101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer this afternoon by Doctor Richard Ahlgrim from the Berean Baptist Church of Springfield, Illinois. Beverend Ahlgrim."

Reverend Ahlgrim: "Thank you for your invitation to lead in invocation. Shall we pray? We thank You, our heavenly Pather, that we need not always lean to our understanding, but in all our ways might acknowledge You that You might direct our paths. We realize the decisions that we make from day to day. And so we would pray, our Father, that You might grant wisdom to make decisions with an understanding of the far-reaching implications behind every judgment. We thank You for the land in which we live, the land of the free, the home of the brave, for the liberty of free assembly and the democratic process. We thank you for the separation of church and state, and yet the cooperation that exists between those who call upon Thy name and those of us exercise the political processes. We pray, our heavenly Father, for a character beyond that that we possess ourselves, that we might make astute judgments in accord with truth. We ask You for an understanding that we might know how to decide and then for the courage to make those decisions that would be pleasing to You. Grant us that courtesy and respect, one toward another; and yet with the full awareness that behind every decision, lives of individuals, as well as the state, are involved. our God, that You might be pleased with us: and at close of this Session and every Session, we shall hear Your, "Well done, good and faithful servants". Grant wisdom. We acknowledge Your preeminence in our midst. in everything, we will be careful to thank You. For we ask

101st Legislative Day

- May 3, 1982
- it all in the name of Your Son, Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Doctor. We will be led in the Pledge today by Representative Rigney."
- Rigney et al: "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 Ryan: "Roll Call for attendance. Any absences,

 Representative Telcser? Excused absences."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Clerk, junk the Roll Call. We're...we're going to
 do it again. We've got a problem here. Dump...dump the
 Roll Call."
- Telcser: "Could the Jour ... "
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright. Now, take..."
- Telcser: "Could the Journal show that Representative Karpiel is absent because of legislative business, Representatives

 Conti and Stanley for legislative business, Representative Kucharski and Barnes for illness?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright, we're taking the Roll Call. Would you get your buttons pushed so we can find out who's here?

 Those of you that are not here, don't push your button.

 Representative Getty, do you have some excused absences?"
- Getty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. May the record indicate that
 Representative Carol Braun is excused due to official
 business, and that Representative Laz Murphy is excused due
 to a death in the family?"
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. Representative
 Telcser for...do you seek recognition?"
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I've just been informed that

 Representative Abramson is absent because of legislative

 business...whatever that may be. I don't know."
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate, Representative. Take

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

the record, will you, Mr. Clerk? With 147 Members answering the Roll, a guorum of the House is present. It gives me a good deal of pleasure this afternoon to introduce to the Members of the Illinois House our latest Member that has replaced Ben Polk. Mr. Ray LaHood is in Ben's seat. He's in the back. Representative Bell is going to tell you a little something about him. Turn on Mr. Bell, would you please?"

- Bell: "It gives me great pleasure to have Ray down here as our district mate. To give you a little bit of background on Ray, he was formerly a teacher in Peoria before coming to the Quad City area and started the Youth Service Bureau there. He served the last five and a half years as the administrative aid to Tom Railsback, both in his district office and in Washington. And up until today, he also served on the school board for St. Anne's School. Ray and his wife Kathy are very good assets to our community. I know Ray will do an excellent job down here in representing the district, and I am happy to have him as my district mate."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative LaHood, would you care to make any comments. Well, pull it up, and we'll show you. That is the best news I've had yet. Turn him on."
- LaHood: "Now what do I do? Oh, it actually works. I am, indeed, very honored to be here today, and I know that I am stepping into some very big shoes. Ben Polk is not only an extremely good friend of mine, he has been a great Legislator for the 36th District, and also a good friend of many of you people down here. I look forward with much anticipation at being a State Legislator. I hope I can do a very good job for the people of our area. I had the honor of having Secretary Edgar come to Moline on Saturday at 4:30 and swear me in. My wife and four children took

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

part in that. And it was a great privilege for them, and we're all very pleased, and they are very supportive of me. And I am very glad to be here and look forward to working with all of you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield to...for a question."

Speaker Ryan: "I believe he would. Representative LaHood."

Bradley: "Repre...Representative LaHood."

Speaker Ryan: "Ray ... LaHood ... "

LaHood: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "Go ahead."

Bradley: "Representative, I'm wondering...we're delighted to have
you with us. I'm wondering if your name is going to be on
the ballot in November to be elected to the...to a full
term."

LaHood: "Fortunately for the people of the 70...new 72nd District, it is."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Byan: "Is your name going to be on the ballot, Mr. Bradley?"

Bradley: "No, thank you. Fortunately for the ... no."

Speaker Ryan: "On page three under the Order of House Bills
Second Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill
2169, Representative Smith. Out of the record. House Bill
2359, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House
Bill 2425, Representative Friedrich. Turn him on. You
want to read the Bill? Go with the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2425, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading."

- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I thought the Amendment had been filed on that. I...I would respectfully ask that you hold it on Second Reading. I thought the Amendment's been filed."
- Speaker Ryan: "Return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading and leave it there. Is that what you want to do, Representative?"
- Friedrich: "Yes, I've got the the Amendments here, but they have not been printed. I'm sorry."
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright, Second Reading. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 2577, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. Okay, we're going to go back and pick up 2169 for Representative Smith who has now arrived in the chamber. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2169, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
 Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Motions or Amendments...further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No, no further Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Pullen, Chairman from the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on April 29, 1982, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 1922, 1971, 2134, 2164, 2234, 2238, 2286, 2294, 2344, 2366, 2416, 2482, 2486; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 2249: 'Interim Study Calendar' House Bill 1965.

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Representative Pullen, Chairman from the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, Ap...action taken April 29, 1982, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: "do pass" Bills 2501, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2574, 2588, 2599, 2613, 2622, 2635; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 2181, 2384, 2439, 2440, 2442, 2443, 2450, 2569, 2593, 2612, 2614; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 2609; 'do pass as amended Consent Calendar House Bill 2133; 'do pass amended Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 2503. Representative Pullen, Chairman from the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 29, 1982, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 2149; 'do pass as amended! House Bill 2081 and 2139; *do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 2407 and 2589; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 2356, 2485 and 2601."

Speaker Ryan: "Messages from the Senate."

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

'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in
the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to wit:
House Joint Resolution 27; concurred in by the Senate May
3, 1982'. 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 adopted the attached First Conference Committee
Report to Senate Bill 791, adopted by the Senate May 3,
1982'. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "On the Calendar on page four under the Order of
House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 178,
Representative Van Duyne. Out of the record. House Bill
327, Representative Rea. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 327, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 958, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 960, Representative record. 1053, Younge. Out οf the House Bill Representative Terzich. Okay, Mr. Clerk, all of the...House Bill 1053 is out of the record. House Bill 1054, Terzich, is out of the record. House Bill 1055, Terzich, is out of the record. House Bill 1072. Representative Wolf. Out of the record. House Bill 1119, Representative Preston. Out of the record. House Bill 1271, Representative Hoffman. Run the Bill, Mr...Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the total English immersion program, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, C. M. Stiehl, amends House Bill 1271 as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stiehl on Amendment #2 to House
Bill 1271."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 allows unit districts and high school districts access to the qualified...to the operating tax rate of the resource equalizer formula. This applies to school districts who levied in the fall; and because of an unusually high state multiplier, their equalized assessed

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

valuation was increased. This...Amendment #2 simply puts elementary schools into the legislation so that all districts are treated equally. It has the support of the Sponsor."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates she will."

Getty: "Representative Stiehl, how many districts does this
 affect?"

Stiehl: "One."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, may...would she yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates she will."

Brummer: "What is the district that is affected, and could you reiterate what the legislation does...what the Amendment does?"

Stiehl: "It is Bell Valley School District in St. Clair County.

We had this same legislation last year. They have regularly levied for the maximum amount for the gualified operating rate. However, they levy in the fall. St. Clair County had an unusually large mul...state multiplier which increased their equalized assessed valuation. Thereby, it limits the qualifying oper...rate."

Brummer: "Okay, and what will the...what will the cost be to...I

think that this...this is a revision of the formula for
those schools with...or for that specific school with
regard to last year."

Stiehl: "\$375,000."

Brummer: "Okay, and have you received the assurance from the

State Board of Education that there are no other schools

that would qualify under that?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Stiehl: "There are...there are unit dis...there is a unit district in Quincy that qualifies under Amendment #1, and there is a...0 Fallen High School which qualifies under Amendment #1."

Brunner: "How far were they below the rate?"

Stiehl: "Ten cents. About ten cents, but they levied it at...They levied at the required rate. The only problem was, they had no idea that the multiplier would be that high."

Brummer: "Okay, I think this is a proposal that has been utilized with regard to other schools that have inadvertently got caught in the same situation, and it probably sounds like a fair proposal."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I just endorse the Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stiehl to close."

Stiehl: "I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to House Bill 1271 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 1320, Representative McMaster. Out of the record. House Bill 1434, out...out of the record? Run it. Read it. 1434, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act creating the
Design Professional Administration and Investigation Fund,
Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were
adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 1, 2, or 3?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 1463, Representative of the record. Catania. Out House Bill Representative Hallock. Out of the record. House Bill 1770, Representative Terzich. Out of the record. House Bill...Alright, Ter...we're going to take out of the record, Mr. Clerk, the two Bills on the bottom of page four, all the Bills on page five, first Bill on page Those are all out of the record. We'll go to 1894, Representative Friedrich. Do you want to hear that Bill, Representative?"

Friedrich: "What number, Sir?"

Speaker Ryan: "It's on page six of the Calendar. It is House
Bill 1894."

Friedrich: "No, hold that please."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. House Bill 1913,
Representative Huskey. Out of the record. House Bill
1921, Representative Ropp. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act to amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Safety Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill...House Bill 1955,

Representative Levin."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

Speaker Byan: "Out of the record. House Bill 2039,
Representative Huskey. Out of the record. House Bill
2044, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2044, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2075, Representative McMaster. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2075, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to simultaneous tenure of certain public offices, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Byan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2076, Representative McMaster. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act relating to simultaneous tenure of certain public offices, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2088, Representative Epton. Out of the record. House...2091, Representative Virginia Frederick. Representative Frederick. Representative Frederick. Representative Klemm, would you tell Representative Frederick we're at her Bill now? Out of the record? 2095, Representative Epton. Out of the record. House Bill 2096, Tate. Out of the record. Bill 2115, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 2135, Representative Levin. Out of the record.

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

House Bill 2146, Representative Ewing. The Gentleman...out of the record. House...2146. You want us...you want to...you want to move that Bill without the Chief Sponsor? You're the hyphenated Cosponsor, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "I'm the hyphenated Chief. We're both...all three together."

Speaker Ryan: "You want to move the Bill?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2146, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #...or Committee Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, Ropp, amends House Bill 2146..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Ropp on Amendment #3."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #3 to House Bill 2146 has two parts. It states that the deactivating district, who seeks to send students to more than one district, shall execute a contract with each of the two or more receiving districts; and the second portion deals with funding in that it states that the sending school will pay, by agreement, whatever it costs to educate that student in the receiving district, and that it shall be no less than what the per capita cost of maintaining that student in that receiving district. I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would the Gentleman yield? Representative Ropp, I think

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

I understand what you're doing by this Amendment; but you still, I think, haven't addressed, although you may have tried to address, the problem of the two year requirement. And it is a calendar year requirement, not a school year requirement. It would seem to me that you might want to further amend this if this Amendment doesn't cover it, and I don't think it does, to make sure you're talking about school years and not calendar years. Because the effect of this would be, on January 1st, you would have all these kids transferring from one school into another; and then two years later it would be all over on December 31, right in the middle of the school year. And I...I'd suggest to you that you might want to hold onto this until you take care of that."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this out of the record.

I need one more Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "You need one more what?"

Ropp: "I need to have another Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, we took it out of the record once,
Representative. But we'll do it again for you. House Bill
2147, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. 2153,
Representative Ralph Dunn. Out of the record. 2167,
Representative Ronan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2167, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning cities, villages and incorporated towns, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2168, Representative

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Pullen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2168, a Bill for an Act relating to motor fuel tax disbursements for certain road districts,

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2171, Representative Irv Smith. Out of the record. House Bill 2182, Representative Ralph Dunn. Out of the record. You want to read that one, Balph? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2182, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Coal and Energy Development Bond Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2189, Representative Nelson. Out of the record. House Bill 2231, out of the Representative record. Wolf. House Bill 2243. Representative Brunner. Representative Brunner back there? I can't see. Take his Bill out of the record. Representative Hallstrom. Out of the record. 2261, J. J. Wolf. Out of the record. 2263, Representative Van Duyne. What does that mean? Out of the record? Read the Bill? Turn the man on so I can understand what he's saying, will you?"

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you. You surprised me, Speaker. I thought you were talking in reference to 178. But, it is fine. There is no Amendments. Go ahead."

Speaker Ryan: "We're at 2263, Representative."

Van Duyne: "Yes, it is sponsored ... "

101st Legislative Day

Speaker Ryan: "You want the Bill heard?"

Van Duyne: "Yes."

Speaker Ryan: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2263, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act regulating solicitation and collection of funds, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. 2274, Representative Tuerk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2274, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Tuerk, amends House Bill 2274..."
- Speaker Byan: "Representative Tuerk on Amendment #1 to 22...House
 Bill 2274."
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when I heard this Bill in Committee, some of my worthy adversaries objected to one provision in the Bill. This Amendment removes that provision, which basically was a penalization or penalizes the seasonal worker. I would move for the adoption."
- Speaker Byan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."
- McClain: "I'm sorry, Your Honor. Or, I'm sorry. I was a lawyer all day."
- Speaker Ryan: "You're not in court today."
- McClain: "I was this morning. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman explain the Amendment a little bit more thoroughly please?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Would the Gentleman explain the Amendment for Representative McClain?"

May 3, 1982

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

McClain: "Attorney McClain."

Tuerk: "There used to be a provision in the law which said that seasonal workers had to work X number of days, 200 days, in order to claim benefits. It was taken out a couple of years ago as one of the provisions of our 1980 agreement; and it was put back into the Bill, unbeknownst to me, quite candidly and honestly; and I'm taking it out again. That is what the Amendment does. For you, you'll...you'll like this."

McClain: "This is pro-business?"

Tuerk: "What?"

McClain: "This is a pro-business Amendment?"

Tuerk: "No."

McClain: "It's a pro-labor Amendment?"

Tuerk: "I guess you could label it that way."

McClain: "Oh, then I'm probably against it, I guess. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative

Tuerk, you care to close?"

Tuerk: "No, I just move for the adoption."

Speaker Byan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2274. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2277, Representative Deuchler. Out of the record. House Bill 2281. Representative Stearney. Out of the record. House Bill 2282, Representative Conti. Out of the record. House Bill 2284, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 2287, Representative Findley. Out of the record. Bill 2289, Representative Rigney. Did you want the Bill read, Representative? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2289, a Bill for an Act to amend the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Revenue Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 20...2303,

Representative Sandquist. Out of the record. House Bill
2314, Representative Huskey. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2314, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2335, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2335, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to state finance, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2340, Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels, 2340. Out of the record. House Bill 2342, Representative Leinenweber. Out of the record. House Bill 23...Is that a blessing you just gave me, Representative Getty? Wait a minute, now we've got them from the other side here, too. You want to...you want that Bill heard, Representative Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "Absolutely."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Is it okay, Representative Getty? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2342, a Bill for an Act in relationship to land trusts, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2348, Representative Hastert. Out of the record. House Bill 2367, Representative Epton. Out of the record. House Bill 2381, Representative Pullen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2381, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Bouse Bill 2392, Representative Woodyard. 2392, Representative. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2392, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2394, out of the record. House Bill 2406, Representative Watson. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2406, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Agriculture Act...Architectural Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?" Clerk Leone: "None."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2412, Representative Terzich. Out of the record. House Bill 2417, Representative Yourell. 2417, Representative. It's on...It's on page eight. Out of the record. 2432. Representative Jaffe. Out of the record. 2437. Representative Karpiel. Out of the record. House Bill 2462, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Bill 2474, Representative Telcser. 2474, Representative. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House...House Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Finance Authority Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion. 'I move to table Amendment #1..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Rep...just a minute. Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, let me first note that the Bill has been read a second time, and I'll leave it on the Order of Second Reading so the Gentleman on my left, who is scheming the Bill's demise, can draft a few more Amendments. I know he has some more he is working on. It is pointless to go on tonight until he has all of his Amendments drafted and filed. I've offered to take every single one of his Amendments he tells me it might reach 200 if he'll vote for the Bill. He still hasn't given me the promise to vote for the Bill yet with 200 Amendments. So please note, Mr. Speaker, it has been read a second time. Let's leave it on Second."
- Speaker Ryan: "Yes, and you note that he has already filed 21

 Amendments that have not been printed at this point."
- Telcser: "I know. That's why I want to give him more time."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. House Bill 2489,

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Representative Kustra. Out of the record. House Bill 2495, Representative Sandquist. Out of the record. House Bill 2496, Representative Meyer, Ted Meyer. Out of the record. House Bill 2499, Representative Telcser. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2499, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. 2505, Representative Robbins.

Representative Robbins on 2505. Out of the record. 2507,

Representative Mays. Want to read the Bill,

Representative? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2507, a Bill for an Act to amend various

Acts relating to the assignment of unemployment insurance

benefits of child support requiring notice to circuit

clerks and for recordings, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2508, Representative

Ewing. Out of the record. House Bill 2511, Representative

Leverenz. Read the Bill? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2511, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 1 or 2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed,"

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2513, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. House Bill 2516, Representative Daniels. Out of the record. House Bill 2541, Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2541, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 1 or 2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third ... Third Reading. House Bill 2559. Representative Daniels. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Barr. Bill. Out of the Read the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2580, out of the record. Representative Barr. On page nine Calendar under the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 2278, Representative Leon. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2278, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the rate of interest, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Leon on House Bill 2278."

Leon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is on Short Debate, and I notice that I am perfectly short so that it is in the proper place. This Bill amends the Interest Act and removes the word

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

residential to specifically provide any real estate mortgage loan situation may be made with no interest rate ceiling. There is no ceiling on commercial real estate loans and none on residential ceiling. I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2278 pass? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. who wish? Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting voting *none...*no*, nine voting *present*. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. We're going to go back to the first Bill on Second Reading, page four, at the request Representative Van Duyne. He was a little late getting here when we started, and at his request, we will go to House Bill...on page four House Bills Second Reading House Bill 178. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 178, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Page nine, House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 468, Representative Sandguist. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 468, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the beer industry, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Sandquist on House Bill 468."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

House, House Bill 468 is the Beer Industry Fair Dealing Act which was worked out in our Committee on Registration and Regulation. My Chief Cosponsor with this is Representative Stuffle, and he will close. It's a Bill that has the support now of all elements of the industry; and it regulates the agreements between distributors and brewers, so that they cannot be terminated without just cause. It provides that either party who was injured can...can go to court if they have...if they don't agree with the termination. But it is a fair dealing Bill. I think it has, as I said, the support of all parts of the industry, as well as the Illinois Liquor Control Commission. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Sangmei...I'm sorry, Representative Sandquist, in the event that there would be an inconsistency between this Act and the Uniform Commercial Code, how would that be resolved?"

Sandquist: "Bell, I believe that this Act would take precedence."

Getty: "So that other states, in dealing with someone in

Illinois, would have to look to this Act and could not rely

any longer on the Uniform Commercial Code. Is that

correct?"

Sandquist: "I believe that is correct."

Getty: "How would this...what would be the effect of state sanction of this relative to anti-trust provisions under the Federal Anti-Trust Laws?"

Sandquist: "Well, it...it couldn't sanction something that was a violative of the Pederal Anti-Trust Law."

Getty: "And do you have the opinion of counsel as to whether or not this is violative of Federal Anti-Trust Laws?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

- Sandquist: "I believe that the counsel who looked over this found nothing...that it was...it was any conflict. It is in the Bill itself that it can't be inconsistent with the Federal Act."
- Getty: "Alright. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative
 Stuffle to close."
- Stuffle: "Yes, I would just appreciate a favorable Roll Call. I think..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Representative. We have a...alright, go ahead and close."
- Stuffle: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Representative Sandquist and I would appreciate a favorable This Bill has been in Committee for a number of vote. He've been working out the differences of opinion. originally had two different Bills. There were some differences of opinion between brewers and distributors. I believe that those have been worked out. Every party to Bill has had an opportunity, through several Subcommittee and full Committee hearings, to hear the Bill. The Bill was technically amended to take care of minor problems associated with the major brewer, Anhauser -Busch, and I don't think there is any opposition to the Bill at this point. It is merely a fair dealing law that establishes rights and remedies with regard to contracts between brewers and distributors of beer in Illinois. And for those reasons and the reasons set forth by Representative Sandquist, I would ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 468."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, we're going to have a break from procedure here. Representative Bowman would like to ask a question, so we're going to allow him to do that, and then we're going to take the vote."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Bowman: "Sorry, I was seeking recognition to try and ask, since I don't...I am not a lawyer, and this seems perfectly reasonable to me. But, can you give me an example of a situation, under the present law, if this Bill does not pass, that needs correcting? I mean, cannot, right now, a party intending action would...it says here that, 'Brewers and wholesalers may cancel, refuse to renew, or terminate agreements provided the party intending action has good cause. Well, isn't that the law now? I don't know."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well, your two part question...first, the general is, there are a number of provisions in this Bill that aren t covered anywhere in the statutes with regard to price fixing problems that have occurred in the state, with regard to drop shipments that have occurred in the state where people have been given commodities they didn't order. with efforts to prevent people from giving to their heirs franchises, with efforts to put distributorship in a single area, and with efforts to not put contracts in writing. The Liquor Control Commission testified at the Subcommittee in Chicago with regard to the need for this Bill. And if you want me to go on, I can go through probably every part of this Bill and cite examples of where there is no coverage in the law for this. It was modeled after a franchise Act in Illinois dealing with auto dealers. It was put together on that basis, and there are a number of other points that I could cite if you would like me to...to go on, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "How about the good cause for termination?"

Stuffle: "The provision in the Bill was put in there after working out the language with the brewers, and the good cause provisions in that deal with the fact that a brewer would have rights and remedies as well as the wholesaler or

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

distributor on the other hand. For example, if a brewer attempted to...rather, if a distributor attempted to defraud a brewer in the conduct of his business, he would give that brewer's product a bad name, obviously. person were convicted of violating a law or a regulation of the Liquor Control Commission that amounted to a felony, the same situation would apply. That is why good cause is spelled out in the Bill with regard to the contracts and the ability to terminate a contract. The Bill where there has to be notice with regard to an attempt to amend or not renew a contract, and the Bill also provides where there does not have to be notice where there have been some of the actions, that are specifically spelled out in the Bill, that would be a reason for the brewer to immediately terminate a contract."

- Bowman: "That was a rather lengthy answer. Can, under the present law, a brewer terminate for good cause right now?" Stuffle: "There is no provision in the law that's specific at the current time with regard to that. That is one of the main reasons the Bill is in, to clarify the rights and the remedies between the brewers and the distributors in the conduct of their business."
- Bowman: "Okay then, you mentioned price fixing in your other...one of your other comments. I notice here the brewers are prohibited from price fixing, but the...our analysis says nothing about wholesalers being prohibited from price fixing."
- Stuffle: "That would be another issue. The issue at hand here is what happens between the brewer and the distributor. That is the whole thing with regard to their operation and their contracts. If the wholesaler attempted to do that, in collusion with others, they would already be under a controlled...the Liquor Control Commission."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Bowman: "But this...this Bill says nothing specifically about wholesalers price fixing."

Speaker Ryan: "Are you finished, Representative Bowman?"

- Bowman: "I just want to make sure that I understood that this

 Bill says nothing about wholesalers price fixing."
- Stuffle: "I think Representative Getty (sic Bowman) has found a possible problem here. We'd like to take this out of the record."
- Speaker Ryan: "That's wonderful. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 668, Representative Catania. Out of the record. House Bill 869, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. House Bill 891, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. House Bill 955, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 955, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Insurance Code and Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the
 Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Vinson." Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 955 represents an effort to provide good health care at reasonable costs for those citizens of Illinois who have to be...have their health care subsidized by the Medicaid Program. Specifically, what the Bill says, is that those individuals...those drugs, which are approved as safe and effective by the Federal Food and Drug Administration, and which are cardio-vascular, arthritic, and hypertensive drugs, must be reimbursed for by the Department of Public Aid. The purpose for the Bill is that those particular drugs are drugs that are critically important to the maintenance of senior citizens in a non-institutionalized environment. The denial of those particular drugs may well involve the incarceration in nursing homes of the senior citizens. By this limited

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

group...by...by insisting that reimbursement be had for this limited group, we may well save money in the public aid system. For those reasons, I would move for the passage of House Bill 955."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Vinson, would you address yourself to the portions of the Bill that repeal the Health Facilities Planning Board Act and the Health Financial...or Finance Authority Act? Where exactly are these?"

Vinson: "Yes, Representative. Nothing...the Bill, as originally filed, dealt with a variety of those issues. Nothing in the Bill deals with that now. It has been amended in Committee so that it just deals alone with the drug issue that I described the...described in discussing the Bill."

Darrow: "Which Amendment was that?"

Vinson: "Amendment #2."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Vinson, from your comments, you did indicate, then, it doesn't have anything to do with the proposed cutbacks that Governor Thompson has talked about on the Medical Assistance Program. Because, I have been receiving, this weekend, a great number of letters from hospitals in my area who have brought up this problem. Has it got anything to do with cutbacks in the medical assistance of Illinois citizens?"

Vinson: "Representative, there are...there are two different points here. It does not do any of the things it was originally introduced to do: abolishing the agencies, changing the insurance system, and so forth, in the state.

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

What it does do is one specific thing that does relate to proposals to control the cost of the Medical Assistance Program. It...it absolutely mandates that for this limited group of three drugs...drug types, that there will reimbursement through the Medical Assistance Program. ¥е do not know whether, in the absence of this Bill, these drugs would be reimbursed for or not. That decision would be made by the State Department of Public Aid. I believe that some of the letters you may have received did relate to support for this Bill, because it quarantees the certain groups of senior citizens will be able to get these drugs who would not otherwise ... who might not, otherwise, be able to get them. That's...that's, I think, the right answer to your question."

Darrow: "Okay, let me ask you; how much, in dollars, are we talking about on this that is actually going to be considered? Would you know?"

Vinson: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question, Representative

Darrow: "I say in dollars, say for these drugs as needed, how...how many sen...either senior citizens or those that are of needy proportions...how...what is the amount or percentage that this Bill will affect? I guess what I'm getting to, I want to find out if possibly this might be used as a shell and to incorporate the Governor's concept after it gets into the Senate."

Vinson: "I have no intention with respe...to...to use it in that fashion at all."

Darrow: "Oh, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

"Really what I am looking for, Sam, is the philosophy Duyne: or at least some kind of a direction. I had the dubious honor of being interviewed by the Will - Grundy County Medical Society the other night, I presume as to they're...they're going to go in terms of the next election, whether they are going to support me, or Harry, or whatever, you, or your opponent, or whatever. really haven't any idea why they interview you, but that was one of the points of discussion. And, they say that big providers, like Caterpillar and other...other like them are really complaining. And, of course, their insurance agents are complaining, too, because the hospitals, quote, in my words, are ripping them off, end quote. My words. I... I had the occasion Sunday morning to go and buy a Sunday paper from a drug store, *Seltzer's* drug store in Joliet, and had the ... I made up conversation with the druggist there. And he said, 'Well, you know, it really isn't all that surprising, because when they come in for 100 of these certain pills in a drug store, they charge...we charge them \$10.50. That is \$7.50 for the prescription of 100. We charge them \$3.00 for putting the prescription out, and in the hospital they charge them almost that for one pill. Now, your Amendment says, at least in the digest; it says that, 'Between hospitals and third party payers, I presume that means Blue Cross - Blue Shield and the hospital, 'That it shouldn't be based on...it should be based on a negotiated schedule of rates and not on the actual cost of the...to the hospital. My druggist alleges that the pill costs 10 %, this hypothetical pill we're talking about. The hospital charges almost for one pill what they charge for a whole prescription of 100. Now, it looks to me like, question is specifically this, are you trying to make this

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

up? Are you trying to let them do that? Are you trying to say, "Well, they don't have to pay on 10% a pill, or they can't charge their patients under 10% a pill as Caterpillar and Blue Cross is trying to negotiate with them."? Or are you saying that we are now obviating that circumstance, and they can charge what ever they want?"

Vinson: "Okay, now you've offered a variety of questions for me
to respond to, Representative. Number one, I will not be a
candidate for the endorsement of the Will or Grundy County
Medical Association's endorsement this year."

Van Duyne: "What count...what county do you live in, Representative?"

Vinson: "What?"

Van Duyne: "What county do you live in?"

Vinson: "DeWitt." DeWitt."

Van Duyne: "Are you going to be a candidate for the endorsement of the DeWitt Medical Society?"

Vinson: "Yes, yes, but not...I promise you I won't be in the Will or Grundy..."

Van Duyne: "Hell, I...I...don't even know why you brought up Will County. I am."

Vinson: "You mentioned that you had been in Will County at that meeting, and you suggest..."

Van Duyne: "Okay, I think...I think the prosecution rests on that point."

Vinson: "Okay, now to get...to get to the nub of your point, you are...you're looking, again, at the underlying Bill that I originally introduced. And the underlying Bill that I originally introduced bears zero relationship to what you have before you now. I have abolished, in the Bill by Amendment...nothing that you're reading in the digest there, under the Bill itself, is involved today. It is just Amendment #2 that we're voting on, because I struck

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

everything after the enacting clause, Representative. Now, under the enacting clause, all we're simply saying is that there are three simple categories of drugs that are very important: hypertensives, arthritics, and cardio-vascular drugs; where the Department must reimburse for those drugs. And, we're simply saying that, because those are three drugs that make it very possible for the senior citizen group to be ambulatory, not to be put in nursing homes. And therefore, we would substantially reduce the rate of reimbursement for their care."

Van Duyne: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, may I address to the Bill?

Thank you. At least my...at least my questions were cogent enough...Mr. Representative, at least my questions were cogent enough to at least bring to the Membership's attention that the synopsis is absolutely wronq."

Vinson: "Well, you're absolutely right about that."

Van Duyne: "And, if I accomplish nothing more than that, why, I think it was at least it was wor...worthy of getting up and asking a question. Thank you very much."

Vinson: "Thank you,"

Speaker Ryan: "There any further discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Vinson, calling your attention to Amendment #2, the language of the Amendment, 'The Illinois Department may not prohibit reimbursement for any drug approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration except as specified under the federal maximum, etcetera'. I...I would suggest to you that you look at that again. I am sure that we both understand what you're trying to say, and I don't have any disagreement with it. But, I am afraid you are excluding them from disallowing, for example,

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

because of fraud or because of one of the other underlying reasons. I would suggest that you might want to switch this language around so that you're affirmatively stating that the Department would honor these items and not have this language that could subsequently cause us a problem if it...if somebody were to say it couldn't be disapproved for any reason. And, I think this is just overly broad the way it was drafted by the Reference Bureau. I suggest that you might want to change that. Also, I thought there might be some problem with the Bill as amended in the lines that are deleted. I think they might have already been changed by a prior Amendment. Might want to take a look at that."

Vinson: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker. We'll

- examine the Gentleman's questions and see if we can't do it a little more artfully."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. House Bill 1321, Representative McMaster. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to township organization, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1321 amends an existing law that permits townships in the County of Cook to contract with municipalities or with the county for police protection. It allows those townships to levy a tax of 10¢ per \$100 valuation to do so. The purpose of this Bill is to permit any county in the state the same privileges as the townships in the County of Cook. In other words, all the Bill does is remove the size limitation of counties so that any township in the State of Illinois can do the same as townships in the County of Cook."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

McMaster: "That's right, John."

O'Connell: "Tom, if...if I'm not...if I'm correct, this
Amendment, that was adopted in Committee, takes out the
increase in the levy from .10 to .25, and therefore, there
is no tax levy increase involved in the Bill as it stands."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Tom, what does it do now that...if...if it applies to all counties, not just Cook; and if it keeps the maximum rate at 10% instead of 25; and it was initially to only apply to Cook; and to raise it from 10 to 25, now that that has been switched back, what does it do?"

McMaster: "No...You misunderstood, I think, John. The law, as it exists today, permits the County of Cook...townships within the County of Cook, to do this with the 10¢ per 100. No other township in the State of Illinois, regardless of the size of the county, can do this. So, we are expanding the law to include all townships and all counties of the State of Illinois."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Van Duyne again."

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I am so loguacious this afternoon, but he asked a question. The answer is, it just allows them to tax that 10%. Now, that is all they could...they used to could do it before, but they couldn't tax for it. Now, at least they can tax for it. And I...I resign from speaking right now."

Speaker Ryan: "What...what do you apologize...for being what?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Van Duyne: "Loquacious."

Speaker Ryan: "Now who accused you of that? Representative Matijevich. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question? Tom, I don't recall this Bill in detail. Does this increase the tax levy for townships?"

McMaster: "No, it does not. It keeps it the same."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McMaster to close."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Bill has been sufficiently discussed. I would urge a green light on this necessary Bill for operation of township government in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1321 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 voting "aye", 28 voting "no", and 2 voting *present*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 1841. Karpiel. Out ο£ the record. House Bill 1889. Representative Griffin. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1889, a Bill for an Act to amend the Crime Victims' Compensation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Griffin, on House Bill 1889."

Griffin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 1889 addresses a very serious problem in the State of
Illinois for all those unfortunate people who become
victims of violent crimes. As everyone here knows, there
is a program administered by the Attorney General's Office
to make certain that people entering hospitals will see

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

posters that will notify them of their rights under the Law enforcement officials are supposed to notify people, who have been victims of crimes, by reading a card. However, there are a lot of victims that are passing through this process without being notified of their rights. People who are brought to a hospital unconscious; the police may leave early. People in many emergency rooms not aware of this particular Act. For a number of reasons, there are a lot of citizens...could be in excess of 90% of the victims of violent crimes, who go through the trauma of a violent crime, things that have happened to them without their will, that suffer. So, to make this Act effective, I believe we must tighten it, make it apply to all those cases, as best we can, that are now not being properly disposed of. So the Bill, in substance, requires the Attorney General's Office to promulgate rules, instructions that will quarantee, as best we can, that people who were victims of violent crimes will be notified of their rights. That is, in substance, what the addresses. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is...Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Griffin: "Yes."

Darrow: "Is there an additional appropriation for this Bill? I assume that the Attorney General can*t operate this program out of his budget. Is that correct?"

Griffin: "Yes. I understand, from talking to Pat 'Goldman' in the Attorney General's Office, that there would be no substantial increase in the budget; that they have the funds available. In fact, there would be, from their point of view, more cost effectiveness through this particular

101st Legislative Day
approach."

known to the victims?"

May 3, 1982

- Darrow: "Well, what...what steps does the Attorney General plan to take? How does he plan to make this program better
- Griffin: "To begin with, the Illinois Hospital Association and the Physicians' Associations in Illinois are prepared to work with the Attorney General to do all they can, within their associations, to voluntarily promote this program, but to also consult with the Attorney General as to the best ways that he may develop laws that will...rules that will accomplish the objective of the Act. So, there would be cooperation with the private sector and the Attorney
- Darrow: "Under the Crime Victims' Compensation Act, if there is a contested claim, isn't it the role of the Attorney General to be in an adversary role to the victim, in those situations before the Court of Claims?"

General's Office in implementing this."

- Griffin: "I'm not certain of that. The Attorney General does pre-screen the claims before they come up before the Court, and it is our understanding that the...the...the people that I have talked to, in the Attorney General's Office, want to see that the legitimate claims are met. The problem is there are of course, a lot of people who make claims that don't meet the requirements. A lot of the people who make claims are screened out for a variety of reasons. The social workers in hospitals do this, and the Attorney General's Office, in effect, as I understand it, backs this up. So, they may be in an adversary relationship on those claims that are proven to be without merit."
- Darrow: "But the Court of Claims actually administers the Crime Victims' Compensation Act. Isn't that correct?"
- Griffin: "As I understand it, they adjudicate the...the claims

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

that are brought before them. Yes."

- Darrow: "Well, why wouldn't we place this responsibility in the hands of the Court of Claims rather than the Attorney General, since the Attorney General's role often is adversary to the very victims?"
- Griffin: "Court of Claims is not set up to implement this, and these are rules for notification. Basically, that is the reason."

Darrow: "What would be the effective date?"

- Griffin: "The effective date? I'll check on that. January 1st,
 next year."
- Darrow: "That would be the earliest that he would be able to send out any literature or anything of this nature with his name or picture on it. This won't be used for political purposes, will it?"
- Griffin: "No, and by the way, this is not an Attorney General Bill. It is a Bill that I have initiated because of a direct experience I had with victims who were not notified of their rights. So, as I understand it, the effective date would be January the 1st; and, as far as the associations or the physicians, they could begin promulgating literature, on their own, spurred on by this Act. But the Attorney General's Office, as I understand, would not be doing anything prior to January 1, '80...'83."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Griffin: "Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Schraeder: "Representative, I...I'm a little bit forgetful. The Crime Victims' Compensation, is that a state

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

appropriation?"

Griffin: "Yes."

Darrow: "And what was it for Fiscal *81?"

Griffin: "It was \$1,999,026."

Schraeder: "And what is it for Piscal *83?"

Griffin: "I'm not certain of that. We don't know that."

Schraeder: "Has it increased? Was the Governor's budget showing an increase?"

Griffin: "We don't know that. I'm sorry."

Schraeder: "What do you anticipate this will be, in additional cost, for the...the fact that there are more notifications, and more posters being furnished and all of the other costs? What would that be projected to be?"

Griffin: "Well, to begin with, I m not certain that the Attorney General's Office, in promulgating the rules, is itself going to be in the business of putting out more The effective date, of course, would be January 1st next year, anyway. But, the ... the Hospital Association, the physicians, various private individuals involved in health care delivery, in response to the orders, worked out between themselves and the Attorney General's Office would, in some instances, be paying for some of these posters themselves. So, we're not asking for any additional revenue. We're asking for better ways of notification. For example, the notification could be distributed in envelopes with the bills mailed to the victims. So, there is a number of ways this could be done that would not be an additional cost to the state, and I believe that the Attorney General's Office would have to submit this as part of their appropriations budget for our approval."

Schraeder: "How many crime victims received compensation in the last fiscal year?"

Griffin: "In the last fiscal year, there were 100...1,073 cases

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

filed. Out of those, 1,027 cases were closed. 578 cases were awarded. 449 cases were denied."

- Schraeder: "Well, do you have an estimate of how many increased cases would be filed, with this kind of notification, and what it would be of cost to the state? You have no..."
- Griffin: "No, I'm sorry, we don't. He don't...we don't know that
 yet; but, if you notice the figures, that a little less
 than half of the total were denied. So that it...it's not
 an automatic..."
- Schraeder: "Well, I understand the Governor proposing that there would be an...increased appropriation for rape victims' compensation. Do you know anything about that program?"
- Griffin: "I'm not too familiar with it except that, under the program that I'm talking about, a rape victim, in many cases, would not qualify. The reason is that most of the rape victims fall under the \$200 limit. If you have...if you sustain injuries, or a loss of work, or whatever that is in excess of \$200, and you can meet the other criteria; you may qualify for...for the assistance. But most rape victims do not fall in that category, unfortunately."

Schraeder: "Thank you, very kindly."

Griffin: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Griffin, to close."

Griffin: "I think the case has been..."

Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute. Just a minute, Representative.

Representative Woodyard, would like to discuss the Bill?"

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Ryan: "He'll yield."

Woodyard: "Redd."

Griffin: "Yes, Sir."

Woodyard: "Do people out of the state...are they entitled to

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

compensation, under this particular program,... who reside out-of-state, but may have had a crime perpetrated upon them in state?"

Griffin: "I'm sorry. We don't know that, Babe."

Woodyard: "The reason I asked, in my district which runs 125 miles along the border of...of Indiana, it was indicated to me that...that several people in the State of Indiana had been signed up for compensation under this program. Do we know?"

Griffin: "No, I'm sorry, I don't know."

Woodyard: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Now is there any further discussion?

Representative Griffin to close."

Griffin: "To begin with, I think we, as the Legislature and the government of Illinois, have to back up the Acts that we put into effect. And the Victims of Violent Crimes Act. I think, was conceived to aid people in our society who are suffering in greater and greater numbers from the actions people who are using brutality and all kinds of inhuman means to get whatever ends they re after. In the name of civilized legislation, I think we have to back up our words and our thoughts with action. The question of whether we owe these people compensation or whether we can afford pay it, I think, is a question that challenges our sense of decency; and, if we see that the benefits of this Act will be to let people really know what their rights are, we will, in the long run, be helping the people of our state. We'll be, in the long run, saving money for the work days that can be lost, for the suffering that it causes, and for other law suits that may be engendered, if we don't act to support this very important Act that is now being administered under the Attorney General's Office adjudicated by the Court of Claims. I hope everybody here

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

will be be moved with compassion for the viole...victims of violent crimes, as I have been. That was the initiation of my concern about this, and I hope that all of you will vote 'aye' on this Bill. This is the month in which the victims of violent crime are going to get a special...going to get a special attention, in the City of Chicago, in a national conference. So, I don't believe we have much choice, as good citizens and as people of conscience, other than backing this particular legislation. So, I ask your support for House Bill 1889. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1889 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'.

This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1924, Representative McMaster. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1924, a Bill for an Act relating to certain debts owed to this state by several counties thereof, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after the Constitution of 1979 was passed...1970, pardon me, various counties of the state still continued to collect one—half of the cost of real estate transfer tax stamps that are issued by the Department of Revenue for the work of issuing these stamps to the vari...various purchasers of property. A court case was ruled, in 1979, that they could not do this by that method. For that reason, the state felt that some method should be set up by which counties could be paid for performing this work of fixing the tax stamps and

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

collecting the money thereof. For that reason, a Bill was passed allowing them to do so, I believe, subsequently to 1979; but was never completely funded. The purpose of this Bill is to allow the state to forgive the counties the past amount that they have collected from 1970 to 1979, when they quit taking out their share of the tax stamps, and to permit the state to pay the counties some...approximately \$250,000, I believe, in total, for performing this work. And that is the purpose of this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Byan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Hallock."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Hallock: "Which counties does this apply to, or does it apply to all of them, or just half, or what?"

McMaster: "It applies to all counties, John."

Hallock: "Does it apply to Cook County as well?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Yourell. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "I notice, by the analysis, that this has a financial burden of \$41,000,000. Is...are those figures accurate?" McMaster: "Fred, this would be if the state attempted to collect that money between 1970 and 1979, which they have no intention of doing, Fred."

Tuerk: "What...what type of guarantee is there that the state
won't go after this money and..."

McMaster: "The passage of this Bill, Fred."

Tuerk: "Well, what you're saying is the state is going to, in effect, loss \$41,000,000 then, really."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

McMaster: "Well, they are going to forgive the \$40,000,000 that, technically, the townships would be considered as owing.

The work of the state and the cost to the state of collecting this and...from each one of the counties, I think, would be rather tremendous and something that would not be feasible and practical for them to do, Fred."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative McMaster to close."
- AcMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the intent of the Bill is clear, and the purpose of it and the effect of it; and I would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1924 pass?'.

 All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by

 voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

 wish? Take the record, Ar. Clerk. On this question there

 are 94 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', and 13 voting

 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

 Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative

 Kosinski, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Kosinski: "Purposes of an announcement with your permission, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, something we look forward to each year is going to happen again. The 11th Annual Gridiron Dinner is planned for May 19 at the Hilton Hotel. As in the past, we have been roasted on these occasions, you know, but we've all laughed heartily and enjoyed them. The tickets are \$20, obtainable from any one of the media people. And for you people who are lame ducks, the dinner is going to be roasted duck. So, I think you ought to come."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

101st Legislative Day

Hay 3, 1982

- I am offering you something for nothing. This is testimon...a testimonial dinner honoring Members of the General Assembly that is being given on Wednesday, this coming Wednesday, May the 5th; and it is going to be held at the Shera... Sheraton Inn, 3090 Stevenson Drive right here in Springfield. Now, you all received tickets like this; and if you haven't sent in for reservations, give me your name, and I'll account for you. Okay? And this is the veterans, for the veterans. That's right, combined veterans. For free."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Smith, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Smith, Irv: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again want to remind my colleagues that the Governor's prayer breakfast is scheduled for May 13, and if you haven't picked up tickets, if you would call my office, we have some good seats available, and we urge you to attend. I know that most of you probably don't need this, but for those of you who do, it is a very good chance. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright, back to work. On page nine, House Bills
 Third Reading appears House Bill 1938. The chief mushroom,
 Representative Rulas. Out of the record, Representative?
 Out of the record. House Bill 1986, Representative
 Friedrich. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to add an Act in relationship to fire protection districts, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is no provision in the law at present for the dissolution of a fire protection district. This Bill has been amended so that it defers dissolution until the assets and liabilities are disposed of. It also provides for dissolution where

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

there are districts with no population, and it also exempts the territory that has been dissolved from...from assignment to a new district by the Fire Marshal's Office. This was a strange thing. We had a district that needed to be dissolved. We could find no place in the law. We went to the Attorney General for a system, and he said there wasn't any. So, this is a method of doing it. We have one that needs to be dissolved, and I would appreciate your vote. As far as I know, there is no opposition."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1986 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1992, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 1998, Representative Oblinger. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1998, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a senior citizen transportation Bill. Last Session you passed and was signed into law for the certification of drivers of vehicles, buses, vans for the elderly. This is a companion Bill which requires inspection of the vehicles. After we put on Amendment #1, it is now supported by the Department of Transportation, the Department on Aging, and the Motor Vehicle Council."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Question for the Sponsor. Does this Bill provide for inspection of vehicles transporting senior citizens?

The way I read the analysis, it exempts vehicles that

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

transfer."

Oblinger: "No, RV...no, RV vehicles were not required to be inspected. Now, when they are transporting senior citizens, they must use a placard, and those buses and vans must be inspected. You probably didn*t read over on the second page. It is a rather lengthy analysis for a small Bill."

Leinenweber: "Well, doesn't this markedly change the thrust of the Bill to go to exempt vehicles and then back to making them all..."

Oblinger: "Pardon?"

Leinenweber: "What does the Bill do...if they were required to have safety investigations, and then the Bill provided that they were to be exempt, and then the Amendment makes them subject..."

Oblinger: "No, that is not true. Up to this point, we have to have trucks inspected, cars inspected, school buses inspected; but they forgot to include the buses and vans that transport the senior citizens. The Department of Insurance and the insurance carriers told me the reason the premiums are so high on vehicles transporting seniors is because they didn't have certified drivers or inspected vehicles. This provides that those vehicles transporting seniors must be inspected."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates she will."

Getty: "Would you please define for us what bear placards means?

Describe that so we will clearly have in the record what your legislative intent is."

Oblinger: "Yes, a number of people who use their campers during the week and weekend for fishing trips and so forth, would then take the...it would be a removable placard, meaning

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

the heavy cardboard type placard that would have to be put on...so that it could be removed when they were using it for their own purposes."

Getty: "Are there any size requirements?"

Oblinger: "No."

- Getty: "So that this placard could be one inch by two inches, and it would meet the requirements of this proposed Act. Is that correct?"
- Oblinger: "It doesn't have any provision for the size. If this is important I suppose it could be amended for that purpose."
- Getty: "Sell, I...I really don't have any particular objections to what I think you want to do, Representative, but I would respectfully suggest that bear placards is something that is rather vague. And it would seem to me that you might want to take this out of the record and put an Amendment on there that would indicates some size using the standard, for example, that is used for truck lettering, for...that is required to be on commercial vehicles and that sort of thing, so that you would at least have something that could be seen by the public. I think that is a safety precaution."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, I will take it out of the record for such an Amendment. Is it the proper time for me to ask that it be moved back to Second, or do I wait till I have the Amendment ready?"
- Speaker Byan: "You can move it back to Second now, if you'd like,
 Representative."
- Oblinger: "Alright, may I please do that?"
- Speaker Ryan: "The Lady asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted, and House Bill 1998 is now on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2005,

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Representative Collins. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2005, a Bill for an Act to provide for the transfer of the Chicago Park District of interest of the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 2005 provides for the transfer of some Housesubmerged lands at the mouth of the Calumet River for development of a contained spoil disposal facility. The situation is such that the Lake Calumet...the Calumet River is in need of dredging so that it can maintain the depth required for...for navigable purposes. The dredge material would not be suitable for dumping in the lake, and so the Corps of Engineers would require that the sponsoring which is the Regional Port District. would construct the spoil disposal facility before they could commence the dredging. This land, which is adjacent to the Iroquois landing terminous of Lake Calumet is at the mouth of the river. It is submerged land and would transferred to the park district who would contract with the Chicago Regional Port District for the facility to constructed. At the conclusion of the dredging operations, the land that has been filled in by this containment facility would, then, revert to Chicago Park District land. This land is immediately adjacent, also, to Lake Calumet; and it would, ultimately, within ten years be additional Park District land in the Calumet River and the park...Lake...pardon me, Calumet Park area. for the support of the ... of the House on this Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "With relish, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Would the Gentleman

yield to a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he would."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

- Meyer: "Will the recipient of this land have to get a solid waste permit, Mr. Collins?"
- Collins: "I think...I think you had better answer that question for me, Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Pardon me? I didn't hear it. Yes or no."
- Collins: "I said I think ... "
- Meyer: "You're fronting for an organization that would...needs a
 solid waste permit."
- Collins: "Well, if I'm fronting for an organization, it is an organization which is a governmental body and not...and not a profit-making organization such as one that I have seen you fronting for."
- Meyer: "That remains to be seen, Mr. Collins. It is like pornography. It is only in the eyes of the beholder. I have no further questions."
- Collins: "Yeah, but you can smell your client on my way home."
- Meyer: "Mr. Collins, I have never taken a dollar in clients' fees from the association that you have mentioned, and I personally regret that statement."
- Collins: "Well, I...well, I would apologize for the inference you drew from my statement. I didn't mean to say that you were making any money from that organization."
- Meyer: "Thank you."
- Collins: "I was referring to the legislation...I meant to refer to the legislation over which you and I have disagreed."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Collins. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Levin, what are you going to add to this?"
- Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Byan: "Indicates that he will."
- Levin: "Representative, I happened to be in exact...in one of my many forays to exact when this Bill came up. And there was some concern expressed that this project might affect the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

And one of the examples that was used was the currents. extension of Northwestern. And, apparently, there was also another project in your area which was controversial that involved a steel company some years ago. You know, what is the evidence as far as whether or not this will affect the currents of Lake Michigan?"

Collins: "The...after that meeting, I asked the representatives of the Department of Transportation if there would be a serious effect upon the currents in Lake Michigan as was...the question was raised by one of the Members of the Committee, and he said that he was sure it would be I asked him to check it out for me further, and minimal. in all honesty, they have not gotten back to me since that I did ask some of the Members on your side, who meeting. are my Cosponsors of the Bill, to check with the Gentleman who raised the questions in the Committee that day. And he is on the floor, and I don't know if he still has the reservations or not, but I was led to believe that he did not."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Giglio: "Representative Collins, since we were talking about money a little while ago, is there any money that is going to be transferred or transpired between the Park District,

or the Port, or the State or the Federal Government?"

Collins: "No, no, no, this is ... this is an outright transfer.

There is no mon...there is no money involved at all."

Giglio: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kelly."

Collins: "I have a representative of the Department of Transportation at my side now who indicates that what research they have been able to do would indicate that

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

there would be little or no deleterious affect upon the lake currents. Representative Yourell had...had questions on that, and I...I don't know if he still does."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kelly, Dick Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Phil, I would just like to ask you about the Little Calumet River in Calumet City in Lansing where they were talking of dredging that river in order to improve the flooding problems that exist there.

And I am just wondering, has this Bill...does it have anything to do with dredging the Little Calumet River and then...dumping that into the...Lake Michigan?"

Collins: "No, no, no, this...this is the Calumet River running from Lake Calumet, the port at Lake Calumet through the ... through the port facilities at the mouth of Lake And it would be the dredging of that stretch Michigan. which is about five and a half miles. The part that you're talking about is the Little Calumet River running between Calumet City and Lansing and is an entirely different problem, which we are all in accord on, that we need...we need some dredging and some diking there. And it is a matter of bringing together federal, state and local authorities and funds. It is an entirely different problem, and one that would not...one problem would not affect the other."

Kelly: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Yourell."
Yourell: "I know...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know there is a lot
of discussion around me because of the controversy that
existed when the Representative and others had the U.S.
steel Bill some years ago, and I have been assured that
this is not the case, in this instance. But, I do have a
guestion for the Gentleman that I...he can, perhaps, get
the answer from...from the representative from the

101st Legislative Day

- May 3, 1982
- Department of Transportation. What kind of study, Phil, did the Department conduct to determine whether that fill would have a...any affect on the lake currents?
- Collins: "The...the Gentleman with me does not have any idea as
 to what the extensive study entailed, but he will have the
 question...he'll have the answer for the question for you
 as quickly as possible. I don't have to pass the Bill
 today. I'd like to, but if you want me to hold it for that
 answer..."
- Yourell: "No, I have no objections, because it's got to go to Senate, but I want to suggest to the Department of Transportation that they don't know a damn thing about the currents in Lake Michigan. It is not in their purview to know anything about that. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and those charged with that responsibility are the ones to contact in reference to that poi...point. And I'd get some answers, but the Gentleman and the Department of Transportation knows nothing about Lake Michigan."
- Collins: "Well, I agree with you, and I didn't mean to indicate they do. I think that they would have to rely on the Survey and on the Corps of Engineers for these answers."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Just one question, Mr. Speaker. You re going to dredge the Calumet River. Are you going to dump this residue into Lake Michigan or any confines of that area?"
- Collins: "No, no, Fred. That is the whole purpose of it...the whole reason for this Bill. You cannot dump the dredgings into Lake Michigan, so you have to construct a facility that would contain these dredgings. And this...this facility will be adjacent to Lake Calumet, which will, ultimately, result in additional park district land. It...this...this...the whole thrust of this Bill is to

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

prevent any dumping in Lake ... in Lake Michigan."

Schraeder: "Is this ground you're talking about dumping on partly submerged now and the..."

Collins: "The land is all submerged."

Schraeder: "And it is not Lake Michigan."

Collins: "It is Lake Michigan, and a facility will be built that
will...in that land, I guess, metal and concrete, so that
you can dump this in and actually create new land without
polluting the Lake."

Schraeder: "But the dumping will be, then, on submerged land that is part of Lake Michigan."

Collins: "It will be on a facility that will be built up on this land."

Speaker Ryan: "What Representative Macdonald?"

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a member of the Water Resources Commission, I would like to stand in favor of this Bill and say that one our objectives for the coming years is a bipartisan objective with both our Congressmen from the Illinois and from our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to attempt to revive the Iroquois landing in the Calumet harbor. We understand that it is absolutely necessary. The Corps of Engineers will bе helping. We...as we understand it, there will be no impairment to the currents Lake Michigan, and I think for the benefit of all of Illinois and to revive the shipping at...at the Iroquois landing that it is very important for us to have this particular project go through. So, I am in full support of it, as are most of the members of ... I'm sure all of the members of the Water Resources Commission."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Bell."

Bell: "Will...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Bell: "Representative Collins, a couple of questions. One, will this be creating islands in Lake Michigan? When you're dumping on the submerged land, will you eventually build up to islands?"

Collins: "The answer is no."

Bell: "Will we eventually end up with a place for a new airport in Lake Michigan?"

Collins: "I don't think you could land a helicopter on this spot,

Bell: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Alright, Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "I have a question for the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. I haven't seen Calumet harbor from beneath the water very often, and tell somebody that doesn't live..."

Collins: "That could be arranged, I think."

Dunn: "Yeah, I know. That is what I am afraid of. I want to know how to vote on this Bill. I don't want to wind up beneath the Calumet harbor. Explain to me what this Bill does for somebody who lives downstate."

Collins: "Alright, I have attempted, and I shall. Lake Calumet is at the end of a five and a half mile stretch of the Calumet River, which must be maintained at a 26 feet depth to be navigable. We also have the Iroquois terminus at the mouth of the lake...of the Calumet River, which is at the mouth leading into Lake Michigan. So. for us †a dredge...for the Corps of Engineers to dredge the River. and then to dump it in the Lake is unpalatable, and illegal and cannot be done. So, there is...there is submerged land at the mouth of the...the Calumet River adjacent to the Iroquois landing terminus, and also adjacent to park district land ... the ... Calumet Park. Bill would convey this land to the park district who

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

would...who would contract for the construction of a waste fill containment facility on ... which would cover this 40 acres of land. And in this facility, they would be able to dump the dredgings from the River without polluting the River or Lake Michigan. As a result, over a ten year period...the dredging would take ten years, they would fill in this facility with the dredgings from the River which. result in 40 acres of additional ultimately. would land...Chicago Park District land for Calumet Park, and the title would be in the Calu...in the Chicago Park District. we would have...we would have new...in ten years we would have our River dredged, and we would have 40 acres of new park land."

Dunn: "Thank you. It sounds like something I would expect to read in <u>Scientific American</u>. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Winchester: "Is it my understanding, Representative Collins, that there is no state general revenue monies, or no bond monies, or no Capital Development Board monies that is in this proposal?"

Collins: "That's...that's absolutely correct."

Winchester: "Is it true, Representative Collins, that this Bill came out of the Executive Committee with 22 *yes* votes and zero *no* votes?"

Collins: "I believe you're correct."

Winchester: "And is it true that there were no opponents, in Committee, on this Bill?"

Collins: "There was no real opposition. There was some reservation expressed by Representative Yourell, and I think one or two others, but no...no real opposition."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Winchester: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, of the southern as one Illinois delegation, and one who probably will never get an to be...or to ride or whatever in the Com...Calumet River or the Calumet harbor, that I do - and am convinced from the testimony that ... that Representative Collins gave us in the Executive Committee and what he has on this floor - I think it is an important project to him and to his area of the state. And I think we ought to get on about the business of the House, and get this Bill up for a vote and vote it out of here. Go on to other business."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield to ... "

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative Collins, this legislation that authorizes the construction, operation and maintenance of a contained soil disposal facility. My question goes a little further. Are these the same type of facilities that were created around the City and the suburbs with the deep tunnel when they have taken the limestone from the tunnel and taken it up to the above ground areas?"

Collins: "I...I have no knowledge of those facilities. I can't answer your question."

Mautino: "Okay, then secondly, once this soil, which is rich black earth, combination peat - p-e-a-t - total: what do you do with this after it is presented? Is it the intention to sell this commodity later after it dries up? Because, it is very rich soil, and there is probably a good market for it, especially in the State of Michigan."

Collins: "No, I think you missed something I said. This will result in the creation of new lands right there on the spot, 40 acres of new park land."

Mautino: "You're telling me that you can take siltation from the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Calumet Lake and Lake Michigan and make solid ground out of the siltation that is in the bottom of that Lake? Is that what you're saying?"

- Collins: "That's what the...that's what the Corps of Engineers says."
- Mautino: "Then I recommend that the Corps of Engineers do a little deeper thinking. Is...it is totally impossible, in this day and age, to make a cohesive organic matter out of peat, spoilage and siltation from any free flowing body of water in the State of Illinois. I know well from Lake 'DePew'. I know well from the dredging of the Illinois River. And if that is the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, I would recommend most highly that everybody look very closely at this piece of legislation."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Collins to close."
- Collins: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this has been thoroughly discussed. This is a much needed piece of legislation for the continued viability of the Chicago Regional Port District, which I think is important to everyone throughout the state. It also will result in additional recreational lands for the people in Chicago and the Chicago Park District, and I would solicit the support of the House."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2005 pass?'.

 All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Meyer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Meyer: "To speak on the question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, you're too late, Representative. We're on the vote..."

Meyer: "To explain my vote, Mr..."

Speaker Ryan: "...And you spoke during debate, so you can't explain your vote."

Meyer: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "You're out of order. Have all voted who wish? No you can't, Representative. You spoke in debate. No, Representative, you spoke in debate. You cannot explain your vote. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 124 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2056, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 2126, Representative Oblinger. You'll try again. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2126, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Oblinger on House Bill 2126."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last year we passed the Domestic Violence Act which protected spouses and children. The Act did not include the aged. It only included the mentally and physically handicapped. So, we've added the elderly people to this Bill, and we've also added the part that takes care of their resources not being used to their own detriment. And the final part is, we have referred some of these cases to the Aging Network for work and couseling of the aged population. As you remember, there was a study done by Sangamon State Oniversity, which was authorized by this Body. They came up with their recommendations, and this Bill is a result of

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

- that. It's supported by all the senior citizen organizations and the Department on Aging."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Josephine, is there any...

 Is this the Bill... Is this the law that we passed last
 year that is being funded by additional dollars through
 marriage licenses and divorce proceedings?"
- Oblinger: "No, this is the..."
- Schneider: "That's not. Okay, that's all I needed to know.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"
- Speaker Ryan: "She indicates she will."
- Satterthwaite: "Representative Oblinger, I'm surprised to hear you say that the Domestic Violence Act, in its current form, does not include the elderly. My impression of the Bill... or the legislation that's currently in existence clearly indicates any family or household member, and it would seem to me that elderly are very clearly a part of that Bill, as it now stands. Why would you indicate that the legislation currently on the books does not include the elderly?"
- Oblinger: "Two responses, Representative Satterthwaite. Number one, they are not always a member of the household. They may be living individually, but that doesn't prevent their children, who are most of the abusers, from abusing them where they live. So, they are not a member of the household. Number two, if you'll look in Section 202, Subsection (B), it talks about who can seek an order of protection on behalf of herself or himself, on behalf of a minor child, on behalf of any person prevented by physical

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

or mental incapacity, and that's where we added 'or because They have to be able to secure the order of advanced age . of protection, and that's where we added the advanced age." Satterthwaite: "Well. шV impression, certainly, as the legislation went through the House last year, was that the intent was to include elderly family members, too, either as part of a household or in regard to any other member that would be abusive of that person, even from a different household. I disagree with your interpretation of the law, as it currently stands. I understand that your Bill might make it more specific because of the clause you mentioned adding advanced age, and I have no problem But there are a great many questions, I believe, in that. regard to the added language on page one of your Bill, with a great many people feeling that, although these things might be very desirable, they are much less specific and much more difficult to try to enforce. And there are great questions revolving around whether or not, by extending the Bill to this extent, we would, in fact, come something that would not be implemented because of its broadness, because of the generality, because it is feasible for law enforcement officials to try to document verbal harassment and that sort of thing."

- Oblinger: "Representative Satterthwaite, you have not looked at the Amendment. That removed those."
- Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry. I have not seen an Amendment. You're right."
- Oblinger: "It removed the 'threatening, harassing or causing extreme and repeated mental and emotional anguish and interfering with the personal liberty of another family or household member', because the law enforcement and state's attorneys said that this would be too difficult to define; and, they couldn't handle it. That has been deleted."

101st Legislative Day

- May 3, 1982
- Satterthwaite: "So, essentially, the change then that remains is the one on page two?"
- Oblinger: "Yes, the one on page two and on page... on the last page where we include one of the remedies being the Aging Network can be a referral agency. Those are the only two changes."
- Satterthwaite: "Thank you, very much, for that clarification."
 Oblinger: "Surely."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Oblinger, to close."
- Oblinger: "The reason we are bringing this Bill before you now; there are as many cases of elderly abuse now being reported in Illinois as child abuse, over 40,000 a year, and we'd like to handle this problem. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 2126 pass?".

 All in favor will signify by voting "aye", all opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 voting "aye", none voting "no", none voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2175, Representative Mays. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2175, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to public water districts. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. This Bill permits public water districts to establish differential rates between users originally served by the district and new users. Currently, if a new area is added to a public water district, there is no provision in the law that allows them to charge the exce... the added cost for dead service and

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

things like that. The statutes don't currently prohibit this differential in rate, but we're in a Catch-22 because they don't expressibly allow it. So, what this Bill does is allow water districts to charge differentials in rates for three specific reasons: if the cost of servicing the new users is greater, if it's necessary to defray the payment of principle and interest on the revenue bonds issued for the purpose, or to provide for a depreciation This Bill is Cosponsored by Representative McClain, fund. who... we ve got a particular problem in our immediate area where we have 91 homes that are unable to be served by the water district. If you have any questions, I'd be more than willing to respond."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2175 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2268, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 2262, House Bill 2262, McAuliffe."

Clerk Leone: "House... House Bill 2262, a Bill for an Act creating a commission on gang crime activity. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to ask for your support on House Bill 2262. In many of the urban areas of Illinois, there is a problem with gangs. We have a very bad problem in Chicago on the northwest and southwest sides where gang activity is very strong; terrorize of decent, honest citizens. People are afraid to go out of their houses. They vandalize. They

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

burn houses down. They write graffiti on the walls and, generally, disrupt the neighborhoods and destroy property. I think this is a matter that needs to be studied by the General Assembly so we can find effective ways of combatting this. And, for that reason, I'd ask for your favorable vote."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, House Bill 2262 pass? .. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Hr. Clerk. On this question there are 122 voting 'no'. voting 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2273, Representative Flinn. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2273, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the funding of metropolitan enforcement groups. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn." Plinn: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2273 proposes to the raise the Bingo Tax from five percent to seven and a half percent and to earmark that additional monies of some close to three million dollars to go to fund the MEG groups. This is approximately two million dollars more than is needed and, without any action by us, that additional money would now go into the General Fund. It only takes about a million and four hundred money to run the MEG Fund, and this is for administrative costs only. It does not pay for the salaries of the policemen of the eight MEG around the state. This Bill was introduced last year and lost here on the floor of the House, but it didn't make any difference because we wound up funding the MEG

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

groups anyhow. And my contention is that, if we do not fund the MEG groups, it's equivalent to legalizing marijuana and all kinds of other drugs that would be pushed on the streets. The small towns and the medium—size town police departments cannot afford to enforce the drug laws like we are presently doing with the MEG groups, and I would like to ask for a favorable vote. I'm sure it's a controversial matter, and there will be some discussion on it."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Will the Sponsor yield..."

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Ewell: ".. and tell us why we ought to spo... why we ought to fund MEG out of Eingo?"

Flinn: "Yes."

Ewell: "In other words, I'm not objecting to the funding of MEG.

I'm saying this is fine. It's a general revenue item, but

why, in particular, would we take this money out of a Bingo

Fund?"

Plinn: "For the same reason that we now take half of the money and give it to the Common School Fund and half of it to the Mental Health Fund. None of the three are connected with the NEG group or the drug problem unless you consider schools connected with the drug problem, but all... We do this in a lot of cases, and this is earmarked money. And that's all it is. Half of the five percent now goes to the Common School Fund, the other half goes to Mental Health. Now, I'm just adding one more category than is already there."

Ewell: "Well, what I'm saying is this, is I have no objection to funding MEG. I think it's a great operation, but I think it ought to be funded out of the General Revenue Fund. The tendency of this Body to reach into special funds and

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

create special funds paralyzes the Body. We might well find that our Common School Fund is so strapped; so has no ability to pay for the common school education of the kids of our state. We might want to save this source for, again, the Common School Fund and for, again, perhaps the Mental Health Fund. Now, I'm not saying that I would object so much to a raising of the taxes; but, to dedicate this to a MEG Fund when it's a gener...when it's a General Revenue item, is a bad precedent, and I think that this type of Bill ought to be opposed on these principles."

Flinn: "Well, if you're asking a question, it's not a precedent at all. We have done it many times. We do it with the other five percent of the tax now. I don't have anything against the Bingo Tax. All... I'm not after the Bingo people at all. I'm just saying that here is something that is sorely in need of funds, and this is my method of getting it. If you find another way to do it, I'll buy your way."

Ewell: "Well, I've got the other way for you to do it. Marijuana is a plant and it ought to be funded out of the Agricultural Premium Fund."

Flinn: "You put in a Bill, and I'll support your Bill."

Ewell: "Well, I'll... You want me to take it back and I'll put an Amendment to it."

Flinn: "Well, you missed your chance."

Ewell: "But I... I say, again, that this would... this is a classic example of something that would much better be done, say, out of the Agricultural Premium Fund where it has some relationship rather than reaching into the Bingo pot, which goes to the schools and the mental health. And these, surely, are two of the neediest areas in the state that affect the greatest number of people, and I think we ought to conserve our funds for that purpose."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Fawell."
- Favell: "Thank Mr. Chairman(sic, Speaker). Will the you, Speaker... Sponsor yield for a question? Sir, I have told that there is another Bill coming down the pike very soon that came out of the Committee 22 to nothing on drug trafficking, which would allow the MEG's group to take some of the profits that come from illicit drug trafficking; and, I would think that that funding would be more sufficient to... for their operations. Do you know anything about that other Bill?"
- Plinn: "No. No, I don't; but, if that Bill was already passed, I
 would table this one, because all I'm after is for funding
 the MEG groups."
- Fawell: "No. it's on Second Reading, but my understanding it has bipartisan support. It will probably fly out of both the House and the Senate. I would think, as your Representative on your other side did point out, I think it would be better if we held off, at least on this until we see if the other Bill does go through. Because. otherwise, we're going to have money coming out of our ears for NEG's, and perhaps not enough for the Elementary Secondary Education and Mental Health Fund. I appreciate what you're doing, and I think it's a good thing; and, I think it's a good department. But I think there is another Bill coming down the pike that could take care of the problem."
- Plinn: "Well, by any stretch of the imagination, I don't see us having money coming out of our ears for any fund."
- Fawell: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we take a good, strong look at this Bill. It's not that I object to what Representative Flinn is doing. It's just that I think there is another way coming down that will suffice, more

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

than suffice, and I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that this money is used properly for mental health and elementary education. I think it should stay there."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Keane."

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

Speaker Byan: "He indicates that he will."

Keane: "How much money are we talking about, in terms of taking it away from the Bingo revenue that the people...?"

Flinn: "Well, let me correct the previous speakers in answering your question. It doesn't take anything away from the School Fund. It doesn't take anything away from Mental Health."

Keane: "No. No. You didn't hear my guestion."

Flinn: "Yes, I did. I'm trying to answer your question and theirs all in one answer. And what it does. presently. there is about close to seven million dollars coming in now in the five percent. This will put it slightly over 10 million dollars, totally, and that additional money of that we would be appropriating about a million and a half. there would be two million dollars more to do something with, if we put on an additional two and a half percent tax. I've only proposed a two and a half percent as a figure out of the hat. It's more than enough money to do this job, which doesn't hurt the other funds. It take that much money away from the Bingo operators; approximately three million dollars, slightly over, away from the operators, not the players, not the general public."

Keane: "Have you exempted the.. the religious operators of Bingo games?"

Flinn: "I would have certainly considered that, if you would have put such an Amendment at Second Reading. I'd have been

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

more than happy to agree to do it over in the Senate, if I find out there's more than enough money by exempting those. I never thought about it to start with, or we'd have put it in the Bill. That's exactly why I lost my Bill last year." Keane: "Well, to the Bill. I think that the original intent of the General Assembly was to assist religious not-for-porfit groups raise money. The Bill was expanded. In many cases, the religious not-for-profit groups that used Bingo to support their efforts found that the Bingo parlors came into existence and did a great deal of damage to their It reduced the ... those who I think the General Assembly originally intended the revenue to go to. This ... In this case, I agree with the previous... those who have previously talked on the Bill. I don't think anyone... has any problems with the MEG program. I voted for MEG funding last year when the funding was coming from a different area. I would do so again. However, I think that to again hit the operators, especially those religious operators, and again reduce them... reduce their revenues: it will probably mean that the competition that they have not been able ... The religious not-for-profit groups have not able to keep up with the competition with the prizes and with the nights, with the volume of the Bingo palaces: that your Bill would hurt them, and I'd have to vote against it. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Winchester: "Monroe, we presently do have funding or had funding for the Metropolitan Enforcement Group. Now, did the Governor cut that from the Department of Law Enforcement's budget?"

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Flinn: "Yes, it was taken out, completely."

Winchester: "Do you recall last year how much money that we appropriated for the Metropolitan Law Enforcement?"

Flinn: "They were funded to the tune of a million point four, last year. I don't..."

Winchester: "So, this would be roughly an increase of one million point four, since this would generate about 2.8 million dollars in additional revenues, by raising it from five percent to seven and one-half percent."

Plinn: "Yeah."

Winchester: "Well..."

Plinn: "As I mentioned in the debate here, there's approximately two million dollars more than is needed for funding the MEG groups; and, if we do nothing, it would lie in the General Fund. We have a choice by amending, or appropriating, or do anything you want. Put it all in the School Fund, half of that balance in the Mental Health Fund, half in the Common School Fund. You can do anything you want to with it. Or we could amend this Bill in the Senate and say only six percent, or we could do like Representative Keane has suggested. We could exempt religious organizations. There's lots of things you can do with it, but my only purpose is to fund the HEG group. That's all."

Winchester: "Okay. I'm with you, Monroe. I'm with you, but this doesn't... This Bill doesn't say, specifically, that 33 1/3 of the collection would be earmarked for the Metropolitan Enforcement Groups. Is that right?"

Plinn: "No, what it does, it funds money, for which we can appropriate, to the MEG Fund group. It implies that that's what the money is for. It would be up to us to appropriate it each year. It would not, automatically, go to the MEG group."

Winchester: "But, for the purpose of some other Members who may

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

be confused, we're ... we're still earmarking the same amount of money that we would be earmarking today for education and whatever the other..."

Flinn: "Mental health."

Winchester: "... mental health."

Plinn: "That's right."

Winchester: "We're not taking away any money. This is additional money that you're generating, and you're just wanting to, specifically, not earmark, but have additional monies so that the MEG units could tap into it. Is that correct?"

Plinn: "Right. That's right."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative
DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know the terrific fight we had over the years to try to pass the Bingo Bill. Now, we're going to start coming around stripping it little by little. The churches and the veteran organizations are in dire straights right now due to the economic situation. I move that we destroy this Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Flinn, to close."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think most everybody understands what the Bill does. It does not take away any of the present funding for the Common School Fund. It does not take away any of the Mental Health Fund, special fund. What it does is appropriate... it taxes, rather, to the tune of about three million dollars more money on the Bingo operators; and, as I indicated, I would be willing, if the Bill passes, to get with the Senate Sponsor, whoever he or she may be, and exempt out the religious organizations. But the Gentleman who just last spoke represents the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

veterans organization; let me tell you I'm aware of some veterans organizations that have money they don't know what... know what to do with right now. I can't find anybody down my way that's opposed to it except the religious organizations, and I understand their plight. And I'm willing to solve that problem. So, I would ask you to support this Bill."

- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 2273 pass?".

 All in favor will signify by voting "aye", all opposed by voting "no". Representative Kornowicz, to explain his vote. One minute."
- Kornowicz: "In regards to House Bill 2273, the original Bingo law, the tax was 10%. Two years ago, I introduced a Bill and cut it down to five percent. Now, Flinn is talking about raising it up to a seven... to seven percent. I think it's real confusing, by cutting it down two years ago to five percent, then, in the certain areas, we're going to raise it up to seven percent. The entire proceeds of the Bingo Bill is suppose to go in to support the veterans and, also, to keep our schools, our Catholic schools and our churches running, and this is the reason that we introduced this Bill...(cut off)..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 54 voting 'aye', 92 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2285, Representative Piel. Out of the record. House Bill 2304, Representative Flinn."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2304, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
 to further effectuate the compact between the Missouri and
 Illinois creating the Bi-State Metropolitan Development
 District. Third Reading of the Bill."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
may I have a disclaimer. If there's any similarity to this
Bill and the other one I sponsored, it's purely
coincidental. They have nothing to do with one another.
And I'll take a reverse Roll Call."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion?"

Flinn: "No, let me explain the Bill, just briefly."

Speaker Ryan: "Oh, alright."

Flinn: "What this Bill does, it changes our law to match with the Missouri law that affects the Bi-State Development Agency. Most people think about Bi-State as being the bus company in St. Louis. Well, that's mostly what they are, but there is such a thing as an airport that operates the trains and the Arch down there; and, they have an industrial park next to the airport. They are strapped by being limited to ten percent to sell their bond issues and their notes. What this Bill, basically does, is raise that limit to 14% where it's already at for all the other airport authorities. This is not general obligation bonds we're talking about. It's revenue bonds. The Bi-State makes a contract with a person who needs their building in that industrial They buy the money, if they can find it. find it at ten percent, that's why the Bill. And then they build the building, and they lease it out and use up the money to... for ... lease money to pay off the There's no money the taxpayers pay at all. This does prevent Bi-State from getting into the building condominiums or subdivisions of that sort or any other industrial... other than industrial buildings. I answer any questions that are available, but this is identical to Missouri law. We had a Bill pass the last year 54 to nothing, and we failed to get it in the

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

last rush of the House here. So, we're going back through with it again. There was a slight change in the Missouri law anyway, and we would have had to re-done ours. So, I would ask for a favorable vote, or would answer any questions."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he'll yield."

O'Connell: "Representative, what relationship does the Bi-State

Development Agency have in relation to the issuance of

industrial revenue bonds, with current law on other

industrial revenue bonds?"

Flinn: "Bell, Lee, first let me back up. The Bi-State Develop...

The Bi-State Development Agency was created by a compact between Missouri and Illinois, by an Act of Congress back in 1949, I believe. I'm not sure. The bond issuance... the bonds that are issued now are a limited ten percent. All the other airport authorities were moved up to 14%, by statute, but we only had the Act in one state. In this case, we've had to act in both, and we've been several years getting around to do this, two or three years, at least, in getting around to do this for Bi-State. And it has hamstrung them from selling any bonds, because there is no ten percent money around."

O'Connell: "So, anytime you address the question of the Bi-State,
you have to amend a specific Act as opposed to general
revenue bond or industrial development bonds for the State
of Illinois."

Flinn: "Yes. Right."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Flinn, do you care to close?"

Flinn: "No, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a favorable vote.

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

That's all."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2304 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2310, Representative Hastert. Read the Bill.'

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2310, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Bill 2310 amends the Property Tax Law, and what it does, basically, is require that supervisors of assessors. township assessors and people who work in assessing offices that qualify for the 500 dollar stipend every year, once they become certified or reach that certificate ٥f assessment; that they have to go back to school for 48 class hours once every three years. So, in essence what it is, is saying that these people have to keep up their qualifications. They have to become updated on techniques, procedures, new laws passed by the General Assembly to keep them in a qualified position to get the stipend that they receive."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Are we talking about assessors that are elected?"

Hastert: "Yes, Representative."

Schneider: "Will this become a condition from candidacy? That is
to say, currently, we know that people run for office
because it's a cross-section and representative of the
population. Now, if you're adding a certification

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

have earned this kind of competency, measured and certified, and then, when we look for candidates to run for assessor, that that person has to have that certification?"

Hastert: "Representative Schneider, as the law reads now, they do receive the certification. It is not a necessary for candidacy. It hasn't been, and what this simply does is say, if they are to continue to receive a stipend for the certification that they've earned, that they have to go

requirement, is that going to be based on their ability to

Schneider: "I was... Excuse me, Dennis. I was aware of that. I just wanted to make sure that, if we're going to require this, that ... that it not be a condition for candidacy, much the same as the educational service region superintendents are now. So, that was my concern. I just didn't want to see that happening."

back to school and update their education level."

- Hastert: "Representative, it's not my intention to make this part
 of an election process. It is my intention to say that, if
 those people re.. to keep maintaining or to keep receiving
 their stipend, that they have to update their education
 level."
- Schneider: "Now, is this an annual stipend? After they ve earned this certification, the state pays this out?"

Hastert: "Yes, it is."

Schneider: "And so, what's your estimate of the cost?"

- Hastert: "There's no cost to this, Representative. It just says that they have to update their education. If any, it's a savings to the state; because, if somebody doesn't update their educational level, that they'll... the state won't have to pay them their stipend."
- Schneider: "That was a pretty clever sentence, Dennis. I got the impression that you have to pay. If the person receives this certification, that they will be given some additional

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

funds because ... "

Hastert: "There's no additional funds, Representative."

Schneider: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is exactly what the Sponsor says it is. It's a continuing education Bill. There are no extra costs to it. If those who have the certification want to continue to receive the stipend, they must continue to...in the continuing education requirements that this Bill would give them. The Bill has been approved and is supported by the assessing officials. It's a way of professionalizing the assessing officials in Illinois, and I think it deserves your support."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Where do the ... The Bill requires 48 hours of additional classroom time in each three year cycle. Where do they... Where are these classes held?"

Hastert: "Well, they're held throughout the state, and they're held by the assessors, in combination with the Department of Revenue, puts on some of the classes. And I imagine they're all sponsored by the Department of Revenue. Many of the people who are in the assessors department do teach those classes."

Brummer: "Okay, and would this be... Our analysis indicates 48 hours during a three—year period of time. Would that be an ongoing item? You would only be certified then for an additional three—year period?"

Hastert: "Yes."

Brummer: "And qualify yourself for the additional stipend, and then you'd have to go another 48 hours during the following

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

three-year period."

Hastert: "The second three-year period."

Brunner: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think it's a very bad precedent, because what you're going to find is that we're going to get a class of people known as certified And, if you're not a certified assessor, you're assessors. going to have a very, very difficult time running for the Assessor's Office. It looks great on a campaign brochure to say that I am a certified assessor. I have been to all the assessor courses, etcetera, etcetera. It's sort of a lock-in provision that, in a Democratic society, ought be there. The true and simple test ought to be whether or not the people, in the particular district or the assessing units, decide that they want to give that person 50% plus one of their votes. and I think any action like this, on the contrary, that would set up a special category of people who will now become known as certified and approved assessors versus the fact that Ray Ewell, John Doe, Vinson, Tuerk or Epton, or anybody else wants to run for the Office of Assessor, is a bad precedent. And I would suggest that we ought not only take a hard look at the Bill, but perhaps we ought to vote against it."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kelley."

Kelley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I under... understand it,
the elected assessor isn't covered. Is this for deputy
assessors? Elected assessors' salary is set by the town
board. It's the deputy assessors that have to..."

Hastert: "This covers township assessors, deputy assessors, supervisor of assessors. All these people are in a class that already receive a stipend, and that, to answer Representative Ewell also, that these gentleman already are

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

either certified assessors or they are not certified assessors. This is not changing the certified... certification process or the stipend, in any way. All it does is say that they have to be updated every three years on their educational process, to keep up on current techniques, processes and what the current status of legislation is. It's a Bill that's a good education Bill; and, if we say that all our municipal and local governments are based on real estate taxes, it's something that's necessary."

Kelley: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Hastert, to close."

Hastert: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think, in debate, we've answered many of the questions that probably have come up about this Bill. Again, I want to emphasize that it's not an increase in stipends. All it is is something that is an ongoing educational situation where people, who already receive a stipend, have to keep up that education level over every three—year period to receive the stipend that they're already given by law. I would just ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The questions is, 'Shall House Bill 2310 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2357, Representative Grossi. Out of the record?

And House Bill 2540, Representative Huskey. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Huskey."

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could I take this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to take House Bill 2540 back to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 2540 is on the Order of Second Reading. Consent Calendar, Third Day... Third Reading. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2038, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. House Bill 2125, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the redemption period in real estate foreclosures together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 2361, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2430, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Police Training Code. Second Reading of these Bills."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Leverenz, do you want to work on 1463? Senate Bill, Third Reading, page ten of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1463, Representative Leverenz."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill..."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1463, a Bill for an Act reappropriating monies to the Illinois Industrial Developmental Authority.

Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Senate Bill 1463 is a reappropriation Bill to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Where is he?

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

The Bill straightens out a problem that was raised through the Auditor General's Office in that the money that we have appropriated in the past, to be available for direct loans. was thought by the Attorney General to have to be returned to the General Revenue Fund or the state at the end of the year. That was not certainly the intent of the direct loan There are two ways to solve that problem. program. to establish, in their authorization, that appropriated to them would be allowed to stay with them and loaned out year by year by year; or, to go through the reappropriation process. It is quicker to qo through the reappropriations process, and that is why we have introduced House Bill or Senate Bill 1463, to reappropriate 1,137,000 dollars that they are using for the direct loan program. I would answer any questions you have. If it's any significant point, it came out of the Senate 53 to 0." Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1463 pass? . All in favor will signify by voting *aye*, all opposed by voting *no*. Have all voted who wish? Would you punch ... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', none voting *present*. This Bill. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- Yourell: "I want to know who voted Representative Huskey's switch just now."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Huskey, who voted your switch?

 Gentleman's in the chamber. Your inquiry is not timely,

 Representative. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Ewing, Chairman from the Committee on Revenue to which the following Bills were referred,

101st Legislative Day

May 3, 1982

action taken April 30, 1982 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 2334 and 2581. 'Do pass as amended' House Bills 1954, 2008, 2377, 2582. Representative Davis, Chairman from the Committee on State Government and Reorganization to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 30, 1982 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: * do pass! House Bill Representative Stearney, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken ... "

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 4th, at the hour of 1:30 p.m.."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 4th at the hour of 1:30 p.m.."

Telcser: "And play golf."

Speaker Ryan: "All in favor signify by saying *aye*, all opposed

no. The *ayes* have it and the House now stands
adjourned."