5948  
 cost of repossession. The proposed Amendment was drafted in 5950  
 good faith and negotiations with the opponents of this 5951  
 legislation and adds the following changes to the Bill: the 5951  
 remedy provided in the Bill would apply only to repossessed 5952  
 goods and not to goods surrendered voluntarily unless 9...60% 5953  
 had already been paid on the chattel. The time limit of 30 5954  
 days will be reduced to 21 days. A one time limitation to 5955  
 utilize this remedy by the buyer will be established, and 5955  
 lastly and I guess most importantly which satisfies most of the 5956  
 opponents of this legislation, protection for the holder would 5957  
 be provided where reasonable cause existed to believe that the 5958  
 security of the collateral would be impaired if the remedy was 5959  
 invoked. And that would satisfy most of the holders and the 5960  
 opponents of this legislation, and I would ask for adoption of 5961  
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 565." 5962

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? Representative Piel." 5964

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?" 5966

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will." 5968

Piel: "Couple of questions, Mr. Marovitz, first of all you're saying 5969  
 whether they feel that their collateral is in jeopardy." 5971

Marovitz: "That's correct." 5973

Piel: "Who is going to be the deciding factor on this, the 5974  
 collateral's in jeopardy or not?" 5976

Marovitz: "The holder." 5978

Piel: "But, ah, wonder if this is a situation where the person will 5979  
 say 30, 60, to 90 days delinquent?" 5981

Marovitz: "Well, if they were obviously in the lending field, they're 5982  
 not going to repossess collateral if they don't feel it's in 5983  
 jeopardy. If they feel that the collateral is in jeopardy, for 5984  
 instance, there are people who have asked me what if the case 5985

existed where we were trying to find this individual, we've made repeated phone calls, we've sent letters. The letters have come back, the phone calls were unanswered or they were having to chase this individual all over the place, obviously I think that's a reasonable case where they believe that the collateral, that the collateral is in jeopardy and that they would have cause to repossess and they would not have to come under the rule of this legislation."

Piel: "Where do you see a point where you do not feel that the chattel will be in jeopardy?"

Marovitz: "I think if an individual had been making payments, had made every reasonable attempt to make those payments, had called the holder of the collateral...the holder, and said they're having some problems, they can't make payments a particular month, and explain what those problems will be, financial problems. I think that would be the case where the collateral would not be in jeopardy."

Piel: "The problem that you would get, Bill, and I don't think that you realize it, you get a multitude of excuses everytime you've got a delinquent payment. And what I'm, you know, worried about with this type of an Amendment is exactly what is going to be the differentiating factor if its collateral is in jeopardy."

Marovitz: "Well, the Amendment actually makes a, makes the Bill better according to what you're saying. It allows without the Amendment..."

Piel: "Oh yea, without the Amendment, it's a horrendous Bill."

Marovitz: "So obviously if we're just talking about the Amendment, it makes the Bill a lot stronger and a lot more palatable to the individuals that you're concerned about, the holders."

Piel: "You say it's reducing it from 30 to 21 days?"

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Piel: "And what was the 60 day provision in there that you were talking about?"

Marovitz: "The...it's 60%...60% payment."

Piel: "What was that?"

Marovitz: "Ah..." 6029

Piel: "...got to have know how the Bill originally came out and 6030  
that's the reason I'm wondering about where you, you dropped 6031  
your 60% on that?" 6032

Marovitz: "No, no, the 60%, I'm only talking about...well, we said 6033  
that the remedy provided in the Bill would apply to only 6034  
repossessed goods, not goods surrendered voluntarily, ah, it 6035  
still would apply for voluntary goods but only where 60% had 6036  
already been paid. So I just wanted to clarify so that I 6037  
wasn't misleading anybody. This is the legislation that if is  
in the editorial in today's Chicago Sun Times." 6039

Piel: "Well, I haven't read the Chicago Sun Times today. Are you 6040  
planning on running with this on Third Reading right away?" 6042

Marovitz: "No, I'mM..." 6044

Piel: "...the impression that I was talking to the people from the 6045  
IBA and...the CBI, they're obviously, all the finance industry 6046  
is completely against the Bill the way it stands right now, and 6047  
they say that the last time I talked to them, they say that the 6048  
Amendments are somewhat better but the Amendments sure don't 6049  
clear up the Bill the way it should be cleaned up if you're  
going to clean up the Bill for passage. And so after the 6050  
Amendment is adopted, if it is adopted, you know, I would like 6051  
some time to talk with people in the banking field..." 6053

Marovitz: "...happy to do that, happy to do that." 6055

Speaker Plinn: "Representative Gaines." 6057

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I 6058  
rise in support of this Amendment and this Bill. This 6059  
Amendment puts it into shape while most credit houses were 6060  
doing five or six years ago. Before I was elected to the House 6061  
five years ago, I had an opportunity in...the Consumer Fraud 6062  
Office in the south side of Chicago. And we had many voluntary  
agreements with many of the car dealerships to do just this. 6063  
And in many cases, the persons involved to answer Mr. Piel's 6064  
question, were the persons who had illness, death in the 6065  
family, or in many cases had made extensive repairs on the car. 6066  
They bought a used car, it stopped running. They took their 6067

money and fixed it up. And then they were short on their 6068  
payments, and they would go in and when they come back to the 6069  
Consumer Fraud Office, in many cases we could work it out where  
they could do just this. So most of these consumers that would 6070  
be covered by this are consumers who've probably put their 6071  
money in the car rather than on the car. So I urge adoption of 6072  
this Amendment and then adoption of the Bill." 6073

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McBroom." 6075

McBroom: "Yes, Representative Marovitz, may I ask you a question?" 6077

Marovitz: "Certainly." 6079

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he'll yield." 6081

McBroom: "Let me see if I understand this properly. After an 6082  
individual has paid 60% of the indebtedness whether it's on a 6083  
car or a refrigerator or whatever it might be, he has an 6084  
opportunity to redeem that particular piece of merchandise if 6085  
it has been repossessed? Is that correct?" 6086

Marovitz: "That's correct." 6088

McBroom: "Okay. Now let's say the remaining 40% represents ten 6089  
payments of \$200 a month, whatever it might be, let's just say 6090  
that. That would be...if he owes ten payments of \$200 a month, 6091  
that would be \$2,000. If he is behind two payments may he 6092  
redeem this piece of merchandise or must he pay the entire 6093  
\$2,000?" 6094

Marovitz: "If he's paid..." 6096

McBroom: "He's paid 60%..." 6098

Marovitz: "Okay, and there's been um, ah, the chattel has been 6099  
taken?" 6100

McBroom: "Yes." 6102

Marovitz: "Okay, ...he's behind two payments?" 6104

McBroom: "Yes." 6106

Marovitz: "Alright, if he's pays those two payments at whatever costs 6107  
that were in taking the chattel, he can get the chattel back." 6108

McBroom: "Okay, it's not required that he pay the entire balance." 6111

Marovitz: "That is correct. That is correct." 6113

McBroom: "...another words what you're saying with the...I know that 6114  
this would not apply to everybody, but conceivably the person 6115



that gets himself into this kind of situation would repeatedly be one or two payments behind. There would be no way that the holder, the lien holder could enforce the entire payment before he surrendered the merchandise."

Marovitz: "I'm glad you mentioned that. The Amendment that we are talking about now, we're not talking about the Bill, the Amendment that we're talking about allows this to occur only one time, only one time. After that he would not have the opportunity to pay to repay the unpaid balance, he's out of luck. So that's...the Amendment makes it stronger just exactly the way that you explained it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you, I think everybody at this point probably understands the Bill, the Amendment which we have drafted after the discussion with the opponents of the Bill makes the Bill much less objectionable, much more compatible with everybody, and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 565."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Amendment #1 be adopted to Senate Bill 565. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', those opposed, the 'ayes' have it. Does the Gentleman have leave to leave this on Short Debate? Hearing no objec...the Amendment is adopted incidentally. Objections to leaving it on Short Debate? Hearing no objections, it remains on Short Debate. On page...Third Reading. On page 4, appears Senate Bills, Second Reading. The first Bill listed is Senate Bill 157. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. We'll stay on Second Reading, we'll deal with non-appropriation Bills so I don't get into trouble. 619, out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 667, Representative Giorgi, I don't see him. Representative Giorgi on the floor? Take that one out of the record temporarily. We might as well go to Third Reading, Representative Kelly, are you going to be ready for Senate Bill 47? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 47. A Bill for an Act in relation to abortions and to establish penalties for the violation thereof."

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 47 as noted in the Preamble is not a new abortion Act. It's intended, rather, as a series of Amendments to the Illinois Abortion Law of 1975. On November 12, 1978, the Chicago Sun Times began a series entitled, 'The Abortion Profiteers'. Illinois citizens were horrified to learn of the atrocities occurring in abortion clinics on Michigan Avenue. Clinics which accounted for 1/3 of all abortions performed in this State. The response was clear and immediate. The public demanded reform. Their faith in doctors suffered irreparable damage and they demanded that these profiteers be held accountable. The Amendments introduced are an attempt to protect women who have abortions from neglect and irreparable damage they may face at the hands of unscrupulous, money-hungry abortionists. In spite of the hostile approach, in spite of the hostile approach of courts in the past two laws which attempt to protect the interests of an abortion patient through such measures as inform consent and reporting requirements, this law seeks to protect these women. In doing so, we are doing the best we can to conform to court decisions of the federal courts in the past. As in a case within almost every law which seeks to regulate abortion practices in the interest of the patient and of the State, these Amendments will no doubt be challenged in court. Courts considering this law will do well to remember the background of the challengers. Many so called respectable doctors will be brought into court to tout the illegality of this law and its so called infringement on doctors rights. We must keep in mind that these respectable physicians are not only a front for the money profiteers who perform abortions in this State. The physicians who will claim to be harmed by this law are the kind of physicians outlined in the Sun Times who neglect to anesthetize a patient before performing a very painful abortion, who perform abortions on women who are not pregnant for full price, of course, and race

through a three minute procedure that should properly take  
about twenty minutes. Physicians who challenge the provisions  
of this law do not have the interests of the patient in mind.  
They are concerned with only one thing, the pursuit of money.  
And if the health or comfort or safety of the patient gets in  
the way of the physician's profits, then so be it. One of the  
most important provisions of Senate Bill 47 is the Inform  
Consent Provision. As the Sun Times series noted, most  
abortion clinics provide little or no counseling to women about  
to undergo a potentially damaging operation. There is usually  
no time for women to express concern they may have about the  
abortion procedure. Counseling for patients at the present  
time is left to the discretion of the abortion clinic director.  
The doctor need not be involved. One under-cover investigator  
for the Chicago Sun Times series, Michelle Young, was trained  
at the biogenetics clinic not to counsel. She reported that  
she was told not to tell patients the abortion procedure might  
hurt, not to discuss the procedure or surgical instruments in  
any detail and not to answer too many questions. The clear  
implication is that the less the patient knows, the easier it  
will be to sell her a medical procedure she may not want or  
need and which indeed may be harmful to her. The Inform  
Consent Provisions of Senate Bill 47 are an attempt to redress  
the almost complete lack of adequate counseling. The  
Amendments in this Bill require the doctor to inform the  
patient that he will perform the abortion so that the physician  
and patient will be aware of who is responsible for the  
surgery. This law requires that the doctor inform the patient  
of any medical risk involved in her abortion. He is also  
required to furnish proof to the patient that she is indeed  
pregnant. No longer can we allow women to bare pain and cost  
of a totally unnecessary abortion simply because she was never  
told she was not pregnant. The Inform Consent Provisions  
require the physician to furnish the women with printed  
information from a state about alternatives to abortion because  
it is the physician who profits from performing the operation.

He makes no money if the patient doesn't go through with the 6211  
 procedure. We cannot allow him the discretion to say what he 6213  
 pleases about the woman's alternatives. We must be sure  
 through provisions of state provided material that would be 6214  
 abortion patients are provided with complete, accurate and free 6215  
 information on their alternatives. The Chicago Sun Times 6216  
 series has shown us too much of the abuse that results from 6217  
 allowing clinic personnel or abortionists to counsel the women  
 as they please because more often than not, they do nothing. 6219  
 This statute also requires doctors to furnish state provided 6220  
 material on the probable physiological and anatomical  
 characteristics of the unborn child to women contemplating 6221  
 abortion like information on alternatives to abortion. We 6222  
 cannot trust the profiteering doctor or counselor to give an 6223  
 objective, scientific account of the State of the fetus at the  
 time of the abortion. Doctors cannot continue to lie to women 6224  
 saying as we know they have in the past that the unborn child 6225  
 at eight or ten or fourteen weeks is just a blob of tissue or 6226  
 is not really alive. Women must be informed of the true 6227  
 characteristics of the fetus through written material in order  
 to insure that their consent to abortion is truly informed. 6228  
 Another provision of this law is meant to redress the serious 6229  
 lack of knowledge about abortion complication cases on the part 6230  
 of the Illinois Department of Public Health. The Chicago Sun 6231  
Times series reported at least twelve deaths occurring as a 6232  
 result of abortions in Illinois, deaths which were unknown to  
 the Department. How many times do unnecessary complications 6233  
 arise without state knowledge of their occurrence? We must 6234  
 redress this terrible lack of knowledge so that we may protect 6235  
 the interests of women exposed to the risks of unskilled or 6236  
 uncaring abortionists. This statute does this by requiring all  
 doctors diagnosing such complications to report them to the 6237  
 Department. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this 6238  
 legislation is a, is a great improvement and the only one of 6239  
 its kind in the United States that I feel will be held up 6240  
 constitutionally when it is brought before that body. I ask

for your support."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I stand up here knowing that this is going to be a kamikaze mission speaking against this Bill. But I think some points ought to be brought to the attention of the chamber before we vote. Throughout his presentation, Representative Kelly has talked about the Sun Times expose' of abortion centers in Chicago as if to legitimize what I consider to be a bad Bill. But let's hear what the Sun Times says about this particular package he offers us. They said in an editorial on Monday that an already bad anti-abortion package was made worse when Representative Kelly added an incredible 23 pages of Amendments. Not reforms they say, not sound proposals, but mean spirited and vicious ones and all plainly unconstitutional. This was the paper that did these series on the abortion clinics in Chicago and called for state legislation to reform the process under which they are regulated. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we had an opportunity earlier today to send to the Governor's desk proposals which would correctly address the abuses which are occurring. With the package of Bills sponsored by Representative Cullerton, there's a neat little shelve game going on in this Legislature to make sure that those Bills which are constitutional will not reach the Governor's desk and this Bill, which is unconstitutional, will reach his desk. How can I say that after looking at some of the provisions in this Bill and court cases like Wynn vs. Scott, Wynn vs. Carrie, Mahar vs. Roe, Collotti vs. Franklin, Planned Parenthood vs. Dan Forth. Provisions in this Bill are very clearly unconstitutional and have already been held so by courts in this country. This Bill obviously will be challenged as soon we override the Governor's veto and what does that mean? It means that there will be no law in existence to address the abuses which were brought to life by the Sun Times investigation. It means that the attorneys who are challenging this law will submit a Bill to the State of Illinois which the

State will pay to hold this Bill unconstitutional. The last 6272  
time, the totals being added up but it will accede \$100,000 in 6273  
attorneys' fees which means that we paid it twice; once to the 6274  
Attorney General for defending an unconstitutional law and once 6275  
to the people who take it to court to prove it 6276  
unconstitutional, so we can go through the charade, Ladies and 6277  
Gentlemen, of passing this Bill and telling our folks back 6278  
home, 'Oh, we did a great job for you', but I'm telling you 6279  
right here and now the court cases are there. This Bill is not 6280  
constitutional. It will be challenged. Think Ladies and 6281  
Gentlemen, if you really want to address the situation as it 6282  
exists, don't vote for this Bill as much as there's political 6283  
pressure for you to do so. But vote for the Cullerton package 6284  
which has been co-sponsored by both pro-life and pro-choice 6285  
people. Because if you want to solve the problems brought to 6286  
our attention by the Sun Times series there is the solution, 6287  
the long term constitutional solution, not here in Senate Bill 6288  
47. And I would urge you to defeat this and to bring those 6289  
good Bills that are being packaged and sent away, bring them 6290  
back and send them to the Governor for signature so that we can 6291  
really correct the abuses which are occurring in our state." 6292

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Greiman." 6293

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 6294  
House. The Sponsor has set aside the cloak of morality and now 6295  
takes up the mantel of health care. And it is on this 6296  
particular afternoon that that mantel is so ill fitting on the 6297  
very day when, when there was opposition to the most 6298  
significant health care Bills in the field of abortion that 6299  
this General Assembly has ever had. And like Representative 6300  
Kempiners, I urge too that we bring these Bills back and we put 6301  
those Bills on the Governor's desk. You know, there are two 6302  
things, two things that are a certainty. The first is, used to 6303  
be death and taxes, but now it, the first is that  
Representative Kelly's abortion Bill is hopelessly 6304  
unconstitutional and the second is that we will probably pass 6305  
it 3 to 1. Those are the two certainties in our, in our, in 6306

our legislative lives. And I think that there are ample Bills for people who believe in, in pro-life positions to have shown their record on. We have over a page in the index. A page of abortion Bills. Many Bills that all of you have shown and wherever you stand on this issue. The scandalous indictment of the doctors, no one believes that doctors should go and do things to women or anybody else without good medical foundations, but this Bill, this Bill that will never...by its first sentence that says a doctor must certify the medical necessity. That's what this Bill says. The first operative provision of this Bill requires a doctor to do something which, for the last six years, has been hopelessly unconstitutional. This is the politics of morality. Now we haven't always had the politics of morality in our land and sometimes though it has been for good and sometimes for evil. The abolitionists who brought down slavery practice that the prohibitionists who took away alcohol, they practice it. I suspect the young people who stood against the war in Asia, they too practice what they call the politics of morality. But we must see through this kind of activity. See through this kind of action and not be diverted from the many problems that we have. Very, in concluding I, I see often a cruelty, a cruelty that we have and a disregard for the living in our unvital support of the unborn. Two years ago we passed HB 333 which stripped the rights of the poor. Last year we stripped state employees of their rights. This Session we have taken and ignored the problems of young pregnant women in crisis and in this very Bill, we have made women a mere vessel for a man who has raped her can now say you carry by baby. And in this Bill we have even imposed on doctors the obligation to support by cus...and have custody of invitro fertilization. And so in conclusion I, I ask you this, respect life, we passed that Amendment to that Resolution the other day. Indeed, let us respect life. No one argues with that, but let us also respect the living. Let us respect the feelings of others. Let us respect the beliefs of others and let us respect the rights of others. This Bill does

none of that and it should be voted down." 6334

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski is recognized." 6336

Kosinski: "I move the previous abortion." 6338

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has...Representative Stearney, he has a 6339  
right to move the previous question, you can vote 'no' if you 6340  
wish. The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The 6341  
question is, shall the main question be put? All those in 6342  
favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the chair's 6343  
opinion, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Kelly to close."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In response 6345  
to, to the opponent's issues that were raised, I'd like to 6346  
point out and I'm certainly glad that Representative Keapiners 6347  
did mention the article that appeared in the Sun Times on 6349  
yesterday because there was some falsehoods in here. One 6350  
paragraph, and I have an understanding from the Chicago Sun  
Times that they will make a correction, it says here 'Kelly 6351  
wants to require that parents or husbands consent to a woman's 6352  
abortion'. There is no written formal consent procedure in 6353  
Senate Bill 47. What it says is that a parent of a minor or a 6354  
spouse shall be notified if their daughter or if their wife is 6356  
going forward with an abortion procedure. I think it's 6357  
important. I know if I was a husband or if I was a parent, I 6358  
would want to know whether or not my child or my wife was going 6359  
to have an abortion. I think that's an important decision. 6360  
This article also indicates in here that the, it indicates the 6361  
contraceptive techniques are in one proposal. There is nothing 6362  
in this Bill at all that relates to contraceptives. That was 6363  
in House Bill 883 which was voted out of here last week. 6364  
There's also another portion of this Article which indicates 6365  
that there was great joking and going on in the House over the 6366  
word sexuality on a Bill and that was on 883. There was no 6367  
laughing going on on Senate Bill 47 and there's isn't any 6368  
laughing going on right now as long as we have six million  
abortion in this country and I'll tell you something else,  
Representative Greiman, about that. I respect women. I  
respect every person from the unborn all the way to senior



citizens, but for one minute when you take away the rights of  
 any one Section, whether it be the unborn, whether it be  
 handicapped, whether it be senior citizens, you're taking away  
 the rights of all of them. This provision that was also  
 pointed out in the Bill concerning the abortion is necessary  
 where the doctor or the physician has to state that it's  
 necessary. If any Section of this Bill will hold up, this  
 Section will because this has been addressed by the United  
 States Supreme Court in 1973, and they indicated that an  
 abortion would have to be necessary and stated so by the  
 physician. So this is the strongest part of the Bill, not the  
 weakest. I ask for those Members of you who are pro-life and I  
 know we do have a great many considering this report we  
 received today to join with me, to join with the Right to Life  
 Organization in Illinois, the Illinois Citizens Concern for  
 Life and the Americans United for Life in passing this Bill  
 with a substantial vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Senate Bill 47 pass? All those  
 in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'.  
 Representative Willer to explain her vote. One minute. The  
 timer is on."

Willer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Flinn: "Go ahead and ask him. We'll violate the rules."

Willer: "Would, Representative Kelly, if you could answer me in your  
 explanation of your vote on page three, and I'm using the green  
 Amendment, I assume you are too, in the definition of abortion  
 means the use of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other  
 substance or device to terminate the pregnancy of a woman known  
 to be pregnant with intent to cause fetal death. What abortion  
 procedures are now used that would come under the heading of  
 drug or medicine used on a woman to cause an abortion when she  
 is known to be pregnant? What...I don't know what kind of  
 abortion this is."

Kelly: "Any...any item that, an instrument, it says medicine or  
 drugs."

Willer: "I know that but what medicine or drug..."

Kelly: "Okay. Let's say for instance there's a procedure known as the saline salt solution which is injected into the womb. That's a substance and I would say that would be considered and..."

Willer: "How about drugs?"

Kelly: "Well, I'm not a doctor. I don't know if anyone is in here but I understand there are in certain stages of fetal development, they use and can use instruments, medicine, or drug and this would, this would say, say that if it is used, then it is to promote a termination of a pregnancy, then it is actually an abortion and I can't see if anything..."

Willer: "Okay. I..."

Kelly: "It's not going to hurt being in the Bill at all."

Willer: "I..."

Kelly: "And I don't see why we should take it out. I think it...who knows, first of all something further along the line could come up that could be some new form of medicine or drug. I think it belongs in here. I think that's a strong provision."

Willer: "Okay. You've more than answered my question. I honestly did not know of any drug or medicine. I realize the saline solution may come under one of those categories. I realize by deleting the rest of that provision that you are striking out anything to do with what many people call contraceptive, IUD, and mini-pills so that's fine. I just want to speak to the Bill now. I think Representative Kelly is right when he says..."

Speaker Flinn: "Bring your remarks to a close. We're well over the minute."

Willer: "My vote is no because first of all it's patently unconstitutional, obviously. But also I talked to a lawyer for a pro-life organization who admitted what Representative Kelly just said. That they are perfecting more and more techniques known as contraception implants etc...that they are going to work very hard to be declared illegal and you're getting into an area whether I maintain the State simply cannot get involved in a woman's personal life at that stage. Some people call

them abortifacients other people call them contraceptions." 6446

Speaker Flinn: "Would you please bring your remarks to a close?" 6448

Willer: "Well, okay. That's..." 6450

Speaker Flinn: "We're into about four minutes now." 6452

Willer: "Well, they don't have a light on." 6454

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Alexander to explain her vote. One 6455  
moment. One minute and the timer is on and the shut off switch 6456  
is on." 6457

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not a doctor nor a lawyer. I'm just a 6458  
woman. You, you, you, and you and I here in this General 6459  
Assembly continually make laws to impose our moral aptitudes 6460  
and beliefs on each other. This is wrong. We cannot legislate 6461  
moral beliefs. This has to come from within an individual to 6462  
know and to believe what is right and what is wrong. I would  
like to ask a question to this House this afternoon. Should we 6463  
help these issues by mandating such laws or do we help by 6465  
providing good health information about how to prevent unwanted 6466  
pregnancies in verse. No, says the sponsors of pro-life. They  
must do as I say or we say and we will continue to regulate 6467  
their morals. I think..." 6468

Speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close please. 6469  
Representative Marovitz to explain his vote. One minute the 6470  
stop clock is on." 6471

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 6472  
of the House. I just wonder why this Legislature continually 6473  
does things that in effect to the outside world are 6474  
irresponsible actions and is a disservice to the State, to our 6475  
constituency, and to this legislative body and the work that we 6476  
were elected to do. I think that the Right to Life Committee  
is the best fund raiser that the ACLU has. Why we're acting so 6477  
irresponsibly when we know this legislation is patently, 6478  
patently unconstitutional is beyond me, and I think that we 6479  
ought to be thinking about that regardless of what your feeling 6480  
is on the legislation on abortion. That's your own moral  
feelings, but we ought to act responsibly in putting 6481  
legislation on the Governor's desk that is constitutional and 6482

is well thought out and we'll stand up to test in court." 64

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman to explain his vote. One 64  
minute and the stop clock is on." 64

Bowman: "I'd just like to address a few remarks to those people who 64  
oppose having a Federal Constitutional Convention to, for the 64  
purpose of amending our Federal Constitution. And who are 64  
voting yes on this measure because it seems to me one of the 64  
best ways of, you know, playing into the hands of those people 64  
who would want a Constitutional Convention is to continue 64  
sending the courts unconstitutional measures like this. It 64  
seems to me that we're making a terrible, terrible mistake here 64  
if we do not exercise our responsibility to screen out 64  
unconstitutional measures such as this one and I urge you to 64  
reconsider your position." 64

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Braun to explain her vote. One 64  
minute. Timer's on." 64

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 65  
would like to echo the remarks of Representative Bowman and 65  
Marovitz. I think it is a shame that we have to continue to 65  
pass irresponsible legislation that is patently 65  
unconstitutional and people will find themselves having to turn 65  
to the courts to enforce rights, to enforce their rights under 65  
the United States Constitution and the State Constitution that 65  
we should have been conscious of and we should have protected 65  
in this body. We were elected by the people to do that. The 65  
courts are not elected by the people to do that. The courts' 65  
role is not to continually strike down laws that this 65  
Legislature passes with no regard for whether or not they 65  
comport with our system of government and our Constitution. I 65  
think this is wrong. Further, I would like to point out that 65  
all 114 votes up there, when we come around and ask for you to 65  
vote for cost of living welfare, entry for welfare or to vote 65  
to keep Cook County Hospital open or to vote to provide decent 65  
housing, I hope you will respond as quickly as you've responded 65  
to this issue because that..." 65

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 65

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 6518  
 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'nay' and this Bill having received the 6519  
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 6520  
 101." 6521

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 101, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections 6522  
 of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill." 6524

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster." 6526

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 6527  
 101 which is before you, is the same in substance as Senate 6528  
 Bill 1310 which was already passed and adopted by the Senate by 6529  
 a vote of 38 to 13. This Bill has been discussed on Second 6530  
 Reading, but I would like to say a few words about the purpose 6531  
 and the philosophy of this Bill. The provisions of the Bill, 6532  
 the constitutionality of the Bill, the cost and the way in 6533  
 which this identical law has been working well in the State of 6534  
 Pennsylvania for six years. The purpose of this Bill is to 6535  
 recognize that our Illinois State Constitution guarantees the 6536  
 equal protection of the law for all people, all taxpayers. And 6537  
 the purpose of this Bill is to fulfill the goal in the 6538  
 educational Article of our State Constitution that says the 6539  
 fundamental goal of our people in the State of Illinois is the 6540  
 educational development of all persons. What this Bill does is 6541  
 to provide that all of your constituents and taxpayers who have 6542  
 children, that those children will be, will benefit from the 6543  
 public transportation system that's being operated by the 6544  
 public school, so that all the children can be transported to 6545  
 their school whether that school is a public school or a 6546  
 private school. What the Bill provides is that if children 6547  
 live beyond the mile and a half from the school that they are 6548  
 lawfully attending, and they reside in the school district, 6549  
 that school district will transport them to their school even 6550  
 if it be a private, non-public school, provided that no school 6551  
 district is required to transport children beyond the cap or 6552  
 the limit of ten miles outside the school district's  
 boundaries. With respect to the constitutionality, many of you 6553  
 have been given a copy of the news story in the report that 6554

just yesterday, Monday, June 25, the United States Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of a law that's virtually identical, operating in the State of Pennsylvania. Yes, virtually identical. It, the Pennsylvania system is the same as you find in Senate Bill 101, requirement that the public school district transport children to their private school but not beyond ten miles. And as many of you know, the reason that this is constitutional is that all taxpayers and all people are entitled to certain benefits such as the police protection, fire protection, sewage, water, and anything that is given to the public including transportation. Now with respect to the cost, the Illinois Office of Education supplied a Fiscal Note which was not to helpful. That said that they were not able to ascertain the cost; however, there will be no cost in Fiscal Year '80, and the Illinois Catholic Conference conducted a survey to ascertain exactly how many students, real students in Illinois would qualify under the provisions of this Act. They found that a little under 25,000 would qualify. And that ah, when you multiply that by \$125 the cost of transporting students, that would give a fiscal impact not next year, not this Fiscal Year but in the following Fiscal Year of 3.1 million. Another reason that this Bill is important is, as you all know, we all know we are having a transportation problem because of the fuel shortage. If there is anything we should do by way of public policy, where possible, is to make it possible for school children to get to school in some other way rather than the private automobile. And this Bill would do that. In a way this Bill is neutral to all students and all schools in that it doesn't make any difference what school they go to, whether it be public or private, they would benefit from the transportation system that is paid by their parents who are taxpayers in the district. This would allow us to continue what is a distinct and wonderful aspect of American education and that is a dual system. There is great concern over the quality of education in our public schools, and there are many people that choose to send their children to private schools,

religious schools and other private schools for various reasons. This Bill would make it possible for those to be transported to their schools. And a typical example, the most common example is where you might have a school district boundary of...that is the same as the road, township road. The student living on the south side of the road would get transported to his private school under existing law, but the student who lives across the road on the wrong side would not be able to get that transportation. There's nothing sacred about the school district boundary. I have the School Code in front of me and as most of you know, there are many provisions where transportation is provided beyond the boundaries. As a matter of fact with respect to field trips, why it's even legal to go into another state. Of course, that's not allowed under this Bill. We also provide transportation for senior citizens and a great many other uses are made of our school bus transportation system recognizing that it is a public system supported by the public, and to the best possible, we should make sure that all, all people and all students are able to benefit from that transportation system. The Bill was considered on Second Reading and the only Amendment was really a clarifying Amendment, what rephrased language that was already in it. So the Bill in substance is the same as Senate Bill 1310 which passed the Senate 38 to 13. I would be happy to respond to questions, I know there is a lot of interest in the legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd only make two or three observations in regard to this Bill, because I know there are a number of other well-informed people who wish to speak on it. I would point out to you that this coming Fiscal Year, we are going to be appropriating something in the neighborhood of \$94,000,000 for regular school transportation and for special-ed transportation. That \$54,000,000 which we're talking about appropriating for regular transportation, we only going to pay

87% or in the neighborhood of 87% of the actual cost to the local school districts on the formula from the State. Anotherwards the State rather than fully funding their share of the cost because of the expense and because of the limited resources, we are going to fund it at less than 100%. Those of you who supported, Senate Bill 1172 that went out of here with the General Distributive Formula for this State were supporting a program considerably in excess of what the Governor says that he has available. I happen to believe those resources are available, and that's the reason I supported it. But there's no way from a fiscally sound point of view that you can support this particular program. What you're going to do is to turn the total cost of this on to the local school districts. They have nowhere else to go for the money. Those of you who have been contacted by your local school districts, know the financial condition therein, particularly those districts which have great uncertainty over what is going to happen in regard to the Corporate Personal Property Tax. I do not see how in good conscious that the Legislature in this House can pass this kind of a Bill, because you not only are going to hoist a great burden on those people who are already trying to do a good job, but you raise great hopes and great expectations on the part of those people who think that these services are going to be available. For that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in opposition to this legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this...one of the Bills where you don't know where to begin. I just want to make sure I don't forget the reference that Representative Deuster made to the School Code particularly the Chapter on transportation and particularly the fact that it's not sacred and I agree with that; however, in the issues that he sights for that particular case, he should note that for most of those transportation provisions are reimbursable and they are also in reimbursable in terms of depreciation. And in many situations those buses are used only on available basis



even to senior citizens. But that's not the major point, I think Representative Hoffman, as usual, has touched on significant aspects of the Bill. I would point out that about two years ago, the Illinois House, from action that stemmed out of the Education Committee, assisted in drafting and redrafting legislation that changed the provision of the Transportation Code, that said that children attending parochial schools must be bussed along the regular routes. We changed, however in recognition, I think, by in part to the problem that there are many times, obviously, when those routes do not conform to where the parochial kids will be attending. We changed that language to read roughly something dealing with safety and economical. I think that was an acceptable change, in fact, I voted for that despite the notion that maybe some of you think I never vote for something of that type. But none the less, we made the accommodation, we accommodated the needs of a community to the services that a school district can render, and I think that's an important change. However, when we come to this question of expanding the School Code to a distance of ten miles, when we begin to talk about forty to forty-five million dollars despite the fact that the IOE would not bite the bullet and come forward with the information, we know from the BOB that that figure is the middle figure. I think there's probably more money, and when you look at what is available to new...for education money, new money, this year the Governor said \$81,000,000. We thought as the House and I think the Senate will concur that maybe there's 135,000,000 new dollars. But imagine what would happen if \$40,000,000 had to be used and we had to stick to the Governor's 81. Half of the money, half of the new money for our programs and schools would have to be directed towards this program. FY '80, there may not be an effect on this, the State of Illinois, but take a look at what happens to local districts. FY '81 when we will be implementing this for our purposes, if the program is implemented at a partial, partial factor, we will be at forty to forty-five million. Don, I think, has read figures that are

substantially in error and based on a study that he quotes 667  
which was used in 1976. Other points, I think, should be born 6678  
out, basically that when we come to education, realize what's 6679  
happened and listen to the major complaints of your 6680  
communities. They say we want full funding of transportation, 6681  
and with good reason. In 1977, \$46,805,000, that was paid at a 6682  
prorated figure of 78%. FY '78, \$50,908,000, 78% a proration 6683  
on transportation. 1979 FY, FY '79, rather, \$53,000,000, a 6684  
prorated figure of '89. Now when you think about adding 6685  
\$44,000,000 to that, you've got to be seriously aware of the 6686  
fact that total transportation programs are going to be 6687  
seriously affected, negatively affected and the services of the 6688  
community will dwindle and you will have on your backs all the 6689  
people who are concerned about a total transportation program 6690  
that is beginning to inch forward in terms of full funding. We 6691  
made some progress this year. I think the program ought to 6692  
come back to you in 2649, we're representing a little bit of a 6693  
growth in the area of full funding, but it will not be of 6694  
course full funding because the money is not going to be there. 6695  
So this year alone, we are faced again with the deficit in 6696  
terms of our responsibility as a team by the local communities. 6697  
So if we're going to prorate dollars as we see them today, and 6698  
we're going to be gullible enough to accept the notion that 6699  
this is good legislation that it's going to follow the total 6700  
community problems, I think we are in serious error. I would 6701  
hope, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Members finally respond 6702  
from not only Representative Totten's point of view, and that 6703  
is fiscal conservatism but also the recognition of the chaos 6704  
and the problems that would result from the fact that we would 6705  
pass a Bill which kids would be crossing boundaries on school 6706  
buses and in some, no clear language on whether or not a public 6707  
school's student is going to be bused out of his own district 6708  
to go to another school. Someone has asked me before what 6709  
happens if a Rochester kid wants to go to Springfield. There 6710  
are a lot of issues that we have to deal with, this is a bad 6711  
Bill, possibly it should be reassigned to a Committee that

would look at it seriously. The School Problems Commission 6707  
 Transportation Commission would certainly look at it. My 6708  
 Committee as...Transportation Sub-Committee, we'd like to look 6709  
 at it. Our Committee did not have a chance, all of our 6710  
 observations are being made from the floor not in committee, no  
 testimony. I solicit a 'no' vote." 6712

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birkinbine." 6714

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" 6716

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will." 6718

Birkinbine: "Don, if this Bill were to go into effect, it would apply 6719  
 to all students in a district, right?" 6721

Deuster: "The question is would...this applies to all students?" 6723

Birkinbine: "Yes." 6725

Deuster: "All students residing in a district that...providing 6726  
 transportation would be entitled to the benefits no matter what 6727  
 the destination is, if they were going to the public school or 6728  
 the private school." 6729

Birkinbine: "Okay. Now you said it could apply even to ten miles 6730  
 beyond the boundary of a school district, right?" 6732

Deuster: "That's the maximum, up to ten miles. The actual figures 6733  
 based on a survey are that 80% of the private students live 6734  
 within ten miles of the distance from their residence to the 6735  
 school they would be going to. So in most cases..." 6737

Birkinbine: "Would the school have to...the school, the eventual 6738  
 destination of the child, have to be within the school district 6739  
 so that ten miles would include swinging out to pick students 6740  
 up or could it be a matter of a student from a district being 6741  
 bused to a school that might be nine miles away?" 6742

Deuster: "That would be about the most farfetched maximum if they..." 6743

Birkinbine: "Well, I..." 6746

Deuster: "Well, wait a minute. If...the way it would work is that if 6747  
 there's no requirement that students be transported into a 6748  
 district that is not providing transportation, first of all, or 6749  
 through a district. So...so that what would the practical 6750  
 result of the Bill is that the two districts who are already 6751  
 transporting students will readjust their schedule either 6752

through a transfer or mutually beneficial routes to transport  
all...take care of all the children under this Act."

Birkinbine: "Okay. There's a school called Christian Liberty  
Academy, it's about nine miles from my house, it's in Mount  
Prospect...or Prospect Heights, excuse me. So it's obviously  
nine miles just about from the school district. If a student  
from my district wanted to go to that school and that district  
does provide school busing as does mine, would my district now  
be required to drop that student off at that school...a  
distance of nine miles?"

Deuster: "The answer is the school has to be accredited."

Birkinbine: "It is."

Deuster: "Okay. And if it's a private school..."

Birkinbine: "It is."

Deuster: "They would qualify on these conditions. The...the distance  
from the student's residence to the school attended must be  
more than a mile and a half and that school must not be more  
than ten miles outside the boundary."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."

Deuster: "You know you have..."

Birkinbine: "Thank you. If I could speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "The question that I raised with Mr. Deuster is a factual  
one because the student is my daughter. She attends a school  
that's nine miles away. She's been doing that for four years,  
although I'm reconsidering next year. The reason is that if  
you transport a student roughly nine miles, 176 days a year,  
out there and back in the morning, go back out and pick them up  
in the afternoon and come back, you are trans...you are  
covering a distance, for one student now, better than 6,000  
miles in a year. Now that's what my school district would have  
to do for one student. In this case, my daughter, because  
she's the only student from the district that goes to that  
school. Now there could be any number of situations such as  
this that would come up. We're talking about covering a  
distance twice the length of our country. Six thousand miles a

year for one student. I suggest that this is unwise 6794  
 legislation. There are a great many people in my district who 6795  
 support it. We've got a great many parochial schools but I 6796  
 suggest to them that this also poses a threat to the private 6797  
 school system, because anytime we start having the Government 6798  
 start putting aid into something, and in this case we would be 6799  
 giving additional aid to private schools and even though we're 6800  
 doing some of it now, I disagree with that, controls inevitably 6801  
 follow. It's like getting mixed up with the Federal 6802  
 Government, pretty soon Uncle starts telling you what you have 6803  
 to do. I suggest that the private schools and their proponents 6804  
 are asking for future trouble and I request that you all vote 6805  
 against this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing." 6806

Ewing: "Mr., Mr. Speaker, I would move the previous question." 6809

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The 6810  
 question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor 6811  
 say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and 6812  
 Representative Deuster is recognized to close. I had a number 6813  
 of lights on both sides of the aisle on, if you'll leave them 6814  
 on, I'll recognize you to explain your votes." 6815

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there 6816  
 were no questions directed toward the subject of 6817  
 constitutionality as is often the case with this type of 6818  
 subject, because the Bill is constitutional. The Bill, the 6819  
 concept has been working for six years in the State of 6820  
 Pennsylvania. The ten miles is a reasonable limit, in my 6821  
 opinion; you have to come up with some limit and that's what's 6822  
 in the Bill. I might say that the, we have a great state as 6823  
 Pennsylvania has, and some cases you'll have students that are 6824  
 transported very short distances and other cases students 6825  
 transported longer distances. I might say that most of us know 6826  
 from our own experience, I do from Mundeline that even though I 6827  
 happen to live about three miles from Mundeline and Mundeline 6828  
 Highschool runs a bus out there, the great vast majority of the 6829  
 highschool students don't even utilize that, because either 6830

they drive their own car or they inveigle their parents into driving them to school, because the schedule isn't that convenient, because we do live in an automobile age. I say that because I want to comment on the Statement by one Representative that the cost involved by it was 40,000,000. It absolutely is not 40,000,000. If those of you have looked at it, analyzed the Bureau of the Budget's statement, they have based their estimate upon the fact that it would cost about three times as much to transport these students, \$375, whereas the cost of transporting a student in Illinois is \$125. The experience in Pennsylvania is actually that it only costs \$120 less. So that the figure of \$125 a student per year which we are using is realistic and proven. Secondly, the Bureau of the Budget's estimate...upon which one Representative bases his figures, estimates the number of students involved is 115,000 which is about three or four times the actual amount we determined by taking a survey. So the most accurate information that is available indicates that in the State of Illinois, the cost here would be 3.1 million dollars which is not much, and even if we based it upon a larger participation, slightly more in Pennsylvania, it might go up to \$4,000,000. I think that is reasonable. Now getting to the essence of the Bill, the essence of the Bill is that all of the students of this State and all of the taxpayers are entitled to receive a benefit from the tax money that they paid to support the transportation system that's functioning in most of our communities. They're all taxpayers no matter what kind of a school they send their children to or their children choose to attend, private or public. And transportation is just like fire protection, police protection, it's a common governmental service that the taxpayers support that has nothing to do with education or religion. All we're doing is making it possible for the children to get to school without regard to what kind of a school they attend so long as it is accredited. I would appreciate your favorable consideration on this concept which has been well thought out. I know there will be many Members

who will be commenting to explain their vote. Thank You." 6860

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Senate Bill 101 pass? All 6861  
those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. 6862  
Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote." 6864

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what we 6865  
have failed to point out is that people have been telling us 6866  
very clearly, we do not want anymore mandated programs unless 6867  
you are willing to pay the bill. Even after Fiscal Year '80, 6868  
if the State were paying its share, local school districts 6869  
would still have to pay 20%. As the law states now, 20% is the 6870  
local school district's obligation even if we fund the other 6871  
80% which we have not. I see we have some good red votes up 6872  
there and I encourage more red votes." 6873

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Anderson to explain his vote. Timer's 6874  
on." 6875

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have some questions and I got cut off 6876  
in debate and..." 6877

Speaker Flinn: "Go ahead and ask the question, I'm not in a big 6878  
hurry. I'll stay as long as you want to stay." 6880

Anderson: "Alright, first of all will the Sponsor yield for a 6881  
question or two? Mr. Sponsor, there were two Fiscal Notes on 6882  
this particular Bill. How come you didn't attach the second 6883  
one?" 6884

Deuster: "I filed two Fiscal Notes, Representative Anderson, if you 6885  
want to check..." 6886

Anderson: "Well, the second one is up there now, yesterday's one was 6887  
on Second Reading with move to Third, there was only one note 6888  
attached. Is that correct?" 6889

Deuster: "At the time it moved to Third Reading, I filed that second 6890  
Fiscal Note." 6891

Anderson: "Yes, I went up and looked and it wasn't there then. I'm 6892  
sorry..." 6893

Deuster: "It's there, it's there..." 6895

Anderson: "Yea, well the second Fiscal Note says in it from BOB, says 6896  
the cost will be somewhere between 40 and 45 million dollars. 6897  
Is that correct?" 6898

Deuster: "Well, I just explained that that's incorrect. I mean that's what it states, but it's wrong because it's been based on a false assumption."

Anderson: "It is? It's the best estimate that the Bureau of the Budget has and I met with them this morning and they did not change their mind any."

Deuster: "I don't want to get into a colloquy, but I already explained in debate..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, please don't because his minute is already up. Representative Anderson, bring your remarks to a close, please."

Anderson: "Well, I did want to ask some questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I...you had a couple of questions there, so proceed if you wish to discuss some more but your one minute is expired."

Anderson: "Alright, secondly, alright, you did distribute some information around and it wasn't signed. Where did that information come from? This survey that was put in my box."

Deuster: "That was put in your box, and it had a little note saying, 'Dear Colleagues I hope this is helpful to you in understanding the Bill', and I signed my name to it. I..."

Anderson: "You signed your name to another piece of paper, but not to the survey itself. That was your survey then."

Deuster: "Don, now...have...you got that in your box, and it had a note from me to you. And you know that. I'm..."

Anderson: "Well, in that particular survey that you passed out, you know this wasn't, this wasn't heard in Committee, and we had no way of questioning any..."

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry that happens a lot, now on the subject, but I'll be glad to answer your question. Now, if you want to be a sports writer about this Bill, the survey was conducted by the Illinois Catholic Conference. They sent a note to every parent of every child in the State of Illinois involved in this and they got a response back and you got it in the survey there."

Anderson: "Every parent in the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Flinn: "You've already went into three minutes,



Representative Anderson, I've got a record. We've got a bunch  
of other people who wish to explain their votes. I'm sorry  
that you got off because the moving of the previous question.  
Representative Rigney to explain his vote, one minute."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is probably one of the worst  
Bills of the Session. Particularly, as it will affect the  
downstate smaller school districts. Consider a minute the  
situation in Freeport where you have about five parochial  
schools. The way this Bill reads, sending units from as far  
away as Jo Daviess County and Winnebago County would be  
responsible for busing children into the Freeport district to  
attend one of those parochial schools. The costs of this are  
beyond belief, and I hope that all of my friends are going to  
consider what they...what you will be doing to the downstate  
districts under this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane to explain his vote. One minute,  
the timer's on."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of  
this Bill characterizes the typical example as two students  
living on opposite sides of a township road and the bus could  
simply pick up the student on the other side of the township  
road. Well, I would say that that is not the typical example.  
The typical example is the kind of situation we would have here  
in Springfield in which we have a number of private schools  
situated in the City of Springfield, and we have about four or  
five outlining school districts that would all be responsible  
for busing any of their children from any part of their  
district to the City of Springfield, and putting, sending those  
students to private schools. It's been said that all they  
would have to do is to drop that student off at the District  
186 boundaries. Well, that simply wouldn't work..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kelly to explain his vote. One  
minute, the timer and the stop clock are on."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I feel that  
this Bill is necessary, because the private schools in the  
State of Illinois are not receiving any consideration at all in

this...state funding. And this would give us a constitutional right to provide that funding and still stay within the framework of that constitution. Now I supported full funding for education every since I've been in Springfield, but I think it's a two-way street. I feel that the parents of these children are going to these private schools should receive at least some moderate, small tax relief. And we're talking about big, about big dollar amounts, but at the same time, it in no way does it compare to the public education in the State of Illinois. The private schools should be considered and I ask you to vote yes."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative J. David Jones to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Jones: "Inquiry to the Sponsor, Don. Inquiry to the Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Jones, I got into trouble twice doing that under explanation of votes, once on this side of the aisle and once over here. And that is in violation of the rules and I'm not going to do it anymore. So go ahead and explain your vote and I'll turn the timer back on to give you a full minute."

Jones: "Alright, the Public schools have been sending me inquiries and asking that here we go again mandating a program for them and where's the money going to come from? And I don't have that answer."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the argument has certainly been made very clear and evident in the Pennsylvania experience that whoever is saying how much this expenditure is going to cost the taxpayers of Illinois, is just talking through their hat. I don't know where they got the figures of half a million dollars or forty million dollars, the experience clearly shows that about a \$4,300,000 expenditure at best would be the experience in Illinois. I can just say to those Members from northern Illinois that we have a lot of parochial and private schools that are not necessarily Catholic, and they

need this relief on the cost of transportation. I speak 7012  
 specifically up there in Boone County and in McHenry County 7013  
 where those private schools, the Baptists and the Unitarian and 7014  
 the Christian Church Schools want this relief. They personally 7015  
 have contacted us and I think you ought to grant it to them. 7016  
 It's a good Bill, it certainly is deserving to those who 7017  
 believe that there should be some relief for those 7018  
 taxpayers..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Robbins to explain his vote. One 7019  
 Minute, timer's on." 7020

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I live in southern Illinois, at the present 7021  
 time the buses from our highschool district leave at 6:30 in 7022  
 the morning and they arrive in at 8:30 traveling something over 7023  
 a hundred miles and if you have to go ten miles out of the 7024  
 district to pick up students so that they are transported to a 7025  
 parochial school within your district, that means that these 7026  
 buses are going to, these children are going to have to ride 7027  
 these buses, some of them for as much as three hours, and I 7028  
 believe two hours is long enough."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Walsh to explain his vote. One 7029  
 minute, the timer's on." 7030

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 7031  
 another aspect of this Bill that has not been referred to to my 7032  
 knowledge is that this mandates that public schools, the public 7033  
 school system provide busing where they may not now provide it, 7034  
 and I can think of a couple of places where that is the case. 7035  
 One is Cicero and the other is Oak Park in River Forest. They 7036  
 must provide bus transportation for their public school 7037  
 students who live more than one and one-half miles from the 7038  
 school. Now in addition to doing that, and there aren't very 7039  
 many public school students who live more than one and one-half 7040  
 miles from the school, they must provide private school 7041  
 transportation for all of the various places they live. The 7042  
 other point I wanted to make is that that this does not apply 7043  
 to Chicago. The one place where it could probably do the most 7044  
 good, because there they are closing private schools, kids from 7045

Chicago are coming out to the suburbs, they will not be provided transportation for that purpose. This is an inane Bill, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bradley to explain his vote. He passes, Representative Darrow to explain his vote. One minute, timer's on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, few years ago we always heard a Bill such as this were unconstitutional. We heard that the...there was a separation of church and state and that this was a violation. The Supreme Court has now ruled that that is not the case, so now we hear other arguments. I would just like to say to the Representatives who have spoke against this Bill who are always advocating more funds for public schools, that I voted for legislation to fund empty chairs under the guise of more aid for state public schools. I voted for more funding when the public schools were heavy with administrators, when we are spending more and more money for education and educating fewer and fewer children in the public schools. I've always supported full funding for your schools and I will continue to. But I would suggest that you start looking at issues like this. I suggest that you start looking at sharing some of the school aid funds with the private schools now that it has been ruled constitutional and..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Keane to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Keane: "Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, a number of speakers who oppose this Bill have indicated that should it pass, doom and black clouds would form over Illinois. This Bill has been in existence, same kind of legislation has been in existence in Pennsylvania for the last six years where there is greater use and a greater number of eligibles, because they have not, they have not excluded, they have not excluded a large city as this Bill does. It's costing approximately \$4,000,000 a year. That cost has been constant, it is not something where you started and then keeps going up. I would

advise or I would ask that you disregard the talk of 40 and 50 million dollars, it is totally out of line. The Bill will cost somewhere between..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Deuster probably missed his calling. He should have been a used car salesman cause he's pretty good at giving low-ball estimates. If you take a look at the Fiscal Note that was filed for House Bill 1310 which is a very substantially part of this Bill, you see that the unit cost that he used was the lowest possible one. One hundred and twenty-five dollars, the cost for public school pupils, but that's the lowest figure. If you look at the cost of transporting people in the voc-ed program, wait a minute, what's...get a little order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "In a couple of seconds he'll be done regardless of what he says."

Bowman: "Okay, \$149, if you look at the people who participate in the special-ed, a program that assists the physical handicapped, it costs \$375 to transport one of those pupils. Or if you look at the general special-ed category, \$680 per pupil. Representative Deuster is using absolutely the lowest possible figure, it's neither reasonable nor prudent, and I urge an 'aye'...'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative VanDuyne to explain this vote. One minute, the timer's on."

VanDuyne: "Just a note, Mr. Speaker, he was talking about 1310, not 101."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 87 voting 'aye', 77 voting 'nay', and Representative Deuster requests a poll of the absentees. I could almost read his mind."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Ralph Dunn, Virginia Frederick, no, I'm sorry, Dwight Friedrich, Gaines, Kozubowski, Molloy, Pierce, Stanley, E.G. Steele, J.J. Wolf, and Mr."

Speaker." 7113

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there are 87 voting...who is wanting 7114  
the floor, Representative O'Brien, for what purpose do you 7115  
arise?" 7116

O'Brien: "How am I recorded?" 7118

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?" 7120

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'." 7123

Ryan: "Vote me 'yes'." 7125

Speaker Flinn: "O'Brien, 'aye'. Any further changes? Representative 7126  
Mahar. Vote Mahar 'aye'. Representative Anderson, I already 7127  
have a request like you're going to make. Representative 7128  
Robbins." 7129

Robbins: "If this receives 89, I will request..." 7131

Speaker Flinn: "...already have one of those requests here. Any 7132  
further changes? Representative Schneider has requested a poll 7133  
of the affirmative votes." 7134

Schneider: "For all 89?" 7136

Speaker Flinn: "For all 89..." 7138

Schneider: "Alright, verification." 7140

Speaker Flinn: "He has asked for a verification of the affirmative 7141  
votes. Would each of you be in your seats, Representative 7142  
Kelly, for what purpose do you arise? He wants leave to be 7143  
verified." 7144

Kelly: "May I have leave to get verified?" 7144

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, you may have. Would the Members be in their 7144  
seats. Would all the Members be in their seats, it's unfair to 7144  
those doing the verifying for you to be wandering around and 7144  
holding conferences up and down the aisles. We'll just take 715  
out a minute for people to get back to their seats and be 715  
seated so we can be seen over...overseen. Alright proceed with 715  
the verification of the affirmative Roll Call." 715

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Alexander, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Bianco, 715  
Birchler, Bradley, Breslin, Brummer, Bullock, Campbell, 715  
Capparelli, Capuzi, Christensen, Collins, Cullerton, Darrow, 715  
Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, 715  
Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, 715

Griesheimer, Grossi, Hallock, Hanahan, Harris, Henry, Huff, 7158  
 Huskey, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Keane, Kelly..." 7160

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, for what purpose does Representative 7161  
 Virginia Frederick arise?" 7163

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?" 7165

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Lady recorded?" 7167

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'." 7169

Frederick: "Would you change my vote to 'aye'." 7171

Speaker Flinn: "Change the Lady to 'aye'. Proceed with the...proceed 7172  
 with the Roll Call." 7174

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kucharski, Kulas, 7175  
 Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Madigan, 7176  
 Mahar, Margalus, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, 7177  
 Meyer, Mulcahey, Murphy, Oblinger..." 7178

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan, could he be verified? 7179  
 Representative Schneider be verified. Proceed." 7181

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien, Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Piel, Pouncey, 7182  
 Preston, Reed, Richmond, Ronan, Ryan, Schlickman, Schraeder, 7183  
 Simms, Slape, Stearney, Taylor, Telcser..." 7185

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Goodwin would like to be verified, 7186  
 Representative Schneider, okay, stand right here in front of 7187  
 us. Representative Goodwin verified." 7188

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich, VanDuyne, Vitek, VonBoeckman, White, 7189  
 Williams and Younge." 7190

Speaker Flinn: "Turn Representative Schneider on. Questions to the 7191  
 affirmative Roll Call." 7193

Schneider: "90, 89 or 90?" 7195

Schneider: "Start out with 90...276?" 7197

Schneider: "Alright, Representative Ewell." 7199

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ray Ewell. The Gentleman is not in 7200  
 his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?" 7201

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7204

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7206

Schneider: "Representative Laurino." 7208

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bill Laurino, the Gentleman is not in 7209  
 his seat, is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman 7210

recorded?" 7211

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'. Remove 7212  
him from the Roll." 7214

Schneider: "Bianco." 7216

Speaker Flinn: "Bianco, the Gentleman is in his seat." 7218

Schneider: "Representative Brummer." 7220

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, I don't see the Gentleman in 7221  
his seat. Is he on the floor? There he is over on the 7222  
Republican side where he belongs." 7223

Schneider: "Collins." 7225

Speaker Flinn: "Who was that?" 7227

Schneider: "Collins, Phil." 7229

Speaker Flinn: "Phil Collins. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is 7230  
he on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?" 7232

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7234

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7236

Schneider: "Farley." 7238

Speaker Flinn: "Farley. Did you say Farley?" 7240

Schneider: "Bruce Farley." 7242

Speaker Flinn: "Bruce Farley, I don't see him in his seat. Is the 7243  
Gentleman on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?" 7245

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7247

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7249

Schneider: "Hallock. Hallock." 7251

Speaker Flinn: "Hallock, Representative Hallock is not in his seat. 7252  
Is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?" 7253

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7256

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Collins is 7257  
back, put him on the Roll. Put him back on." 7259

Schneider: "Huskey." 7261

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huskey's in his seat." 7263

Schneider: "...how did you record Representative..." 7265

Speaker Flinn: "He's in his seat." 7267

Schneider: "Thank you. Representative Terzich." 7269

Speaker Flinn: "Terzich. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on 7270  
the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?" 7272



Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7274

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7276

Schneider: "McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe." 7278

Speaker Flinn: "Roger McAuliffe. Waving from the back of his seat,  
he's in his seat." 7279

Schneider: "Representative Mulcahey." 7282

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mulcahey, the Gentleman is not in his  
seat, there he is out in the aisle." 7283

Schneider: "McClain, McClain." 7287

Speaker Flinn: "McClain, Representative McClain, not in his seat. Is  
the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?" 7288

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7292

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7294

Schneider: "Representative Jones, Emil Jones." 7296

Speaker Flinn: "Emil Jones, the Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he  
on the floor? McClain, return McClain. Remove...Remove Emil  
Jones...how's he recorded first, is he recorded as 'aye'?" 7297

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7298

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Put Representative Hallock  
back on. Hallock, return to the Roll." 7300

Schneider: "Representative Campbell." 7302

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chuck Campbell, the Gentleman is not  
in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How is he  
recorded? Campbell, Chuck Campbell." 7308

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7309

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Emil Jones is back, return  
him to the Roll." 7311

Schneider: "Alright, Representative Piel." 7313

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bob Piel is in his seat." 7317

Schneider: "Representative...do we have Terzich? VonBoeckman." 7319

Speaker Flinn: "Representative VonBoeckman is in his seat." 7321

Schneider: "Representative Ryan." 7323

Speaker Flinn: "George Ryan, Minority Leader, I don't see him in his  
seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman  
recorded?" 7325

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7327

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 7332

Schneider: "Lechowicz." 7334

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz. I don't see the Gentleman 7335  
in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman 7336  
recorded?" 7337

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 7339

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 734

Schneider: "Davis, Representative Jack Davis." 734

Speaker Flinn: "Jack Davis is right in front here. Representative 734  
Ryan has returned. Will you put him back on the Roll." 734

Schneider: "Who is that?" 734

Speaker Flinn: "Who is that?" 735

Schneider: "Oh, Ryan." 735

Speaker Flinn: "Ryan is back. George Ryan, in person." 735

Schneider: "Representative Dawson." 735

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Glenn Dawson. I don't see the 735  
Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the 735  
Gentleman recorded?" 735

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'." 736

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll." 736

Schneider: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker." 736

Speaker Flinn: "Count them up, Clerk. Representative Yourell, what 736  
purpose do you arise?" 736

Yourell: "To ah, how am I recorded?" 737

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?" 737

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'." 737

Yourell: "In order to save my colleagues the expense of sending out 73  
some more Roll Calls, I'll change to 'aye'." 73

Speaker Flinn: "Change Yourell from 'no' to 'aye'. This question 73  
there are 84 'ayes', 84 'ayes', and 74 'nos', and 73  
Representative Deuster moves to put this on Postponed 73  
Consideration. That right? Representative Deuster." 73

Deuster: "Yes, I would ask leave of the House for that I be provided 73  
with the Roll Call on this." 73

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if you put it on Postponed Consideration, there 73  
won't be any available, but if you don't, and it loses, you'll 73

get a Roll Call." 7387

Deuster: "Well, I wouldn't want to do that...I would..." 7389

Speaker Flinn: "You have a choice, Sir..." 7391

Deuster: "I'd like to put it on Postponed Consideration, Mr. 7392  
Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "You don't have any choice in the matter. Do you wish 7394  
to put it on Postponed Consideration?" 7396

Deuster: "Yes, we'll put it on Postponed Consideration." 7398

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked leave to put it on Postponed 7399  
Consideration. Hearing no objection, the Bill will be on 7400  
Postponed Consideration." 7401

Anonymous: "Senate Bill 244." 7403

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't announce it. Representative O'Brien. 7404  
Representative O'Brien has asked leave to move 244 back to 7405  
Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any 7406  
objections? Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second 7407  
Reading." 7408

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, O'Brien, amends Senate Bill 244 on page 7409  
1 by deleting 12, by deleting line 12 and so forth." 7411

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dan O'Brien." 7413

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members, Senate Bill 244, the 7414  
other afternoon had four to five Amendments that were put on 7415  
the Bill by Representative Walsh and myself. And I checked 7416  
with the staff yesterday, and they indicated that because we 7417  
put so many Amendments on that we had made a technical error 7418  
and a technical mistake. This Amendment, Amendment #6 7419  
incorporates all of those Amendments that Representative Walsh 7420  
and I put on the Bill the other day in the correct fashion and 7421  
the proper manner, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call." 7422

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 7423  
#6 to Senate Bill 244. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', 7424  
those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment #6 is 7425  
adopted. Further Amendments?" 7426

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 7428

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 375. 75...Senate Bill 7429  
375, Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?" 7431

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement." 7433

Speaker Flinn: "State the announcement." 7435

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we have a House Democratic Member that is just 7436  
 been recently married, Staff Member, Jim Morfue and wife Sue 7437  
 are up on the Republican side of the gallery, and they haven't 7438  
 been able to get away on their honeymoon because we work them 7439  
 so hard. We ought to show our appreciation. Jim and Sue." 7440

Speaker Flinn: "Read Senate Bill 375." 7442

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections 7443  
 of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 7445

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle." 7447

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Senate Bill 375 is the 7448  
 combination of many years of work with regard to the issue of 7449  
 early retirement by public school teachers in Illinois. For 7450  
 many years we have attempted to provide for a Bill that would 7451  
 minimize cost impact for the teacher's retirement system while 7452  
 at the same time saving millions of dollars in salaries in the 7453  
 public school districts of this State. Senate Bill 375 with an 7454  
 Amendment worked out between myself and the Chairman of the 7455  
 Pension Committee, Representative Terzich, and with the 7456  
 teachers' groups in this State, provides as follows: First of 7457  
 all, it caps the maximum amount of any increase in teachers' 7458  
 salary during the last year of employment, so a teacher could 7459  
 not get a windfall from a school district, in effect be forced 7460  
 to retire in that manner. That is a cost saving both to the 7461  
 system and to the district which I'll go into in more detail in 7462  
 a moment. Secondly, the Bill as amended limits the number of 7463  
 participants. This was worked out in consultation with the 7464  
 boards, the school board representatives downstate and in 7465  
 Chicago as well, to provide a cap on how many people who are 7466  
 eligible that could retire each year. Third, and importantly, 7467  
 this Bill repeals itself in five years. I would indicate to 7468  
 you that the downstate teacher retirement system is indicated 7469  
 in the Committee on pension, but this year because of balloon  
 payments in salaries by school districts that the cost without  
 this Bill could reach \$80,000,000 in the ensuing year. The

cost with the Bill which would allow early retirement but put a 7470  
cap on salary and essentially, and importantly, provides for a 7471  
one shot contribution equal to 135% of final average salaries  
will go a long way, in my opinion, and in the opinions of 7472  
experts in the pension field in helping solve some of the 7473  
problems that are particularly a peculiar part of the teaching 7474  
system. As you know we have declining enrollments in this 7475  
State. As you know, this is the most costly pension system in 7476  
this State. I would point out to you by way of example that 7477  
with the cap and the provisions in the Bill, if we are to take  
a average example of a teacher, let's call her Mary, who might 7478  
be making \$22,000 a year now. And we were to invoke the 7479  
provisions of this Bill, she would retire five years early, and 7480  
the discount for early retirement will remove as the Bill 7481  
provides. But in the case of that teacher, and she is a 7482  
typical example, the savings to the school district by hiring  
someone new on the salary schedule and making the one shot 7483  
payment for her early retirement would equal according to the 7484  
pension system \$33,000. Now carrying that farther, using that 7485  
average example, that's \$33,000 savings when compared to the 7486  
potential estimate of 3,000 early retirements in Chicago and  
downstate over five years would result in a savings, in a 7487  
savings in salary of \$99,000,000 to school districts over that 7488  
period of time. I reiterate, the Bill is supported by the 7489  
Chicago Teachers Union, by the Illinois Federation of Teachers,  
by the Illinois Education Association, most importantly and 7490  
strenuously by the retirement systems who want this Bill to 7491  
save money, who want this Bill to clear up problems they have 7492  
with ballooning payments, and it's been worked on by and with 7493  
school boards throughout the State of Illinois. I submit it to 7494  
you in hope that you will look at the facts, consider the  
situation. The issue, I think, is totally different to the 7495  
teacher system because of the issues I raised on early 7496  
retirement and in involvement with enrollment problems in cost 7497  
and the fact that this is the most costly pension system in the 7498  
State, and I would ask for your affirmative vote on Senate Bill 7499

375, and will be happy to answer any questions that you might have." 7500  
7501

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Gene Hoffman." 7503

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of 7504  
the House, I rise in support of Senate Bill 375 as amended for 7505  
a number of reasons. One, in the past, we've had a serious 7506  
problem of, of particularly administrators making arrangements 7507  
with their school board to give them tremendous bonuses in 7508  
their last year. In fact in some cases, in order to move the 7509  
administrator on, the school district will agree to give them 7510  
two year salary in one, and that then becomes counted as one of 7511  
their best four years and just runs their, runs their pensions 7512  
out of sight and runs the system out of sight. This Bill puts 7513  
the cap and says it can't be more than 20% increase from one 7514  
year to next. And I think under any circumstances, that is 7515  
reasonable. Also it limits the number of participants who 7516  
could be involved in this in any system, to 30% of those that 7517  
are available. That then has a tendency to mitigate the 7518  
initial cost of the school district which in the long run 7519  
actually going to save. Now there's another factor in this 7520  
beyond just the fiscal implications. I think this is a 7521  
fiscally sound Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a 7522  
teacher by profession and a Legislator by avocation, let me 7523  
tell you that in my judgement, the schools and the children 7524  
will be much better served if teachers have this option. Those 7525  
of you who have had an opportunity to spend any time in the 7526  
classroom, know that after a certain amount of time, some 7527  
people are out of gas. The best that we can do for the 7528  
children of this State, would give these people who have this 7529  
feeling about themselves and want to leave the system, to give 7530  
them an opportunity to get out rather than forcing them to hang 7531  
on as we do now. And for those reasons I support Senate Bill 7532  
375 as amended." 7533

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen." 7531

Ebbesen: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question." 7533

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, he indicates he'll yield..." 7535

Ebbesen: "Representative Stuffle, I was over in the Senate and I missed your opening remarks, did you say that this Bill as amended has the support of the Illinois Association of School Boards?"

Stuffle: "I said that the Bill has the support of the teacher organizations, and we worked as well as we could to work out the problems of the School Board Associations and the School Board. The Association has not taken a position to my knowledge for or against, but I can assure you that there are boards in this State, many of which I have talked to, who are in complete support of the Bill. And we worked with the School Board Association, and we worked with the City of Chicago School Board in working on the Amendment. It's not the best of all worlds for all involved, but it reaches to the issues involved, and we tried to solve as many problems as we could including meeting the cost of the Bill, and the Bill meets 80% of the cost of the pension issued along without even looking at the \$99,000,000 savings estimated."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Ebbesen: "In so doing, I'd just like to say that as the Bill was originally proposed, it provided for a two for one employer-employee split in the one time contribution was based on a percentage of the teacher's last full-time annual salary. Now at age 55, in illustration, the employer contribution would have been 60% and the employee contribution 30%. And in between the ages of 56 to 59, it would be relative. Now we put on the other day, House Amendment #1 which increased the employer's contribution at age 55 to 80% of the final salary. But I'd like to point out to you that this increase is the employer contribution to 100% at age 55 and of course, through the next four years would gradually decrease, but the employer contribution is extremely excessive due to Amendment #1. Now what it does, it mandates for all school districts other, now other than the City of Chicago. Now if a teacher chooses to exercise the option, the school district is absolutely required

to make the contribution. The new Amendment which requires the consent of the employer in the Chicago School District. Now I know I have a communication here from the Ron Cardoni, from the Illinois Association of School Boards. And they oppose the Bill, because of that 100% contribution, and because it's mandating the employing school district to do certain things with 100% contribution. And at least the very option that applies to the Chicago Board of Education should apply to all school districts in this State, and I certainly would encourage everyone to take a very close look at what they're doing on this Bill. And if you'll join me, you will be casting a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield to a few questions?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Larry, in the amended form, what would be the net result in increasing, would there be a change in increasing the unfunded liabilities at all in this Bill as amended?"

Stuffle: "Well, Jake, the best way to answer this, I think, is to go back to what I said earlier. The Pension Laws Commission says a \$5,000,000 increase cost in downstate in the coming year, a \$2,000,000 increase cost in the City of Chicago. But that is taking the Bill in a vacuum based upon this year's salary figures. The Retirement System says you've got to look at the situation we've had occur in the last two years, the last few years and what school districts are doing, they're saying in the absence of early retirement, we're kicking up the salaries by 20 and 25 and 30%, and if we don't pass this Bill giving the early retirement incentive and capping that thing, that we may have a cost as high as \$80,000,000 in the coming year."

Wolf: "What would the year projected as to the increase in unfunded liabilities, accrued liabilities?"

Stuffle: "\$35,000,000 according to the Pension Laws Commission, again in a vacuum without the Bill. The Retirement System says it could be three or four times that much if we don't do something along this line."



Wolf: "It wouldn't be three or four times that much in accrued liability, increase in salary cost, right?"

Stuffle: "The Retirement System says that if we don't pass a Bill of this type, that that \$35,000,000 cost result in the Bill, in overall period of time, unfunded liabilities could jump up to three or four times that much, because when those higher salaries are given, those people are given those salaries to quit. And when they quit, that translates into greatly increased multiplied pension costs now and in the future."

Wolf: "Alright, so what you are saying then is this would decrease, not decrease but lessen the amount of accrued liabilities that would accumulate each year? Is that what you're saying?"

Stuffle: "That's the argument made by me and by the Retirement System as I went through the issue because these people would retire under this proposal, there would be some money kicked in. If they don't retire under this proposal, there won't be any money kicked in, the only thing that will be kicked in is a higher pension or a higher pension base, because of a higher salary in the last year. And there won't be anything kicked into that, the only effect then is what we have now. It's been happening in the last few years and that is a magnified cost increase."

Wolf: "Okay, I noticed in analysis that the Pension Laws Commission and the Taxpayers Federation opposed the Bill before in its amended form. Do they now support it?"

Stuffle: "I'm sorry, Jake, I did not hear the last part of your question."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McCourt."

Wolf: "My analogy..."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry, I didn't...I wasn't trying to interrupt you, Jake. I thought you were done. Proceed. Representative Jake..."

Wolf: "The analogy shows that I have here that the Pensions Laws Commission and the Taxpayers Federation was in opposition to this Bill. Now as amended, are they now supportive of it?"

Stuffle: "I don't know about the Taxpayers Federation, the Pension Laws Commission says they still oppose it, because it doesn't

cover 100% of the Bill's cost without looking at the other 7652  
 issue I raised, they do say that it covers 80% of the cost." 7654

Wolf: "Okay, so the Pension Laws Commission does oppose. Is there 7655  
 any tax increases, would there be involved in this in order to 7656  
 pay, pay for it?" 7657

Stuffle: "Are there any tax increases? No, in fact..." 7659

Wolf: "Would it be necessary?" 7661

Stuffle: "No, in fact, as I indicated, the savings in the other end 7662  
 in the school district that has a tax rate obviously for 7663  
 schools, the savings will be somewhere estimated in the 7664  
 neighborhood of \$99,000,000 over a five year period." 7665

Wolf: "Okay, one final question, with early retirement on the part of 7666  
 the teacher, how is without penalty I take it? Right? Okay. 7667  
 How early an age could they retire?" 7669

Stuffle: "55." 7671

Wolf: "At age 55." 7673

Stuffle: "With at least twenty years of service." 7675

Speaker Flinn: "...McCourt." 7677

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I 7678  
 think the one reason that this Bill should be defeated is the 7679  
 reason put out by Representative Hoffman. Representative 7680  
 Hoffman just mentioned in speaking in favor of this Bill that 7681  
 the reason this is a good Bill is that there are many teachers 7682  
 who have run out of gas. And because they have run out of gas, 7683  
 or another way of putting it, because they now are no longer 7684  
 qualified to teach the kids in schools, that we should use the 7685  
 Pension System as a reas...a way of getting rid of these 7686  
 teachers. Now the Pension System should not be used as a tool 7687  
 of a pers...of, for personnel policies. This Bill, if we do 7688  
 this for the teacher system, we'll be doing this for every 7688  
 other system next Session or the Session thereafter. This Bill 7689  
 will cost in excess of \$8,000,000 per year to the State. It 7690  
 will increase the teachers unfunded liability by over 7691  
 \$59,000,000. Now if the various school districts have a 7691  
 personnel problem and they have teachers that have quote, run 7692  
 out of gas, let them satisfy and solve that problem by getting

rid of the teacher. But not by putting on the State the, the  
 added burden of paying them a pension before they are entitled  
 to the pension. And just so everyone will know that the  
 pers...the Taxpayers Federation Personnel Commission and the  
 Pension Commission both oppose this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The  
 question is shall the main question be put. Representative  
 Hoffman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Hoffman: "My name was used in debate, and all I would say to that  
 Speaker and to the rest of the Body, people ought to do what is  
 right for whatever the reason."

Speaker Flinn: "Would the Members please refrain from using other  
 Member's name in debate, it's in violation of the rules. The  
 question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor  
 say 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Sponsor,  
 Representative Stuffle to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I know there are arguments  
 against this Bill. I know there are arguments by those who  
 look only at the Bill in terms of the pension impact in a  
 vacuum. And if you look at that \$7,000,000 cost next year in a  
 vacuum, you're avoiding the fact that the people in the  
 retirement system have said that the cause of the ballooning  
 efforts by school districts in giving larger and larger  
 salaries at the tail-end of careers to get rid of people that  
 it's going to cost not \$7,000,000 but in the absence of this  
 Bill, \$80,000,000 possibly next year in the downstate system  
 alone. We tried to make this Bill the least onerous as  
 possible in Chicago and downstate. It so happened we had many  
 school districts downstate who would've said we don't want any  
 cap. We would've retired or let anyone retire this way. These  
 school districts are already doing that. They are already  
 ballooning salaries. They are already outside the Pension

System in totally, legally allowing early retirement. But the difference is this, there doing it now by jacking up salaries that cost the local taxpayer more money. And it cost the Pension System more money, and it is going to continue to cost the Pension System more money. And I submit to you this is a different situation then we would have in other systems that have pension coverage. We have lower enrollments. And you and I also know that even with lower enrollments, we still got building costs. We still got schools. We've got an issue that differs here than it would somewhere else, say a Judge or a Legislator or say someone in the State System even. We've got a situation where this is the most costly pension system we have, we choose between this Bill that will cost \$7,000,000 and the current situation that may cost \$80,000,000. And I submit to you that Representative Hoffman knows this issue better than I, being a teacher and looking at the situation day to day. If you want the bad apples out, if you want people out who are burned out, then vote for this Bill. If you want to hide behind the issue, if you want to say that we only want to look at the Bill in the vacuum, then vote no. If you want to save the State and the local taxpayers some money, then vote for it. That local taxpayer doesn't give a damn which pocket the money comes out of, because he is going to save \$99,000,000 in five years by conservative estimates on salary costs, at the same time it's going to cost 35 to the Pension System if you look at it in a vacuum even. It's going to save \$99,000,000 in five years in salaries in any case. But if you don't look at in a vacuum, it's going to save even more money to the Pension System. And I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Senate Bill 375 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye' and 39 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now we have some clean-up chores, it's not really clean-up chores, but there are some

people asked to take their Bills back for purposes of an Amendment. We have some on Second Reading. On page 4, there are some Bills that are on Second Reading, they must be moved today so that they can be moved tomorrow. And we need to do this now. So we can be better prepared to adjourn a little later on. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Thank, thank you, Mr. Speaker, there's also a written motion down here to go to the Order of Motions. Representative Wikoff and I have waited patiently for at least a week and a half now, and I would hope that perhaps you might work us in sometime tonight on that particular request..."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, but I need to do this first, because it's not fair to the Sponsors to hold their Bills on Second Reading when tomorrow is the last day for passage on Third Reading. So on page 4, under Senate Bills, Second Reading Short Debate Calendar appears Hous...Senate Bill 140."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative J. David Jones. No Committee Amendments. I'm sorry. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, J. David Jones, amends Senate Bill 140 on page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Now, J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the circuit breaker Bill, Senate Bill 140. And this Amendment reduces the ceiling of \$15,000 to 12,000 and reduces the total, the amount that can be paid from 800 to 750 and leaves the supplemental the way it is. This has the approval of the Senate Sponsor and I move adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate Democrats have done, in my opinion, what amounts to a very despicable thing. They have caucussed in and decided that they are going to vote for no tax relief Bill except for the Sales Tax Relief Bill that the Democrats

know...is going to get vetoed. That means that we are forced to vote for Senate circuit breaker Bills if we want any hope for senior citizens property tax relief this year. This is a token Bill. This is a Bill which is acceptable to the Budget Bureau. It's going to cost a little over \$9,000,000. You remember in last year's budget 6,000,000 was budgeted for senior citizens property tax relief in new benefits. This year the same 6,000,000 has been budgeted. If the Governor just wanted to give 6,000,000 a year, he ought to be giving 12,000,000 this year, and yet, the Budget Bureau only comes up with this little pale \$9,000,000 Bill. I think we ought to pass every senior citizens circuit breaker Bill that's on the floor in the House, because I don't think that we ought to let the Senate Democrats deprive our senior citizens of property tax relief for the second year in a row. You'll remember we overrode the vetoes in the House, and they refused to do so in the Senate last year. So I hope everyone will vote yes on this and send the Senators a message they will deserve."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 140 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 967. Does the Gentleman, Representative Jones, have leave to keep Senate Bill 140 on Short Debate? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Short Debate. Read 967."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 967, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Any motions pertaining to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Kornowicz, amends Senate Bill 967 as amended on page 1, by deleting lines 23 through 26 and so

forth." 7342

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz." 7844

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just heard my 7845  
colleague, Skinner, in regards to the Senior Citizens Bill. I 7846  
think it's about time that the Members of the House will come 7847  
out and support the Senior Citizens Bill. It provides for 7848  
greater benefits and additional claimants. Senate Bill 967 7849  
increases the qualified threshold from 10,000 to 15,000. I ask 7850  
for a favorable vote." 7851

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Jake 7852  
Wolf, turn your light on and I'll see it." 7854

Wolf: "Yea, I...the Gentleman, I think, was addressing the Bill. I 7855  
think we're on Amendment #2 and if he could just explain what 7856  
Amendment #2 does." 7857

Speaker Flinn: "Would you explain, Representative Kornowicz, what 7858  
Amendment #2 does to the Bill." 7860

Kornowicz: "In regards to Amendment #2, it triggers from a...to 3 1/2 7861  
from 4, from 4%. And also this Act takes effect on January 1, 7862  
1980." 7863

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf." 7865

Wolf: "It changes what from 3 1/2 to 4%?" 7867

Kornowicz: "The 'trigger', in deleting in line 22 by deleting 4% to 3 7868  
per...3 1/2%." 7869

Wolf: "Well, I don't happen to have a copy of the Bill. What's the 7870  
net effect to that?" 7872

Kornowicz: "Well, it's like the...in regards to the cost, of the, of 7873  
the Bill. This Bill, this Amendment puts the Senate Bill 967 7874  
to identical posture of my Bill, House Bill 329 or Senate, 7875  
which is on the Senate Third Reading. If amended this fashion, 7876  
fiscal impact would be \$16,000,000 according to the Department 7877  
of Revenue Fiscal Note." 7878

Wolf: "Okay, so this...the impact, that's what I want to know, what's 7879  
the change from 3 1/2 to 4%, how much dollar amount is 7880  
different?" 7881

Kornowicz: "This was a...in regards to Amendment 1, #2..." 7883

Wolf: "No, no, yea, 2, that's the one we're asked to vote on..." 7885

Kornowicz: "Amendment 2 is the income for that year...but not in no event does the grant to exceed \$650. It's less than 5%. That's what it showed before on the Bill." 7886  
7887  
7889

Wolf: "I give up." 7891

Kornowicz: "I ask for a favorable vote." 7893

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 967. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?" 7894  
7895  
7896  
7897

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Kornowicz, amends Senate Bill 967 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following." 7898  
7899  
7900

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz." 7902

Kornowicz: "What is the third Amendment? I don't have that third Amendment...I move for its adoption." 7903  
7905

Speaker Flinn: "You've heard the motion. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed. Sounds like...Representative Ralph Dunn to explain his vote." 7906  
7907  
7908

Dunn: "Mr. Chairman, I understand him to say delete the enacting clause and start us over...I believe he said that, and I liked to have an explanation of it, if we could reconsider. I voted on the prevailing side and I move to reconsider that vote we just took. I'd like for Eddy to explain what it really does." 7909  
7910  
7911  
7912  
7913

Kornowicz: "Alright, just one moment there, Ralph." 7916

Speaker Flinn: "He's going to explain..." 7918

Kornowicz: "It rewrites the Bill...raises the income from 10,000 to 15,000...flickers from 4% to 3 1/2%. Mr. Speaker, I think it's a fine Bill, I really..." 7919  
7920  
7921

Dunn: "I withdraw my objection. I thought it was a new Bill..." 7923

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further discussion, Representative Bill Collins." 7924  
7925

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest that if anybody had any difficulty in understanding this Amendment, that maybe Representative DiPrima would explain it for us." 7926  
7927  
7929

Speaker Flinn: "G.D....to explain it, is...any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment" 7930  
7931



#3 to Senate Bill 967. All those in favor say 'aye', those 7932  
opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?" 7933

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 7935

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Representative VanDuyne, for what 7936  
purpose do you arise?" 7938

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had Senate Bill 140 before us 7939  
just a moment ago and I don't know whether everybody, everybody 7940  
just accepts what Cal Skinner says or not, but..." 7942

Speaker Flinn: "We're passed that order of business." 7944

VanDuyne: "Now, wait a minute...I want...I voted in the, I voted on 7945  
the prevailing side, and I want to make now on that position, a 7946  
motion to reconsider the Amendment which we adopted, House 7947  
Amendment #1 sponsored by J. David Jones." 7948

Speaker Flinn: "We're still on 967, I'm got some more to finish with 7949  
that first." 7950

VanDuyne: "Well, would you recognize me for..." 7952

Speaker Flinn: "I'll recognize you when it...does the Gentleman have 7953  
leave to leave 9...Senate Bill 967 on Short Debate? Hearing no 7954  
objections, leave is granted. Third Reading. Now 7955  
Representative VanDuyne." 7956

VanDuyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm, I don't know whether I'm being 7957  
mislead or what, but I think Cal Skinner got up and spoke so 7958  
conditionally and not knowing what he was talking about, 7959  
everybody just took it as face value, but we took a voice vote 7960  
and I'm presuming I voted on the prevailing side, and I 7961  
therefore..." 7962

Speaker Flinn: "Your motion would be out of order, because the Bill 7963  
is not on Second Reading, and we can't remove Amendments from 7964  
Third Reading, and that's where it's at right now. It's on 7965  
Third Reading. You would have the Sponsor move it back to 7966  
Second, your motion would be in order." 7967

VanDuyne: "Could you have the Parliamentarian explain how you go 7968  
about reconsidering the vote then?" 7970

Speaker Flinn: "The only way you can remove an Amendment or put one 7971  
on for that matter is while the Bill is on Second Reading. And 7972  
the only way I know to get it on Second Reading is to talk the 7973

- Sponsor into moving it back to Second Reading. But it is now on Third Reading. Representative VanDuyne, you have something further?"
- VanDuyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether your ruling is proper or not, but there is no real vote. I don't even know if I'm in order as far as voting on the prevailing side, because you took a voice vote..."
- Speaker Flinn: "Well, you wouldn't be order, you...you're right..."
- VanDuyne: "...but I would ask the Sponsor here, there was kind of a fast shuffle, and I would like to ask the Sponsor to take it back and at least give us a chance to talk about it."
- Speaker Flinn: "Well, LeRoy, even if you took it back, you couldn't make the motion to reconsider, because it was not a record vote. What you can do is make a motion to table if it gets on Second Reading."
- VanDuyne: "Okay, then I would like to make that request of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Flinn: "Does the Sponsor wish to move it back to Second? The Sponsor declines your request."
- VanDuyne: "But, Mr. Speaker, now I'm not trying to be troublesome but there was no conversation at all. Mr. Skinner gave us completely false information as quickly as it was. Could you enlighten me, whatever, what we did is take our circuit breaker and take it from 15,000 and put it back to 12, and take the 800 and put it back to 750. And I don't think anybody even knew what we were doing."
- Speaker Flinn: "Well, I don't think your remarks are in order, in the first place. We should not be discussing that Bill to start with. I've explained what the rules are, Senate Bill 1104."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan, Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Flinn: "Any motions pertaining to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1, Senate Bill 1104 by Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Zeke Giorgi. One moment, please..." 8016

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker..." 8019

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, Representative Skinner, for what purpose 8020  
do you arise?" 8021

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I really do have a point of personal 8022  
privilege." 8023

Speaker Flinn: "State your point..." 8025

Skinner: "I was wrong, Representative VanDuyne is right. I think if 8026  
we amend Dave Jones's Bill in the House, it will never get pass 8027  
concurrence in the Senate. I thought we were on Third Reading, 8028  
not Second. And I would also hope that Representative Jones at 8029  
some point today, would bring this back to Second Reading, and 8030  
you would allow him to do so so we may take the Amendment off, 8031  
because it's the only way we're going to get a Bill to the 8032  
Governor's desk. We can't send it back." 8033

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if 176 of you ask to take it back, and 8034  
Representative Jones said no it wouldn't go back." 8036

Skinner: "I understand that." 8038

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, Representative Giorgi, proceed." 8040

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 8041  
1104. There was an inaccurate date placed in that Amendment. 8042  
I'd like to motion...I'd like to adopt my motion to table." 8043

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you 8045  
arise?" 8046

Mautino: "To ask the Gentleman what else is in that Amendment, except 8047  
the correction. I'd like to know what that Amendment does. I 8048  
don't happen to have it in front of me. Is that the deficit 8049  
spending for civic centers?" 8050

Giorgi: "No, that's not the Bill, that's 667. This Amendment creates 8051  
a moratorium for July 1, 1980. We intended it to be June 1, 8052  
1979. So I'd like to move to motion to table my Amendment #1 8053  
to Senate Bill 1104, because I have an Amendment #2, it'll take 8054  
care of the thing I'm tabling." 8055

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment, Committee 8056  
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1104. All those in...question, 8057  
Representative Collins." 8058

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I...those dates went by me, would the Sponsor mind giving them to us again, and what his a... second Amendment is going to do."

Giorgi: "The first date creates a date for freezing support for civic centers July 1, 1980. The intention was to put in there July 1, 1979."

Collins: "I see, no new civic centers after July 1, 1979 is what you want to say. Is that right, Zeke?"

Giorgi: "Right."

Collins: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "June 1, 1979, June 1, 1979, June 1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman's motion is to table Committee Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Committee Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Giorgi, amends Senate Bill 1104 on page 2, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Amendment #2 would grant all authorities created before June 1, 1979 and it indicates there would be no civic centers contemplated unless the study has been, is going to be done by BED is completed and filed with us."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Wolf: "Can we table a Committee Amendment with a voice vote?"

Giorgi: "We did."

Wolf: "I know we did."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, yes, we just did. We already did it."

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #2, which is..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Further discussion? If not, the...the question is shall the Amendment #2 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Totten, amends Senate Bill 1104

as amended on page 1, line 1..."

8111

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

8113

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1104 is the Bill that amends the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act to require a study of the economic feasibility of the civic center program. The Gentleman from Rockford has put forth the proposal, and I propose to amend it in this fashion. First of all, the Amendment #3 would eliminate the substantive part of the Bill which calls for a study which would cost over \$50,000 to see if we need more civic centers in Illinois. Well, everyone of us here know that we don't need any more civic centers in Illinois, and we would be absolutely wasting the \$50,000 on the study to prove the point. So my Amendment would strike the substantive portion of the Bill dealing with the appropriation for a study for existing civic centers. The second thing that the Amendment would do would be to terminate the State program of being obligated to pay construction costs for civic centers created after July 1, 1979. I would point out to the Members of the House that this would not jeopardize any of the existing civic centers that have been created, but it would prevent the State from being obligated to pay for any civic centers that were created after July 1, 1979. By adopting this Amendment, we can save considerable cost, we can do away with the study which this Legislature knows is not warranted or needed and knows what the result will be, and we can insure some fiscal sanity in the future progress of this Legislature in this State towards the whole question of civic centers, and I would ask for your favorable vote on Amendment #3."

8114

8115

8116

8117

8118

8119

8120

8121

8122

8123

8124

8125

8126

8127

8128

8129

8130

8131

8132

8133

8134

8135

8136

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

8137

8138

Giorgi: "I should be...we should be fair about this with the Members of the General Assembly. What Totten is saying is that as long as you've said that Aurora, Decatur, Danville, Peoria, Rockford, Springfield, Bloomington, Waukegan, Joliet can have civic centers, what he is saying today is whether there is a

8139

8140

8141

8142

8143

study or not, he wants to freeze these nine in for any future 8143  
 benefits. Now if you want to freeze these nine in, you vote 8144  
 for his Amendment, you're not hurting me, I'm from Rockford. 8145  
 But your other people that want a...that might think in the 8146  
 future the BED study will show that they can support a civic 8147  
 center or that it might help their economic area, fine. You 8148  
 vote against the Amendment. If you want to freeze the nose 8149  
 that feels it has a good deal going now, go ahead and vote for 8150  
 Totten's Amendment. I'm going to vote against it, because I 8151  
 don't think it's fair to the rest of the Members of the General 8152  
 Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien." 8154

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you recognize me after this Bill in 8155  
 relation to House Bill 244?" 8157

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Is there any further discussion? The 8158  
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten to close." 8160

Totten: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 8161  
 of the House, the Gentleman from Rockford has put it well what 8162  
 this does is take out the substantive study, save over \$50,000. 8163  
 It would insure that the nine...ten or so that have been 8164  
 created would remain, but it would prevent us from creating, 8165  
 new...any new civic centers as I think the will of this General 8166  
 Assembly will show in the Amendment. And I ask for your 8167  
 favorable vote." 8168

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Amendment #3 be adopted. 8168  
 All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. We must be 8169  
 getting tired on this side. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment 8170  
 is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 8171

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 8173

Speaker Lechowicz: "We better have a vote on that one. Third 8174  
 Reading. Any further Amendments? Leave for Short Debate? 8175  
 Leave. The Bill's on Short Debate. House Bill 1338." 8177

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections 8178  
 of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief 8179  
 Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments." 8181

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. Any 8182

Amendments from the floor?" 8184

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Kornowicz, amends Senate..." 8186

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz." 8188

Kornowicz: "Gentlemen, and Members of the Committee, in regards to 8189  
Senate Bill 1338, Amendment, Amendment, on page 1, in line 22 8190  
by deleting 4% and inserting in lieu the 3 1/2%. This is the 8191  
only change, it's the circuit trip at 3 1/2% of income. I ask 8192  
for a favorable vote." 8193

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from 8194  
LaSalle, Mr. Anderson." 8196

Anderson: "Sponsor yield?" 8198

Kornowicz: "Yes." 8200

Anderson: "You mean, Representative Kornowicz, that you take 3 1/2% 8201  
of your income and subtract it from your property tax? Is that 8202  
what you are saying rather than 4%?" 8204

Kornowicz: "No, that's not right." 8206

Anderson: "Well, then what are you saying?" 8208

Kornowicz: "If your rented property, if it exceeds more then you get 8209  
3 1/2%, off the income." 8211

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is shall 8212  
Amendment #1 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 8213  
opposed. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any 8214  
further Amendments?" 8215

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 8217

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Leave on Short Debate, leave? 8218  
Leave is granted. House Bill 667. Mr. Giorgi. I'll get right 8219  
to you, Denny. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." 8221

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 667, a Bill for an Act to amend the 8222  
Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act and Cigarette Tax Act. 8223  
Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in 8224  
Committee." 8225

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?" 8227

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed." 8229

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?" 8231

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Skinner, amends Senate Bill..." 8232

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. The 8234

Gentleman is not on the floor. There he is." 823

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is a modest proposal to cut 823  
every county in the State of Illinois into the Ag-Premium Fund. 823  
It is clearly germane, because..." 824

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." 824

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have been aware of this Amendment for about 824  
ten days, and I presented the Parliamentarian with a copy of 824  
his Amendment because I wanted to rule in germaneness." 824

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman questions the germaneness of the 824  
Amendment." 824

Giorgi: "I ought to let Skinner finish, because I don't think the 824  
General Assembly is going to accept his theory anyway, but, 825  
such a terrible theory...I think you're out of luck, Cal." 825

Speaker Lechowicz: "While we are waiting for the Parliamentarian to 825  
interpret the germaneness of the Bill, move the Bill out of the 825  
record temporarily. We'll go to...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 825  
O'Brien." 826

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I inadvertently put Amendment 825  
#6 on House Bill 244, and we had leave from the Members to 826  
bring that Bill back to Second Reading, and I forgot to table 825  
Amendments 1 through 5..." 826

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright..." 826

O'Brien: "...which are contained correctly in Amendment #6." 826

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 244 is on Third. Bring it back to 826  
Second. Leave is granted. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 826  
O'Brien." 827

O'Brien: "I would move at this time to table Amendments 1 through 5 826  
and that would leave only Amendment #6 on the Bill which 826  
actually contains those five Amendments..." 827

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to table 1...the Gentleman 827  
moves to table Amendments 1 through 5. All in favor signify by 827  
saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendments 1 through 5 are 827  
tabled." 827

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members." 827

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #6 remains in the Bill. Any further 827  
Amendments?" 827



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 8281

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Now back to Senate Bill 667. 8282  
 Question is germaneness on Amendment #1, I believe. Jack, is 8283  
 that Amendment #1 that we are considering? And it's on Second 8284  
 Reading. There you go. Amendment #2. We'll read Messages 8285  
 from the Senate while we are waiting." 8286

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 8287  
 Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of 8288  
 Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House passage 8289  
 of Bills the following titles: to wit, House Bill numbers 8290  
 2148, 2161, 2167, 2168, 2184, 2204, and 2206 together with 8291  
 Amendments and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask  
 concurrence of the House, passed by the Senate as amended, June 8292  
 26, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary." 8294

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, the Amendment 8295  
 is not germane. Any further Amendments? Any further 8296  
 Amendments?" 8297

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 8299

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On Consideration Postponed, 8300  
 appears Senate Bill 296. The Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. 8301  
 Younge." 8302

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..." 8304

Speaker Lechowicz: "296, Jack." 8306

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 296, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections 8307  
 of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the 8308  
 Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee." 8310

Speaker Lechowicz: "...he asks leave to bring the Bill back 8311  
 from...Consideration Postponed to Second Reading. Any 8312  
 objections? Hearing none, on Second Reading. On that 8313  
 ques...the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, what purpose do  
 you seek recognition?" 8315

Vinson: "Just on a parliamentary inquiry. How do we get to 296 and 8316  
 bypass those other Bills on Consideration Postponed?" 8318

Speaker Lechowicz: "I didn't hear what you said." 8320

Vinson: "How do we get to 296 and bypass those other Bills on 8321  
 Consideration Postponed?" 8322

Speaker Lechowicz: "By the discretion of the Chair." 8324

Vinson: "I beg your pardon?" 8326

Speaker Lechowicz: "Discretion of the Chair." 8328

Vinson: "Don't you have to start at the beginning of the order?" 8330

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, we don't. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge." 8331

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative 8333  
Younge." 8334

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House Bill...Senate Bill 296 8335  
establishes a branch office for IHDA in Springfield and 8336  
Amendment #1 would add to that East St. Louis. And I move to 8337  
table Amendment #1." 8338

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #1. Is there 8339  
any discussion? Hearing none, Amendment #1 is tabled. Any 8340  
further Amendments? Yes, it's tabled." 8342

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Younge, amends..." 8344

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. Younge." 8346

Younge: "Move to table Amendment #2..." 8348

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady...did you object, Mr. Walsh? Mr. Vinson 8349  
objected. The Lady moves to table Amendment #2. All in favor 8350  
vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Pardon me. Oh, she just 8351  
withdraws Amendment #2, that's swell. Any further Amendments?" 8352

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 8355

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third...back to Consideration Postponed. The 8356  
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." 8358

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that you gave Mr. Vinson 8359  
wrong information. You are required within an order to go 8360  
through it and when you leave that order, go back to where you 8361  
had left it and continue through until you have completed it 8362  
and then start from the beginning." 8363

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Walsh, you're absolutely correct only on 8364  
Second and Third Readings. Sen...I'm on Consideration 8365  
Postponed, Sir. Senate Bill 746. Lady from Cook, Miss 8366  
Catania. Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back from 8367  
Consideration Postponed to Second Reading. Any objections?  
Hearing none, Second Reading. Mrs. Catania. Any Amendments?" 8368

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Catania, amends Senate Bill 746 as 8370

amended in the first sentence and so forth." 8372

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment 8373  
#2 to Senate Bill 746 establishes a procedure under which 8374  
complaints could be brought and decisions could be made. This 8375  
is a point that was raised in debate on the Bill, and this is 8376  
an attempt to put it in form that was requested by those who 8377  
voted 'present'. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to 8378  
Senate Bill 746." 8379

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the...any discussion? The Gentleman from 8380  
Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 8382

Leinenweber: "Yea, this is the Bill, as I recall it, that prohibited 8383  
the spending of appropriated funds in violation of the rules of 8384  
the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission or the United 8385  
States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Is that 8386  
correct? Is that correct?" 8387

Speaker Lechowicz: "Miss Catania, please." 8389

Leinenweber: "She said yes. Right now..." 8391

Catania: "Yes, but now we are going to have a Humans Right Commission 8392  
so this refers to the Human Rights Commission instead of the 8393  
Fair Employment Practice Commission." 8395

Leinenweber: "Is that the sum and substance of the Amendment or are 8396  
you taking out the United States Equal Employment Opportunity 8397  
Commission?" 8398

Catania: "No, it establishes a procedure so that complaints can be 8399  
made to the Human Rights Commission." 8401

Leinenweber: "Right, so the substance of the Bill, anotherwards that 8402  
ah, will remain the same after Amendment #2 and that is 8403  
prohibiting the spending of appropriated funds in violation of 8404  
the rules and regulations of the Human Rights Act or Human 8405  
Rights Commission and the United States Equal Employment 8406  
Opportunity Commission. Is that correct?" 8407

Catania: "That's right." 8409

Leinenweber: "Thank you." 8411

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is shall 8412  
Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 8413  
'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further 8414

Amendments?" 8415

Clerk O'Brien: "Nor further Amendments." 8417

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Back to Postponed 8418  
 Consideration...Consideration Postponed. Okay. On page 2, 8419  
 Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 93. The 8420  
 Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, move to bring the Bill 8421  
 back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an  
 Amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second 8422  
 Reading." 8423

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would, my motion is to move it back to 8424  
 Second for the purpose of tabling Amendment #2. And I think 8425  
 the Sponsor of Amendment #2, Representative Yourell, would move 8426  
 to reconsider Amendment #2, because it was..." 8427

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider Amendment #2 by 8428  
 which it was adopted. All in favor vote 'aye', vote 'aye', 8429  
 'aye'. The Bill's back on Second Reading, we're moving to 8430  
 reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted. The 8431  
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell." 8432

Yourell: "Don't you all get excited over there now. This is the 8433  
 Amendment that most of you were opposed to on Senate Bill 93. 8434  
 This is the Amendment that reapportions the County of Cook into 8435  
 fifteen legislative districts. Ah, if you don't want me to 8437  
 table this Amendment, just vote 'no'." 8438

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 8439  
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 8440  
 there's 132 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the 8441  
 House moves to reconsider the vote from which Amendment #2 was 8442  
 adopted. Now, Mr. Yourell moves to table Amendment #2. All in 8443  
 favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is 8444  
 tabled. Any further Amendments?" 8445

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Dyer-Hoffman-Daniels..." 8447

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer." 8449

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #5 is an Amendment that was put on 8450  
 another Bill in the House, passed overwhelmingly, went to the 8451  
 Senate, the Senate Sponsor didn't really want that Amendment on 8452  
 his Bill. The Amendment would simply give to the Chairman of 8453

County Boards, where the Chairman is elected at large by the voters, the power to either sign ordinances or veto them. The veto can be overridden by a majority vote of the members of the County Board. It effects only DuPage and St. Clair County, and it is acceptable to the Sponsor of this Bill and also the Senate Sponsor, and I would move for approval of Amendment #5."

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

Huskey: "Ah, I have nothing to say, my light was on by mistake, Mr. Speaker."

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

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder sometimes if this Amendment that is offered isn't something like the wolf at the cabin door. He shows up at the front door and you drive him away from there, and he comes round to the back door and you manage to drive him away from there, comes around to the window and peers into the window, and one way or another he keeps showing up again. This Bill has more lives than the proverbial cat. It started out the idea of giving the DuPage County Board Chairman a veto power over the Board's action, started out as Representative Dyer's House Bill 2383. Now that Bill was put on the Spring Calendar. Then this same idea was presented to us again in the form of an Amendment to Senate Bill 1423 which the Sponsor has already alluded to. That was tacked down to Senator Weaver's Bill, came over here, went back over there. He didn't want it on the Bill so it was taken off. Now this same Amendment, after those two setbacks, is tacked on to Senate Bill 93 here which basically has to do with weed cutting. But I want to suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this Amendment is an idea that is not wanted by the DuPage County Board whom it purports to serve. They have been all over this ground. It has been debated. It has been defeated by a healthy majority of the Board. It affects only DuPage County, possibly St. Claire. But it is a subsistent change and it gives the Chairman of our DuPage County Board executive power

that he does not now have. And I repeat, the Board itself does not care for him to have this power. It in effect gives him at least a portion of home rule powers which he does not now have and the Board itself does not want him to have. Our county has rejected home rule by a vote of 3 to 1 there. And I think that if such a change is to be made, let it come in through the front door. It would seem to me that fairness, fairness would indicate that we do it in an open and above board way. Mrs. Dyer has a Bill as I say, Representative Dyer has a Bill that is on the Spring Calendar, but let's come in the front door with this and not tack it onto an Amendment. Representative Katz, this morning mentioned how many bites do we get out of an apple. Well, there have been two bites already taken out of this apple. Now the Sponsor is seeking for a third bite. I don't think that this is the way to do it in the closing days of a Session to impose our will on the DuPage, on our Board. Let's be fair about this thing. It does not affect most of the people here in the General Assembly, but it does affect us in our county. And I would ask you, I would ask you, my colleagues here, to give careful consideration to this before you vote yes on this seemingly harmless Amendment and join with me in defeating the Amendment. There is no emergency about this, there's absolutely no emergency, there's nothing about giving this Board Chairman this power that has to be done immediately. Let's debate it, let's bring it to Committee where witnesses can come down, they can appear, they can vote, they can have their say one way or another. But let's not do it in this way..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Chairm...Mr. Chairman, I will. We can afford to wait on this and do this in a fair way when there's, when the...they...the proposal can be heard. It's a substantive change, I would ask you, my colleagues, to join me in defeating this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer to close."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I am presenting this in a perfectly wide open way. This is the power that the President of the Cook County Board has. This is the power that the Mayors of most cities have. It is simply the power that an executive needs when an executive has been elected at large and should be in a position to show leadership to a county board. I have not had one phone call or one letter in opposition to this Bill from any member of the DuPage County Board. It has the support of the County Board Chairman and also the Chairman of the Legislative Committee. I could have done this in a sneaky way. I had a Bill that I could have put into Conference Committee and done it with no one knowing it. I'm doing it in a wide open way, it's a good government Bill, I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Amendment #5 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye', opposed. The question is shall Amendment #5 be adopted. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Bruce. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 51 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1072. It's on Third Reading, Short Debate. Mr. Reilly moves to bring the Bill back from to Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, 1072 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Ewing, amends Senate Bill 1072..."

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

Ewing: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to table Amendment #2 and then..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Ewing: "No, just a minute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What? Excuse me."

Ewing: "Is it Amendment #2, Mr. Clerk, that's now pending, that

hasn't been adopted?" 855

Clerk Leone: "Yes." 856

Ewing: "I would like to then table Amendment #1 and then consider 856  
Amendment #2 which replaces it." 856

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All 856  
in favor say 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any 856  
further Amendments?" 856

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Ewing, amends Senate Bill 1072 as 856  
amended." 856

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing." 857

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 857  
is an agreed Amendment that has been approved by the Department 857  
of Transportation, and it is in replacement of Amendment #1 857  
which I just tabled. Amendment #2 addresses any concern that 857  
the Department had, whether Amendment #1 which deals with local 857  
zoning for direction of signs on the highways might cause us to 857  
lose any federal aid. My understanding from the Department of 857  
Transportation, they feel that Amendment #2 will not jeopardize 857  
this aid, and I would ask for your favorable adoption." 858

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment 858  
#2 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', 858  
opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 858

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments." 858

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Leave to leave on Short Debate. 858  
Hearing no objections, left on Short Debate. Senate Bill 1342. 858  
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, asks leave to bring the 858  
Bill back from to Third to Second for the purpose of an 859  
Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second 859  
Reading. Any Amendments?" 859

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Peters, amends Senate Bill 1342 on page 859  
1, line 9 by deleting..." 859

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters." 859

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 859  
of the House, Amendment #1 would more or give better definition 859  
to what we mean by judicial supervision in this Act in relation 860  
to assistance given to minors or families in need of service. 860



I have discussed it with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee as well as the Minority Spokesman, the Committee, both are in agreement. And I would ask the adoption of House Amendment #1." 8602  
8603  
8604

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #1 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?" 8605  
8606  
8608

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments." 8610

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading, the Gentleman have leave to leave the Bill on Short Debate. Leave is granted." 8611  
8613

Peters: "Thank you." 8615

Speaker Lechowicz: "Motions. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester." 8616  
8617

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a second, please. Ah, Representative Wikoff and I have a motion filed with the, the Clerk, Senate Bill 1069 to take from the table and place on the Calendar on Second Reading, second legislative day. House Bill...Senate Bill 1069 would, let me get my files together, he took me by surprise. Okay, thank you, it would exempt farm machinery and equipment used exclusively for farming from a 4% state sales tax. The exemption is phased in over 30 years beginning January 1, 1980. I think it's a very good..." 8618  
8619  
8620  
8621  
8622  
8623  
8624  
8625

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan." 8626

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, providing for a Perfunctory Session to 9:00 p.m. tonight, we move that we adjourn til 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning." 8627  
8630  
8631

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that we extend the Perfunct til nine o'clock and the House stand adjourned til 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', the House stands in Perfunct til nine o'clock tonight, and we will reconvene tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you seek recognition?" 8632  
8633  
8634  
8635  
8636  
8637

Matijevich: "Only to remind the Members of both the House Appropriations 1 and House Appropriations 2 Committees, tonight's our night." 8638  
8639  
8640

Speaker Lechowicz: "Be at the State Fairgrounds. Have a nice evening. It's ten o'clock tomorrow morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Ten o'clock. Ten." 8641 8642 8643

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bills to wit: House Bills 2233, 2228, 2268, 2237, 2240, 2283, 2291, 2305, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2321, 2357, 2358, 2367, 2373, 2377 together with the attached Amendments hereto which Amendments have been printed by the Senate in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit passed the Senate as amended June 26, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business, the House now stands adjourned." 8644 8645 8646 8647 8648 8649 8650 8651 8652

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 26, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0079	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	56
HB-0089	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	57
HB-0326	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	58
HB-0380	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
HB-0437	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
HB-0440	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	64
HB-0524	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	68
HB-0692	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73
HB-0843	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73
HB-0991	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-1019	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	75
HB-1025	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
HB-1039	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
HB-1047	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	81
HB-1048	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	82
HB-1052	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-1060	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-1063	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
HB-1070	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
HB-1071	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	88
HB-1079	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	88
HB-1080	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	89
HB-1084	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	89
HB-1086	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	90
HB-1130	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	91
HB-1139	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
HB-1156	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	94
HB-1160	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	95
HB-1184	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	96
HB-1187	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	97
HB-1193	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
HB-1223	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
HB-1228	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	99
HB-1233	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	99
HB-1244	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
HB-1253	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-1261	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	102
HB-1269	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-1272	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
HB-1290	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-1306	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
HB-1307	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	105
HB-1324	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	105

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 26, 1979

PAGE 2

HB-1345	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	113
HB-1350	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
HB-1355	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
HB-1357	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	118
HB-1401	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
HB-1457	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
HB-1459	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
HB-1510	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	123
HB-1593	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	123
HB-1754	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
HB-1847	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
HB-1945	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	128
HB-1951	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	125
HB-1990	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	130
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	141
HB-2023	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	136
HB-2126	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	136
HB-2207	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	137
HB-2287	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	138
HB-2328	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	138
HB-2637	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	140
HB-2671	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	141
SB-0007	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	142
SB-0047	3RD READING	PAGE	163
SB-0093	2ND READING	PAGE	221
SB-0101	3RD READING	PAGE	174
SB-0140	2ND READING	PAGE	206
SB-0157	2ND READING	PAGE	44
SB-0244	2ND READING	PAGE	196
	2ND READING	PAGE	217
SB-0296	2ND READING	PAGE	218
SB-0375	3RD READING	PAGE	197
SB-0389	2ND READING	PAGE	54
SB-0565	2ND READING	PAGE	157
SB-0636	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	147
SB-0667	2ND READING	PAGE	218
SB-0745	3RD READING	PAGE	28
SB-0746	2ND READING	PAGE	219
SB-0758	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	151
SB-0807	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	151
SB-0811	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	152
SB-0905	3RD READING	PAGE	33
SB-0906	3RD READING	PAGE	33

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 26, 1979

PAGE 3

SB-0930	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	152
SB-0932	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	153
SB-0967	2ND READING	PAGE	207
SB-1072	2ND READING	PAGE	224
SB-1099	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	154
SB-1104	2ND READING	PAGE	211
SB-1114	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	154
SB-1117	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	154
SB-1125	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	154
SB-1172	3RD READING	PAGE	26
SB-1202	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	155
SB-1335	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	157
SB-1338	2ND READING	PAGE	215
SB-1342	2ND READING	PAGE	225
SB-1350	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	157
HR-0220	3RD READING	PAGE	8
HR-0236	3RD READING	PAGE	5
HR-0265	3RD READING	PAGE	9
HR-0289	3RD READING	PAGE	10
HR-0332	3RD READING	PAGE	11
HR-0343	MOTIONS	PAGE	13
HJR-0013	3RD READING	PAGE	20
HJR-5059	3RD READING	PAGE	25
*HJR-0046	1ST READING	PAGE	2

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
 JUNE 26, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. WALSH - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	1
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE	4
EXCUSED ABSENCES	PAGE	25
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	218
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	226
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	227
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	227