45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will come to order and the Members will be in their seats. Father Paynic from the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception Church in Springfield will lead us in prayer this morning."
- Father Paynic: "Let us pray. Lord, you continually add new children to your chosen people. We pray that you increase the faith and knowledge of those who are learning about you and ask us to make us instruments in helping them to be numbered among Your elect. We ask You, Lord, to make us Your servants in driving from the world all error, sickness and hunger and to give shelter to the homeless and peace to the oppressed. O God of Eternity, comfort the sorrowful, give strength to the suffering, and hear the call of all who call to You in distress, that all may be refreshed in Your mercy. We ask You, especially, O Lord, to watch over and protect our President, our Governor, our spiritual leaders. And spare them to the misguided souls who value their own greeds and ambitions more than they value human life. From this day, O Lord, we ask You to direct our actions in what we say and do, may we have a source in You and through You be brought to its accomplishment according to Your will. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Father. Representative Pouncey will lead the pledge this morning."
- Pouncey: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United 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. Take the record, Mr.

 Clerk. 170 Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the Rouse is present. Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 313, Keane-Peters-Barnes whereas the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Illinois mourn the senseless and tragic attack upon the Holy Father Pope Paul John II and whereas; Pope Paul John II has spent his entire life serving the cause of peace and justice for all the peoples of the world. As Saint Peter's successor, Pope John Paul II has made personal pilgrimages, each a mission of peace and love, seeking out the oppressed and the helpless of the world; and whereas Father Karol Wojtyla, without any consideration for his own personal worked to save the lives and souls of the victims of Nazism and Communism and world oppression, sparing thousands from persecution and death; and whereas, the Holy Pather has won the hearts of people of all nations, races and religions, and his special understanding of the human condition — its weaknesses and strengths. Pope John Paul II, in reaching out to the children, the sick, the elderly, the down trodden, has set an example to all men and women to follow the path of compassion and understanding towards our fellow man; and whereas, in his many travels throughout the world, Pope John Paul II visited the State of Illinois; and the City of Chicago was most honored and graced to welcome the Holy Father into our State, City and hearts During his visit to Illinois, Pope John Paul II 1979. inspired the people of our State to dedicate our lives ending discrimination, powerty and violence; and whereas, the Members of the House of Representatives are saddened that the violence on the Holy Father has sought desperately to eliminate from the world, has now become his personal cross, therefore be it resolved, by the οf Representatives of the Eighty-Second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the Members herein extend their most fervent prayers to the Holy Pather with the intention that he will have a speedy recovery, so he may return to his needy flock; and be it further resolved, that

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

suitable copy of this resolution be sent to the Most Holy Father Pope John Paul II as a symbol of our wishes for his full and quick recovery to good health."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have all Members join as Co-sponsors on this Resolution."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to have all Members entered as Co-sponsors on the Resolution for the Pope. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted.

Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. the past several months our nation, and in fact, the people of the world had experienced the tragedy of violence which has befallen our President, befallen the Holy Father, and befallen countless peoples in various cities in every country of the world. It is our heartfelt prayer that God, in His wisdom, may show us through the suffering taken on by His Holiness the Pope, that we have a new obligation. a new duty to pursue those measures and that conduct in life which would lead to an end violence, and in fact, lead to a brotherhood of all men. There is in the Polish language a greeting and a well and that is 'Stolat' and 'Stolat' translated means 'we wish you a hundred years of life, a hundred years of continuing the inspiration that you have given to the people of the world whether they be Christian, Moslem, Buddhist or Jew. Our hearts are heavily burdened by what has happened in the and as аn expression of our Representatives of the eleven million people in Illinois, Mr. Speaker, we ask that this Resolution be adopted and presented to the Pontiff as our recognition of his stature as a moral leader of the world and of our best wish that he continue in following in the steps as a Vicar

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- of Christ in bringing the good news and the gospel to the people of the world. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move approval of the Resolution."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. On the calendar on page 13, under the Order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 463. Representative Barnes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 463, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this
 Bill is the result of the Rape Study Committee and also a
 result of some of the public hearings that were held by the
 Illinois Investigating Commission when it was discussing
 deviate sexual assault on young victims. This Bill will
 tend to lessen the ordeal for the victim because it is a
 very traumatic experience and I would encourage an 'aye'
 vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, under what provision of the rules did you decide to call this Bill at this time?"
- Speaker Ryan: "This is where we left off...on this order of business. We finished...that would be the first call. Do you object to this, Representative Madigan? Representative, do you object to this Bill being called at this time?"
- Madigan: "If you are proceeding pursuant to the rules then certainly I would not object because I know how much you

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

enjoy proceeding according to the rules."

- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative
 Kucharski."
- Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps, the person who needs this support most are the young victims. While most suffer a great deal, it is the young child who may remain scarred for life. These emotions of fear, guilt and terror are not healed quickly. Even in the process of identifying their assailant even with the protection of police and family fear reaches out. Facing the offender in court, isolated in the witness stand, manipulated by a trained professional, terror and horror are all too real. Reliving the incident, agonizing over it leaves one very alone. We must not only support and uphold the law but the victim too, and I urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Katz."
- Katz: "Yes, I'm sorry. Representative Barnes, have you taken off Amendment #1 to this Bill?"
- Barnes: "No, but I would be very happy to do that at this time.

 Representative Katz and Representative Stearney had
 objected to Amendment #1 and it was agreed with
 Representative Getty that we would remove Amendment #1."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes to close."
- Barnes: "Well, I think Representative Kucharski kind of summed it up very well. He has had some personal experiences along these lines and on a discussion one time riding home, I decided to put this Bill in. We know from very personal experience, it is a necessary Bill and I would encourage an 'aye' vote at this time."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty."
- Getty: "I'm not quite sure I understood the Lady. I thought that

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- she had agreed to take off Amendment #1. She could take it back right now and do it, I would think."
- Barnes: "I would be very willing to do that, Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Then I would suggest that she ask leave to take it back to Second then move it back."
- Barnes: "Alright."
- Speaker Byan: "Well, I'm willing to do that but I think everybody ought to understand that if the Bill goes back to Second and the Amendment comes off, in order to act, final action on the Bill today will require 107 votes."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, what the Lady, as I understand it, would be asking to do would be to take it back and not amend it but to table an Amendment and I think we have ruled in the past that where it is tabling an Amendment, you are not adding new substance and therefor, it would be back in the shape we were already familiar with."
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright, I misunderstood, Representative, you're right. I thought that she wanted to add another Amendment on. Alright, return House Bill 463 to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted to House Bill 463."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Lady moves to reconsider Amendment...Representative Katz, do you seek recognition? The Lady moves to reconsider Amendment...the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted to House Bill 463. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to withdraw Amendment #1 at this time from House Bill 463 and have it tabled."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #1 to House Bill

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- 463. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at this time I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 463."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 463 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 158 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present' and this Bill having received a Constitutional Amendment(sic) (Majority) is hereby declared passed. House Bill 463...or House Bill 473, Representative Leverenz."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 473, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz. Nice to have you with us this morning, Representative."
- Leverenz: "Good to be here, Speaker, thank you. House Bill 473
 would provide that all containers over three gallons for
 beer would have a deposit on them. This is a practice
 within the industry now and we're simply putting it into
 law. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 473 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Bartulis 'aye'. Representative Giorgi, do you seek recognition? Representative Brummer, do you seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber to explain his vote."
- Leinenweber: "We're operating rather quickly this morning but I

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

think people ought to know what they're voting on, maybe But: this is kind of a Bill that I don't everybody does. think, see why in the world that we should mandate a specific type of deposit on draft beer containers. It's opposed by the, seems to be the Retail Liquor Association. I think rightly so. This is an unwarranted interference in enterprise. If a draft beer distributor or manufacturer wants to charge \$3.00 or \$16.00 or \$15.00 and can get it, then he ought to charge that. If he can't get it, to be competitive he has to charge less then he ought to charge less, and I think maybe the price of the beer that some of us drink when we go into establishments might even be lower. This is a bad Bill and we ought to defeat it."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "That's the reason I asked you to hold up a minute,

George."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Leverenz in self-defense."

Leverenz: "Take the record before I set a record."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, before I get to the Century Club will you take the record, please?"

Speaker Ryan: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Did you want to poll the absentees, Representative?"

Leverenz: "Not really."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "He just tied the Bill with the guys that like to dance with each other."

Speaker Byan: "On this question there are 23 voting 'aye', 102
voting 'no' and 39 voting 'present' and this Bill having
failed to receive a Constitutional Amendment...Majority is

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

hereby declared lost. House Bill 477, Representative McClain. Read the Bill.

1-17

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 477, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act for Abused and Neglected Children Reporting Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 477 as amended deletes everything after the enacting clause. So that the synopsis of the Bill is inaccurate. There are basically four Amendments on this piece of legislation now. Pirst Amendment parallels the language now, presently used in the Juvenile Court Act....presently used in the Child Abuse Reporting Act and moves it also into the Juvenile Court Act. That's done because a lot of courts are interpreting from different Acts differently and it's inconsistent with the courts findings...many throughout the State. So, that Amendment was given to me by State's Attorney Richard Daley and it was confirmed by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. The second Amendment is also an Amendment put together by Rich Daley and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. It delineates what is the evidence required, prima facie evidence for abuse or neglect. It line items those matters out. It also goes into the idea of what's admissable evidence, what is a written record, also business records or what hospital official can actually certify what information receives from a hospital. The item that might be of some concern to some Members is that right now a minor is presumed incompetent to testify in an abuse or neglect hearing. What this Amendment would provide is that it's rebuttable presumption that a minor is competent to testify; which is a significant change in the law which everyone, at least

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

everyone I've talked to supports. Amendments #3 and 4 were proposed by Mr. Getty. They reinstate the confidence reliance between a husband and wife and I support Amendments 3 and 4. I think that pretty much clears up this piece of legislation. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The question is,

'Shall House Bill 477 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 159 voting 'aye', 2

voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having

received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared

passed. House Bill 490, Representative Kane."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 490, a Bill for an Act in relation to collective bargaining by firefighters, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 490 establishes a collective bargaining process for the firefighters in the State of Illinois. ... Let me briefly down the particular provision of this collective bargaining Bill. The bargain unit is limited to unions made up exclusively of firefighters, secret ballot election on representation which would be handled by the Director of Labor, requires good faith bargaining on the part of both the union and the municipality. House Bill 490 prohibits mediation requires fact-finding, Ιt strikes. conciliation by the Director of Labor. It provides for a period, provides for binding off cooling arbitration, provides for the enforcement of any agreement or finding by the arbitrators in circuit court, and union membership or membership in the bargaining unit is not

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

This is a good collective bargaining Bill. It mandated. is tightly drawn, limited. It is conservative. There are some who will object to any kind of collective bargaining for public employees on the basis that collective bargaining is bad in itself in any form - that it will lead to labor unrest, strikes, increased costs, and all of the other ghosts and images that have been dragged up since the first union was formed. These ghosts should have been laid to rest a long time ago because the lessons of history are clear that there are more disputes, more labor unrest, more termoil, more strikes, when there are no ground rules for both sides to follow, no responsibilities for either side to live up to, and no established legal procedures for resolving of disputes between employees and employers. When there are these ground rules and procedures, the friction is reduced and the number of strikes are reduced. If you look at recent strikes of firefighters in this country and also police officers that were bitter and prolonged in the cities of Dayton, Cleveland, Toledo, New Orleans, Louisville, Anderson, Kansas City, and Witchita. in states and A11 of these strikes took place municipalities in which there comprehensive was no collective bargaining agreement. In recent years in the state's of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio where there are comprehensive collective bargaining laws there have been some 60 strikes in fire departments in the last two years. But there has been only one firefighters strike in a state that has had a comprehensive collective bargaining Act, and that strike was in Milwaukee and was caused because the City Council postponed the agreement that they had agreed to at the bargaining table. Some have raised the question that arbitration and the process of arbitration will take control out of the hands of elected officials and put that

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

control into the hands of the arbitrators. In states that do provide for collective bargaining and arbitration and binding arbitration usually the number of strikes that go to arbitration are between five and eight percent. is only one state that has gone to arbitration...or the number of strikes or disputes that have gone arbitration that have been any significant number and that has been Pennsylvania. If one makes a study of difference between the costs of arbitrated awards and words been negotiated, there is no significant that ha ve difference between the level of awards in cases that have gone to arbitration and those that have been negotiated between the two parties in the same area. And so I would say that if you want to reduce strikes, if you want to reduce employment disputes, we need to have the kind of collective bargaining law that House Bill 490 puts into effect. This is a good collective bargaining system. Collective bargaining as a means of resolving disputes has proved to be good and effective, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 490."

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

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

House. Would the Sponsor yield to a question..."

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "Representative Kane, I notice in Section 3 Item D...Paragraph D there is a phrase in here that says in effect after it talks about the rights of the firefighters self-organization, 'forum join', etcetera, etcetera, come down to Item D and it says they have the right to refrain from any and all such activities. That is correct, is it not?"

Kane: "You read well."

Hudson: "Isn't that...if they have the right to refrain from any

- 45th Legislative Day May 18, 1981

 and all of these activities, isn't that in a sense a right
 to work concept?"
- Kane: "I think what you need to do is also look at Section 9 which says that employers may make agreements with labor organizations relating to unions, security, agency shops, and fair share payments, etcetera."
- Hudson: "Thank you...thank you, Representative. That is exactly the next point I was getting at. In one part of this Bill it is purported that the workers under this arrangement would have the right to refrain, but then we go to the Section 9 that Representative Kane just mentioned, then we find that no, they really don't. Employers, it says, may make agreements with labor organizations relating to union agency shops, etcetera, etcetera. security, understanding, and I would...this is another question that when you talk about union security you're talking about the possibility within that contractual agree...arrangement that may be arrived at, you're talking about the possiblity of a union or a closed shop, are you not?"
- Kane: "Union...union membership would not be required."
- Hudson: "Union security, what do you understand the term union security really means in a contractual sense? What are you talking about?"
- Kane: "It would be protecting the bargaining unit that has been elected by a majority vote."
- Hudson: "By protecting that bargaining unit, aren't you talking about a closed shop which is a denial of the workers' right to refrain from joining?"
- Kane: "I think we discussed right to work the other day and I don't think that this is an integral part to House Bill 490."
- Hudson: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill."

 Speaker Ryan: "Proceed, Representative."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Hudson: "Here we have in House Bill 490 a proposal that would mandate statewide collective bargaining, possibly closed door union shops - would mandate this on a state basis. And I am going to say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this Bill is couched with honeyed phrases. It iscouched with honey-like provisions that may seem sweet. It is not. It will allow for the things that we have just discussed. It, in the long run in my opinion, will be anti-taxpayer. In that, exclusive bargaining agents sitting down with their employees who happen to be governmental units, will decide on wages, hours, etcetera, things that the average taxpayer takes an interest in. Now, I am going to suggest under our system of government, government established and run for all the people. The people delegate powers to our Legislators, and these are...powers are given and they are created and operated by law. That is the Legislatures are. They give...the people give to these governmental units the power and authority to perform certain duties and provide services. Government so created and employed must employ people, naturally, to carry on the tasks assigned to it. These people are different I will maintain from those in private enterprise. These people serve, or should serve the public welfare. And I am going to say to you that as the labor leaders and the unions enter into this picture the function is not so much one of public welfare, but the interest of the union members. And these are usually identifiable with the union bosses and And when we equate...and when we union heirarchy. require collective bargaining which means, of course, the union representation exclusive bargaining agents, we are bringing them in, I will say, as co-equals to sovereign government to the exclusion of other groups. And I am talking about taxpayers, and I am talking about other

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

groups that might want to have a voice in these decisions as well as the exclusive bargaining agent. And I believe Government cannot be run in an orderly this is wrong. manner this way. It is established for all the people. It is established supposedly of the people and by the and for the people and not of the union, by the union and for the union. And this is where we end up under compulsory bargaining...collective bargaining. I think we should think twice before we put the state seal of approval on this idea. And we will see, yes, we will see strikes. There is no prohibition. There is a prohibition in the Bill against strikes, but I will warn you in advance that strikes can be called legally or illegally. We have had They are illegal. them in the City of Chicago. nonetheless, we have had them, and we will continue to have I am going to close, my friends, by suggesting to you that compulsory unionism in the public sector, odious as it may be, in the private sector is even worse. This is a dangerous Bill. It is probably one of the most far-reaching Bills that will come before you. It is a new concept, and I think we ought to think carefully. Иe ought to think more than once before we put the state seal of approval on forced, mandatory unionism in the because once we do this we have sector surrendered...surrendered a degree of state sovereignty which we have no right to do, and I am not just talking through my hat, Ladies and Gentlemen. Think about what The public sector is different than the doing. private sector, and we have no business turning over what should be everybody's business and the people's business, the taxpayers' business to an exclusive bargaining agent and making it co-equal with sovereign government. said a long time ago that a House divided against

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

cannot stand, and I don't think that our municipal government can stand this. Their rates are going to go up. This is a blow against municipal government. It is taking away...going to take away its power to control its own affairs and turn them over to exclusive bargaining agents brought in as co-equals to their government. This is wrong in principle, and if we vote for it I believe we are extremely foolish. I would urge a resounding 'no' vote on Representative Kane's proposal with all due respect to the integrity of this fine Gentleman."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Conti, I am going to turn the clock on 10 minutes."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I did introduce such legislation in the House last year with collective bargaining with a no strike clause. But what concerns me most of all with this Bill is Section 15. existing laws and ordinances which are inconsistent with this Act are hereby superseded. Pursuant to Paragragh H and I. Section 6 of Article 7 of the Illinois Constitution exercised by a home rule unit of any power which is inconsistent with this Act is hereby specifically denied and pre-empted. Now I am going to ask the question whether this is going to take 107 votes. Now: I realize that when the state goes ahead with their employees on collective bargaining, then it would only take 89 votes. But they are mandating this on municipalities and pre-empting these municipalities, I am sure that this would take 107 votes to pass. You might have a 'litical' rule there."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle. Are you finished?".

Conti: "No, I want...I want an answer whether it takes 107 votes
or 89."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle on that point."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think Representative

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Conti raises an interesting point, and I would hope to submit some reasons why I think the Chair should rule that this takes 89 rather than 107 affirmative votes. If you'll look carefully at the Bill, it also contains another sentence with regard to the exercise of concurred powers by those home rule jurisdictions. With regard to Article 7 Section 6H to the 70 Constitution, the provisions of that language as opposed to others dealing with home rule authority in the Constitution, I believe, require 89 votes in this case, and I direct your attention to the constitutional commentaries wherein two of the Members indicated specifically that, and I quote, that under Section 6of Article 7 the vote requirement in the General Assembly for a statute pre-empting any power or function granted to a home rule unit under this Section is less onerous than the vote requirement under Section 6G which is the other pertinent part!. And I would submit because of the specific language referencing 6H of Article 7 and because of the concurrent power allowed to be exercised this Bill, that you should rule that this Bill does in fact take 89 rather than 107 votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Your point is well taken, Representative Stuffle, and that is the ruling of the Chair. 89 votes. Have you completed, Representative Conti? Any further discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "Representative Kane, you indicated that settlements involving biding arbitration somehow were not a great deal higher in their settlements than those elsewhere. What...what authority do you use to say that? What statistics back you up? Who gave you that information?"

Kane: "I didn't say that they were not a great deal higher. I

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

said that they were approximately the same. There was a study conducted by...well, it was contained in a speech given to a national organization of firefighters in which the expert was going over all of the state statutes and the provisions of them and the results of them."

Birkinbine: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "The Sponsor has lifted from a speech to someone who is preaching to the choir about the beneficial aspects of public employee collective bargaining for firefighters indicating that this is really no more expensive than settlements without biding arbitration. Well, that simply flies in the face of the facts. The...as a matter of fact the Wall Street Journal a few weeks ago had an article saying that the nationwide experience involving binding arbitration has at best been disasterous. In fact, I think California...the California is Legislature Bill that would abolish any and all considering a agreements that have gone into effect involving binding It is an extremely expensive...it is an arbitration. extremely strange way about coming to a settlement. Imagine bringing in an outsider who has no connection with a particular municipality, a particular village. entire concept may have a nice sound to it, but in every single state, every single state, and I challenge the Sponsor of this Bill to name one state in which public put into effect employee collective bargaining has been with or without a strike clause in which strikes have not increased dramatically. The record shows that whether or not there is a no strike clause in such collective bargaining agreements makes no difference whatsoever. if you can name...if anyone here can show the experience of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

states that have gone into public employee collective bargaining even with or without binding arbitration, with or without a no strike clause in which strikes have not increased dramatically, then it will be a new source of information because every study that I've seen, every study that I've seen published and know of shows that when you go into collective bargaining arrangement you are changing the entire way municipalities deal with their people. And strikes turn out to be a natural result. The closest example that we can draw from is Michigan, northern industrialized state, a neighbor. They had in about the 7 year period before they went to public employee collective bargaining, they had fewer than 10 strikes over that entire period. Within the next couple of years after that, the strikes were over 100. It is a dramatic change, and I don't think we want to do that. In fact, I know, as do the Democrats from the City of Chicago, they know that Byrne does not want to do this thing irrespective of the comments and promises she may have made to the firemen during her campaign. It is a bad idea and I recommend a vote against it."

- Kane: "In answer to that question I would cite the three neighboring states of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa and compare their strikes with Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and I think that you would see a substantial difference."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Mr. Speaker, In answer to the last speaker's question, the State of Oregon had one strike when the city reneged on a guarantee to a workable agreement. The city was at fault because they broke every bit of arbitration that was agreed to. The State of Michigan which you just mentioned, there has never been a firefighters' strike in the State of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

There might have been public employees. Michigan. mentioned the State of Michigan. I'm glad you brought up because firefighters have not had a strike in the State of Michigan since they ve had this type of legislation. experience with this...I've been dealing with it 12 years as a negotiator for the firefighters' union. Our city officials have told us for the last eight years they'd rather give us the right to strike than the right to collective bargain. Our present administration as much as two months ago told us the same thing, 'Go ahead and strike. We'd rather have you strike', because they're afraid of getting beat at the bargaining table. employees have been held back for so many years, there is no doubt that the first two years the city is going And they usually come up a little bit...as a looser at the bargaining table. But it is catching up with for what did to employees, if you are an administrator, for the last 25 or 30 years. And all this is is giving them a chance to bargain for what they have coming. The...biggest opposition that we have to this from city officials are irresponsible administrators who can't treat employees right and they say, 'The only way you'll get collective bargaining is go to the state house and get it. And this is why for the last six or seven years we've been coming to Springfield to try to get this collective bargaining Bill because we've been told that we're not going to get it especially in our smaller communities until the state house gives it to you. And then we will abide by it. strikes are very minimal in the states that have had it. The records...you have been given literature from the International Association of Firefighters pertaining to this, the amount, and the numbers in the states which currently have collective bargaining. I am asking you for

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

the protection of these men. I don't want to see what happened in Normal, Illinois four years ago when these men were followed around with armed guards, firefighters going The kids couldn't even walk into the firehouse to fires. yard to speak to their fathers. The armed guards would run them away from the doors of the firehouses. This isn't a very good scene. The only winners in this are the attorneys who collect a big lawyer fees. All it amounts to is loss of time and money for firefighters and Administrators, it is a loss of newly elected sentences. officers. It is a hazard to the elected offices in that I am asking you, this is the only resource the community. firefighters have to stop from striking. My city had a strike, and we have settled for under the cost of living for the last eight years. And we have not had a We are begging for this Bill, holding off from having a strike hoping that we do get treated fairly at the I am begging for this Bill. This bargaining table. Legislator (sic) will be here two years from now, four years from now, ten years from now. If it doesn't work we can take it back away, but give us a shot at it. Give us one shot at it and let us prove ourselves I am begging you. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative Kane, your Bill provides for collective bargaining and compulsory arbitration, but in the event that fails and the parties go to strike, is there any penalty in here after...after giving the unions the right to collective bargain and arbitration, is there any

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

penalty in the Bill against the union itself if they call an illegal strike?"

Kane: "If they go to binding arbitration, the findings of the Arbitrator Panel are enforcable in circuit court. If you look at Section 10 you'll see the penalties for a firefighter who participates in strikes in violation of the Act."

Schuneman: "But no penalty directly to the union. It is to the individual members of the union. Is that correct?"

Kane: "That...that would have to be handled under Section 10 or in a court proceeding."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that question and the answer that was just given is the principle reason tht we should not pass this Bill. I understand that firefighters and other public employees want to bargain collectively, and I have no problem with I understand that they would like to have binding arbitration, and I have no particular problem with that. The problem is that strikes by public employees are illegal, and they strike in spite of it. And there is no way that you can effectively enforce a law such as this. It will encourage strikes by public employees, and I think the only logial thing that we can do here in Illinois is to stop this kind of legislation before we become another statistic with other states who have passed similar laws who have increased the number of strikes in the public sector. Every record that I have been able to find, every credible study that's every been made on this matter would indicate that when you pass legislation of this kind you have more strikes in the public sector than you do without this kind of legislation. We should vote 'no' on this

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunn."
- "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Dunn: that any Member of the General Assembly who has had any experience in local government would find this Bi11 offensive. I think it is a violation of local control. At this time we have an option. You may join or you don't have to join. I don't think the state should mandate that we will have pubilc unions in that area. We have the health, the welfare, and the safety of the community in your hands. I don't think we need a third party pulling the strings. In my community we don't have a union in the fire department because they would never ask for one. We treat our people fairly. We have no overtures for union, and I would urge this to ... ! no vote on this Bill. "
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Kelly."
- Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, I would move the previous question."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries.

 Representative Kane to close."
- Kane: "I would yield to close to my Cosponsor, Representative Stuffle."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle to close."
- Stuffle: "Yes, briefly on the Bill. To touch a few points addressed on the other side of the aisle. First of all, we debated the right to work question the other say. I think that was soundly defeated. I think secondly we ought to keep in mind that firefighters are people. Public Employees are people. The public employees and firefighters pay taxes like the rest of us. They are

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

asking for the same rights that the rest of us have under this particular piece of legislation. Representative Schuneman suggested that there is no penalty if indeed after the arbitration proceedings are conducted there still happens to be a work stoppage. Well, indeed he knows that the provisions of this Bill in the low otherwise would indicate that the employer can certainly go to circuit court can certainly seek relief and that if a union or its Members or its officers refuse to live up to an order of a court, that they can certainly be punished for a contempt of that particular court. Very briefly, the Bill provides for no strikes as we indicated in Section 4. It provides only a permissive agency shop. It is not imposed by law in any way in Section 9. It provides no work - no pay. provides binding arbitration, and to that point I would simply say this, when previous Bills have allowed or suggested the right to strike. Those who oppose this concept have said, 'No, we should have arbitration'. the Bill now provides for arbitration they suggest, 'No, we should have the right to strike. , and we know they don't want either one. I suggest to you and reiterate to you the arguments of Representative Kane. Sixteen states studied since they have had a comprehensive collective bargaining Bill for firefighters have had absolutely no strikes Sixteen major states that have their jurisdiction. collective bargaining in the comprehensive form have had no strikes. I lastly submit to you that comprehensive. It is fair. It provides for a Majority to rule, and it gives to firefighters only what those people in private employment already enjoy. I would ask for your 'aye' vote on behalf of Representative Kane and myself and the consideration of the arguments made here today."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 490 pass?' All

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Leinenweber to explain his vote."

Leinenveber: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ι am sorry that the Membership...or the Sponsor didn't address the question of the State Mandates Act which I think is a very important consideration for those of you who are about to vote on According to the Department of Commerce this. Affairs, the State's Mandate Act applies in two Community separate areas. The requirement that arbitrators be hired constitutes a service mandate for what is reimbursement of 50 to 100% of the increased cost is required under the State's Mandate Act. But more importantly the requirement that the parties submit to binding arbitration constitutes a personnel mandate because it pertains to salaries, wages, working conditions and fringe benefits. Under the State's Mandate Act, all of the costs atributable to arbitration must be reimbursed by the State of Illinois. And the total annua1 cost according to the Department could be substantial, but no data is available on which to base a reliable estimate. So you're voting absolutely in the dark for what this is going to cost the State of Illinois on down the road. Those of you who favor the State Mandate Act ought to know what you're doing. You may be imposing on the State of Illinois a horrendous cost. If it determined somewhere down the line that the ... the personnel mandate consists of the difference of the offer of the local government and what figure the arbitrator settles. So I think we ought to very seriously consider what we're doing."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any...Representative Bluthardt to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

speak against the Bill. It has been my observation that police and fire personnel salaries and fringe benefits have increased more rapidly than the other municipal employees and also those in private industry. I think they are well taken care of. If that we not so we wouldn't have so many making applications for those jobs. My feeling in the matter has always been that when a policeman or a fireman is sworn into duty, he swears to uphold the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Illinois, and the ordinances of local government. And in return he has received the compensation provided from time to time by ordinance. It seems to me that is a contract. That is a contract he ought to live up to. I see no need for this. I think the vast majority of municipalities along very well with their employees, especially their police and firemen. I think this would only invite strikes. It would take away the authority that the newly elected officials of municipalities have to operate the government, and I am glad to see that it hasn't quite enough votes. I hope it doesn't get any. Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wikoff to explain his vote. Just a minute, Representative. There is no filming during explanation of vote for you cameramen in the balcony. The light is off. Proceed."
- Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote on here those of you who would like to see the responsibility of the local elected officials transferred to a disinterested third party, vote 'yes'. If you want to keep some responsibility in your local elected officials, vote 'no'."
- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kane, do you seek recognition? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are...there are 106 voting "aye", 39 voting "no", and

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- 3 voting 'present'. Representative Kane. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 519. Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Having voted on the prevailing side I would move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 490 passed."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, you're on House Bill 5...House Bill 490?

 Back on House Bill 490. Now make your Motion."
- Kane: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move that the vote by which 490 passed be reconsidered."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that Motion lie upon the table."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves that the Motion lie on the table.All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. House Bill 519, Representative Hoxsey."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 519, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act and the Workers' Occupational Disease Act, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoxsey on 519."
- Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to place 519 in Interim Study in the Labor Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Put House Bill 519 in the Labor and Commerce
 Committee. Out of the record. House Bill 531,
 Representative Catania with Representative Peters in the
 Chair."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 531, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Yes, while we are waiting, there seems to be a great deal of discomfort in the Chamber because of the temperature. I wanted to know if the Chair could find out

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

if they've got the air-conditioner on or what the hell's the matter. But it's really uncomfortable in here and if the Chair can do anything about it, I'm sure that he would certainly please all of the Members."

Speaker Peters: "A number of Members have complained and the Clerk's office is making some inquiries with the engineers or whoever's in charge of that. Representative Bower suggests more Members talk. Representative Bower."

Bower: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I rise on a point of personal privilege. You and Speaker Ryan have certainly gone out of your way to try to make certain that only those parties who are authorized on the floor of the House are here, but I wanted to point out that two nights ago I was watching an evening news cast on television, which the cameras zeroed in on various Members on the floor of the House and as television often does, they tried to find some people in embarrassing situations to put the General Assembly in a bad light and they dwelt for quite some time on . somebody that was reading the newspaper. It happened that that person was not a Member of the General Assembly. To my knowledge, they had no legislation pending at the time. I would just merely like to point out to those people who are on the floor of the House, if you're not Members of this Body, don't do anything that's going to embarrass this Body because I think we do a good enough job of doing that ourselves."

Speaker Peters: "It is now the intention of the Chair to go to a special order. House Bills on Third Reading dealing with the Regional Transportation Authority. The first Bill on that special order, House Bill 531, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thanks for telling me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
would like to clarify at the outset that I really didn't
know that I was going to get to lead off a special order."

Speaker Peters: "Okay, Representative Catania, it's not a special order, it's a special subject matter."

Catania: "A special subject matter, okay."

Speaker Peters: "Yes."

Catania: "Thank you, Representative Collins, I think you're special too."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike. Excuse me.

Representative McPike."

- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day we objected to this because you could narrow in on any subject you wanted. Mosquito, mosquito abatements, you could narrow it down to turn right on red if you wanted to and just hear that Bill. Consequently, you could skip all over the Calendar and take anyone's Bill and I object to it again today. It's not within the rules and I don't think that the Chair is following the rules in so doing. But if you're going to ignore what I'm saying and proceed, we would request a list of the Bills that are going to be heard on this order of business."
- Speaker Peters: "The list, Representative, is as follows, 531, in this order. They will be called in this order; 531, 533, 829, 1270, and then back to the top of the list, 186."
- McPike: "Thank you for the list but again, I object to doing this. I think you are completely outside the rules of the House."
- Speaker Peters: "Sponsors of 531, Representative Catania; 533 is

 Catania; 829 is Stanley; 1270 is Pullen; 186 is O'Brien.

 Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "What's the next few hours going to be? Republican oratory day, here today? Mr. Peters, where on the Calendar

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

is 531 now?"

- Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Chair. 531 was the next in line and under our rules, you therefore have the right to go to all Bills pertaining to that subject matter and I apologize to the Chair because it is completely within the rules. This is not what happened the other day when you just decided to pick something out of the record. So, I owe the Chair an apology."
- Speaker Peters: "It just was a misunderstanding. No need to apologize, Representative. Representative Stearney."
- Stearney: "I have an inquiry, Mr. Speaker and that is why House Bill 155 is not on that list?"
- Speaker Peters: "Well, the "
- Stearney: "Was that decision to place them on the list discretionary with the Speaker?"
- Speaker Peters: "No, we..."
- Stearney: "Because it seems to be rather arbitrary since it deletes my Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Your point probably is well taken,

 Representative Stearney. I would ask that you would just

 come up and discuss it briefly with the Parliamentarian."

 Stearney: "Will that accomplish anything?"
- Speaker Peters: "I think it may well. Representative Priedrich, no? Representative Priedrich."
- Friedrich: "Well, I'm just going to suggest that the Members on the other side of the aisle would let the Speaker run the House. I think we could get along better."
- Speaker Peters: "House Bill 531, Representative Catania, proceed.

 The Bill has been read for a third time."
- Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 531 simply establishes the mechanism so that the payments that the Governor has now speeded up to the RTA

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

can be made in an appropriate and timely way. It in no way changes what he has now begun. It simply says that 'on or before the 25th day of each calendar month the State Department of Revenue shall prepare and certify to the Comptroller the amount to be paid to the Authority which shall be the then balance in the Trust Fund outside the State Treasury. The balance shall be the amount collected by the Department during the second preceding calendar less any estimated payments or refunds made by the Department during the second preceding calendar month and an estimated amount collected during the preceding calendar This is the mechanism that was written out by the month. Department of Revenue in the Amendment that we adopted Committee on Transportation. It's the procedure the suggested by the Auditor General. As I say, it simply establishes the mechanism for the procedure that has now. been initiated. It came out of Transportation unanimously, 11 to nothing and I ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "On the Bill, Representative Giorgi. On the Bill Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have no objections to this Bill. It, I think, puts into the Statute and sanctions the actions that the Governor has already taken. For that reason we think that it should be passed and would support it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

Deuster: "Representative Catania, I recall the Governor or someone saying that one way to help the RTA would be to speed up one payment but that could be done once and it

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

couldn't be done again. I'm wondering whether House Bill 531 ratifies that one time speed up and you're nodding yes, let the record indicate."

Catania: "Yes, it has now been speeded up. This simply establishes the mechanism for the continuing payments. It will never again speed up anything. That has been done. The Bill was, of course, introduced before the Governor did that. He has now taken that step and the Department of Revenue actually has no mechanism with which to proceed now that he has speeded it up. This establishes that mechanism in an orderly way that the Department of Revenue put into the Amendment in Transportation Committee."

Deuster: "So, this is going to ratify and clarify the procedure that's already been accomplished and under way?"

Catania: "That's right. It just clarifies it and sets it up in a reasonable fashion."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, question is 'Shall, House Bill 531 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Mr. Clerk. aye . record, Piel, You're Representative Schuneman, would you just reach over and vote Representative Piel 'aye'. I'm sorry, add Piel. this...Representative Miller 'aye'. Piel and Miller 'aye'. On this question there are 144 voting McCormick aye'. 'aye', 16Representative Zwick. Greg, Zwick's button is not flashing here. Pardon. Representative Zwick, proceed."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to explain my 'no' vote by saying to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

you that if you believe in loans, then you vote 'yes'. But you may call it anything you like. In effect what this is, anytime you give someone money when they're not really entitled to it....as far as I'm concerned, that coincides with the definition of a loan and that is exactly what this does. It sets up a process to advance the money before they are entitled to it as the law stands now. So that if you don't believe in a loan in bailing out the RTA or the CTA then you should be voting 'no' on this. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 144 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Najority is hereby declared passed. Piel, McCormick and Miller were to be added as voting 'aye'. House Bill 533, read the...Representative Catania. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 533, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 533 does exactly what the Digest says. It simply reduces the compensation of the Directors of the Regional Transportation Authority per day from \$200.00 to \$100.00. It does not in anyway reduce the annual salary which they are able to achieve, which is \$25,000, they just have to work twice as many days to get there. Right now the situation is, that if they go to a 15 minute or half hour meeting they are paid \$200.00 for that one time effort on that day. I have always felt that this was a rather extravagant reimbursement. I'm not in favor of cutting peoples salaries but this does not do that, and I think that right now they probably will be working twice as many days as they have in the past anyway during the crisis that

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

they're having. So, they'll be getting paid for the days that they're working instead of running out of their time for which they get paid and maybe that will increase their enthusiasm to help bail out the RTA, to put together creative solutions to the problem, and I ask for your support on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in support of this Bill and indicate that the idea for this legislation really came from a member of the RTA Board. Those of us from Lake County had a Saturday luncheon meeting with Sidney Danhoff, who is our RTA Board member and Sidney is not a politician or an elected public official but rather a businessman. who to controlling expenditures, balancing is accustomed budgets and running things efficiently. And Sidney Danhoff said to us that we need to economize in the RTA. what we need to do. We need to...to do some things to control our cost and we ought to set an example at the top. He said that he believes the Members of the RTA Board really, before they move on to suggest renegotiating contracts or controlling costs or whatever else needs to be done, they ought to set the example themselves. suggested lowering the per diem from to 200 to 100. This is a good thing and it has the support of at least one RTA Board member. I think this is the we, in the Legislature, can also suggest that what the country needs and what the nation needs and what Illinois needs is to control the cost. I would urge your favorable vote for this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentle...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. We read in the newspapers some months ago that it was going to cost \$70,000 in compensation to RTA Board members to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

increase fares and cut service. This makes absolutely no sense at all as the newspapers I believe editorialized. Moreover, this is simply an encouragement for the RTA to dabble in operations. I think irrespective of whether you're on this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle, it's pretty general agreement that we want to get the RTA out from operations. That's a local concern and that is accomplished by this Bill. Finally, you know, we're not sure we're going to be seeing the elimination of the RTA given how slowly progress is come on the issue and so this is not just a technical change. We may be saddled with the RTA so it's important that we pass this Bill."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

 Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'

 Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', and opposed?

 The 'ayes' have it. Representative Catania to close."
- Catania: "Thank you for all the supportive speeches. Please vote
 'aye'."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 533 pass?' Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Peters 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 8...Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, do you think you could use your tremendous powers up there at the Chair by raising the temperature in this room by about five degrees?"
- Speaker Peters: "We have asked that that be done. It has been

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

brought to our attention by a number of the Members, both on the floor and privately and the Clerks are checking with the engineers to see what we can end up doing."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "On page 16, House Bill 829, Representative Stanley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 829, a Bill for an Act to create the Suburban Transportation Authority, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you very much, Mr., Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 829 was amended and it currently would abolish the RTA and create a suburban transportation authority. The CTA would remain as a separate transit agency with the Chicago City Council as the CTA Board and the Mayor as its Chairman. original deliberations, the Transportation Study Commission gave serious consideration to the creation of a suburban transportation authority. Today I think everybody realizes that the problems in suburban Cook County and the collar counties dealing with mass transportation significantly different than they are in the City of Chicago. I think indications of legislation introduced here by Representative O'Brien and Senator D'Arco regarding fares and other considerations indicate a very definite willingness to have a separate city transportation agency. The Suburban Transportation Authority would permit purchase of service agreements with the CTA, all commuter rail service would be able to be subsidized., CTA suburban service would continue, the Bill, itself, offers some tax relief...suburban Cook County. It reduces the current 1% sales tax to 1/2% sales tax. I think it gives the governing people in the City of Chicago the right to their

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

own self determination by the idea of whether they can tax, whether they can raise fares or whether they can streamline up to them and it's their and cut costs. It's Authority responsibility. The Suburban Transportation members would receive a compensation of \$10,000 per year and the Chairman would receive \$15,000 a year. There would be six from suburban Cook, five from the collar counties, one from each of the respective counties. I think this is a responsible action to the current crisis that we're looking at and I think it's a responsible action to how large the district is, and let me remind you of something. Cook County is larger than 39 other states, and the RTA region is larger than 42 other states. considerable differences and I would request a favorable vote on helping to solve the transportation crisis that we're now facing."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Findley."

Findley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In the gallery to my right are students from my hometown, Virginia, Illinois. The fifth grade classes of Kathleen Virgin and Linda Brew. Welcome to Springfield, students and teachers."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you Nr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 829 as amended, and as you know Representative Vinson and Meyer and I joined in the Amendment on Thursday night last, is clearly an attempt to produce a resolution of the perennial transportation problem that exists in the northeast six counties. The Chicago Sun Times today in an editorial called the suburban and the collar county Legislators cruel, cruel in this approach to mass transportation. They think we are perennial RTA haters and we are opposed to mass transit and

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

I can assure you that that, and to the Sun Times, is certainly not true. We're not opposed to mass transit, quite the contrary but we are opposed to inefficient and wasteful mass transit. We're not opposed to subsidies, quite the contrary, we're for subsidies to efficient systems. What we are opposed to is shoveling further money down Chicago's version of the Florida sinkhole that is the We're not opposed to labor, we're opposed to the excesses of contracts that prohibit inefficient labor yes, the Amendment that was developed the And, other night did address new situations in labor and the suburban mass transit situation that would be in the Bill. We have no problem with amending those situations to take care of the concerns of labor in the new services that will be developed in the suburban transit authority that's created under House Bill 829. I think it's rather peculiar that after Thursday night there was apparently a news black out in the City of Chicago over this issue. The dailys and the electronic media neglected to report what had happened in this House overwhelmingly by 98 votes to adopt this Bill as an Amendment to 829 which now becomes the Bill. rather patently strange to me because downstaters now Representatives and the collar county Representatives are all aware of the excesses inefficiencies of the RTA and CTA. I some times wonder if those riders within the city are aware of those excesses and that this issue if raised and this Bill when passed and signed by the Governor will let the riders and the citizens of the City of Chicago know that those excesses exist because to continue them, the City Council and the Mayor as the Chairman of the CTA will be obliged to raise taxes, unmercifully raise taxes, in the City of Chicago to fund those excesses or the alternative will be to reform, and

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

they will have to stand to election on that particular issue as they well should have to stand to election. I say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not just a self-help This Legislature is ready for subsidy, it's ready for the interim financing, it's ready for everything that we have to do to keep people moving all over the State, not just in the northeast six counties, but first...first the bottom line as evidenced here last Thursday night was all over this State, because that Amendment was Representative Meyer from Chicago, Representative Davis from the suburban and collar counties and Representative Vinson from downstate who brought it to you. All over this State people are saying, clean up your House. We will not give you more money until we know that you work. This is a good Bill and I solicit your support."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Meyer."

Ted Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 829 as amended abolishes the RTA and creates the Suburban Transit Authority who will provide the same commuter rail service and bus service at half the Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen this is...this Bill cuts the sales tax used for mass transit in suburban Cook County by 50%. In regards to the CTA, the Mayor and the Aldermen are given the authority to raise taxes if the fare box cannot support the system. This is a good Bill. taxes in one area and gives the authority to the City of Chicago to solve the City of Chicago's transit problems. The Democrats have...the Chicago Democrats have been silent in this Chamber for 45 days, 45 legislative days and have demonstrated no leadership in the area of mass transit Yes, no legislation has been introduced by legislation. the Chicago Democrats to try and solve this problem. and Gentlemen, the Cook County Democrats are Ladies

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

knee-jerk Democrats. Every time a Republican introduces a Bill they jerk and kick at it, but yet they provide no solutions and alternatives. Let's send this Bill to the Senate and sit down with President Rock and Mayor Byrne at the bargaining table. Let's get Mayor Byrne out of Cabrini Green where she did such a good job and put her in the bus driver's seat."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've been reading in the newspapers lately about the Burlingtion Northern...the Burlington being on the verge of going of business in the six county area. The Illinois Commerce Commission has said, well, we may temporarily stop that. But that's not going to last long. We have a very real crisis and it does not just affect the CTA it affects the suburban buses and it affects the commuter railroads and we are very close to seeing the Burlington and the Chicago Northwestern and all of the other mass transportation the suburbs as well as in the city come to a halt. So this is a very important issue. It's a critical issue. It is something we must take seriously at this point. Make no mistake, this Bill maintains the RTA, sure it cuts off the City of Chicago and the CTA but you're still going to have you're still going to have the bureaucracy, you're a RTA. still going to have the planners planning for service that nobody uses. You're still going have the bus routes with one person taking a bus. Keep in mind, as well, that what you're going to be doing as well is you're going to be increasing fares in the suburban areas if this Bill passes. Currently, the percentage of fare box revenue for particularly outer suburban buses is very, very low which means they are getting in some cases up to 75 or 80% subsidy. With this Bill in its current form what it will

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

do is it will cut down on the revenues for such a subsidy to the suburban buses and to the commuter railroads and the only thing you're going to be able to do is raise fares on the Burlington and on the Chicago Northwestern and on NORTRAN and on the suburban systems. This is not a well thought out idea. It's great, you can get at the City of Chicago but it's not going to accomplish the objectives that I think the Sponsor and the other people on the other side of the aisle would like to accomplish. This Bill does other things as well. It is a very strongly some anti-labor Bill. As Representative McCourt pointed out in It eliminates the rights for employees that are debate. currently guaranteed under the law. Now what does it do in terms of the City of Chicago? It makes the City Council responsible for mass transit. Well, one of the things it does, is it in effect eliminates even in the City of the one cent sales tax that has been used to subsidize mass transportation. The result of this is going to be to bankrupt the CTA. That's exactly what The one cent sales tax, the doing by this proposal. authority for that, is currently in the RTA Act. This Bill deletes that Section so there is no authority even in the The City of Chicago to maintain the one cent sales tax. only option is the property tax increase. That cannot come about fast enough. So what we have, is an invitation to bankruptcy, immediate bankruptcy on the CTA which is used not only by residents of the City of Chicago but suburbanites, who come into the city every day... Иe recently had a shutdown in Boston. We recently had shutdown for three days of their system where the people outside of Boston said, we don't need to subsidize Boston, you know, they're not efficient. You know, we want to take revenge on them. Well, the system shutdown and it cost the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

State of Massachusetts and the economy of Massachusetts untold millions and millions of dollars in sales tax revenue and economic gain. This is what we stand to bring about if this Bill is passed. It's going to bankrupt the It's going to continue the RTA and it's going to mean substantial increases in suburban fares. I think the Sun-Times was correct today in their editorial when they pointed out that the economy of the State of Illinois is an integrated economy. Ιt is vital that the mass transportation in northern Illinois be maintained and continued in order to protect our economy. Our economy is not very good as is. If you want to make it even worse, you vote for this Bill. If you'd like to see a more rational approach, we urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill and consider some of the other measures that will be coming down the pike."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think from the beginning of this issue this year we all knew there were three ways of dealing with the problem. Number one, we could impose a statewide tax or number two, we could impose a regional tax or number three. we could restructure transportation in such a fashion that it was possible to economize and to save money. This is an option number three approach. It structures transportation in a fashion in which elected officials in the city can make decisions about trade offs of service and costs and elected officials, elected officials in the suburbs make similar decisions. It replaces regional government with local government and it permits elected officials not appointed bureaucrats to make decisions about intensely political issues. There has been much discussion. I believe the previous speaker alluded to it, about the labor

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

problems in this Amendment and in this Bill. Staff advised us when we offered the Amendment that the language being deleted were free standing federal guarantees that were not necessary to be duplicated in State law, that the lanquage superfluous. Our intention in deleting it was only to assure...was only because that language stood on those quarantees were still provided. Now, I for one, have voted against right to work. Т voted prevailing wage and I voted for the firemen collective bargaining Bill that came up a few minutes ago. Ι matter of fact. anti-labor person. As a as I've mentioned before my father is a retired railroader and I understand very deeply what it means to be a railroader and to have those guarantees. I make a promise to those of you who join with us who are also not anti-labor people and I make this promise on behalf of every Sponsor of the Amendment and every Sponsor of the Bill that that language will be restored in the Senate not because it's but to allay any concern that you might have. Finally, I would say to downstaters, that what this Bill does is that quarantees that you will not have a tax imposed on you operate the CTA in its ineffecient system. To will say to this Bill suburbanites, I you that what quarantees in its structure and in its revenue forms that the trains will keep running. The RTA will not be able to close down the trains as they currently propose Your trains will remain running, and finally, to those Legislators from the City of Chicago gathered here today, it what this Bill does for you; gives you self-determination. It gives the right to your elected officials, the ones you choose, to make decisions about whether to cut back service, whether to raise fares or whether to raise taxes. It gives a great city the right of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

self-determination, the right of home rule over that city and I would urge adoption of this Bill. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the passage of this Bill. I'm opposed to the Bill because it is not broad based and the ... I feel that the Sponsors of the Bill are short-sighted in offering solution to the transportation crisis а northeastern Illinois. I agree with Representative Stanley when he says that there should be a separate agency manages the affairs of suburban transportation. matter of fact, that concept was contained Amendments that the Democratic Task Force attempted to offer to Governor Thompson's transportation plan as Representative Ryan. I with agree bу Representative Meyer that no one should allow excesses bν organized labor or by any organized association in terms of wages and conditions of work. I agree with Representative Vinson that there should be local autonomy for the CTA but at the same time there should be local autonomy for suburban transportation and for the railroad companies which operate the commuter trains. All of that is well and good and it all sounds good when offered in debate on this floor of the House but there's one key element lacking in the equation, this Bill does not recognize the rightful role as provided by the Constitution of Illinois for the State of Illinois to be involved and to support mass people of our transportation throughout the State. The State in 1970 at the time of the ratification of our Constitution provided that under the Constitution the State of Illinois has a rightful place in funding and mass transportation throughout the State. This

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

ignores that constitutional provision. This Bill ignores what has happened across the nation where we have seen from state to state, from municipality to municipality that there is a need for subsidy for mass transportation and that that need rightfully should be supplied by the State. This Bill provides no funding, no financing. short-sighted. It says to one little enclave in the State, the enclave that happens to be the commercial center and the commercial keystone to this State, you pay for this service on your own. You are responsible for moving people to and from their jobs. No one else bears responsibility to transport people to the Sears Tower, to the Standard Oil Building, to the First National Bank, to the Continental Granted that at least 50% or probably more of the Bank. employees in those buildings live outside the physical boundaries of the City of Chicago. Granted that those people travel from DuPage County, from Suburban Cook County, from the collar counties to jobs that are good jobs those jobs they earn a good livelihood that allows them to raise their families in a very nice suburban This Bill ignores all of that. This Bill environment. says, sure, certain people who work in downtown they will work in those beautiful buildings and then they'll go home and they will not participate in support of Chicago's mass transportation system. This Bill says, only Chicagoans will participate in the support of the mass transportation system in Chicago. So when we say that, who are we talking about? We're talking about the poor, we're talking about the black, we're talking about the aged, we're talking about those who should not be required to bear a disproportionate burden of support for And for all of those reasons, this Bill is this system. not good for the State, it is not good for the City of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Chicago. The Bill should not pass and I say to those of you who are supporting this Bill and offering these Amendments, many of your concepts are good but they are short-sighted and you lack the key, financing of mass transportation in this State as provided by our Constitution."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed? The 'ayes' have it. Representative Stanley to close."

Stanley: "I'll yield to Representative Klemm to close."

Speaker Peters: "As the principal chief Co-sponsor,

Representative Klemm, to close."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Klemm: the House. I think this is the first attempt that we finally have taken to strip away some of the problems and opening the door to the problems of mass transportation the RTA area. As you know we've always had funding of highways and funding of downstate RTA-CTA, combined as a package and finally, I think, we're addressing where the problem lies of separating both the CTA and the RTA in the City of Chicago and the suburban areas. Now...several years now. I've had probably the only distinction of General Assembly of having to vote to appoint some of the RTA directors. During our discussions with some of various directors through the years, we find City of Chicago saying, what does the suburbanites know about our problems and the suburban areas continually tell us, what do the people of the City of Chicago know about our problems. Well, finally we are separating the two entities in giving the local jurisdiction to solve the problems and

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

to provide the transportation desperately needed for both areas. The Minority Leader had said about the importance of transportation to the City of Chicago and yes, we agree the City of Chicago certainly benefits from that and Sears Roebuck and companies such as that receive the sales tax from the farmers downstate when they order their products from the Sears Roebuck and yes, all the commodities that we do buy from the city does receive benefits because of the sales tax those entities receive. So we do support many of the programs that are in the City of Chicago. I think one of the important things is that it was not the intent of this legislation to at all diminish the importance of labor negotiations and contracts, and in fact, we have in there specifically saying that the contractual agreements will continue and that you can renegotiate. It seems to me that the City of Chicago being elected by their aldermen...that the RTA members being elected by the suburban area finally brings the local control, the local input that has been so sorely needed and lacking all these years that the RTA has No needed...no longer do we need the large, been there. empty, rambling buses throughout the RTA with nobody riding because we don't need that service and if the City of Chicago needs additional service, fine, we commend you for trying to get it, and I think you would have the input. Ι think this is an approach that's reasonable. divert taxes from downstate to help pay a mismanaged CTA or RTA. It allows the local people to pay their own fair Home rule authority in the City of Chicago allows them to impose sales taxes. We are giving that authority to the RTA. We are giving them that authority to tax their own people and we think this is responsible. We think this is the approach that we should use to solve the problems. Thank you again and we wish and hope that you'll vote for

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

this good piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 829 pass?'

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Representative

Ewing to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, looking back at this issue you can tell why I'm putting a green vote up there. This is one of the few remedies we address this problem. The Minority Leader to. mentioned in his debate the plan Representative Ryan I would remind the Minority Leader, had he put the votes up there at that time, that plan would have sailed out of here. He refused to do so because of that we've come to realize the real problems with that plan and I think this is the best we're going to get. We better move something out. We do have to have a way to address this, all of us recognize that. Let's put the green votes up there."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pierce to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill as amended by Amendment shows why we need a Committee system in the Illinois House of Representatives. A major Bill was put together by Amendment that not only has anti-labor characteristics which could be expected from some of the Sponsors, but addition, is poorly thought out. It provides for an interim board appointed by suburban Legislators. The vultures are going to take over the RTA men who are so hostile to public transportation that they get red in face when they talk about it and against it. It provides for the politicizing of the board run by the Chicago City Council and Mayor in Chicago and by partisan elected officials in the suburbs to take over the public Transportation Authority that they create here, Suburban

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Transportation Authority. What would happen if this Authority came into existence? Number one, they would cut the sales tax out, they'd elect people that were hostile to transportation, they'd shift the entire burden...entire burden on the commuter, which is what they want to do have them pay 100% of its fares and then they would destroy the public transportation system. It's not surprising to me that those who've always been against transportation are pushing this particular Bill as amended. It is poorly thought out. It won't work, it's impractical. It's done to bankrupt the system and as a suburban Legislator interested in public transportation, I will vote against House Bill 829, as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen to explain his vote." Ebbesen: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at least this is one possible solution which is something that has some semblance of sanity and reality, and you know: the Minority Leader said something about we have to have something that's more broad based and that have to share this whole situation. You know, we talk about the possibility of a shutdown. Now when you start talking about sharing, where is the elected leader of Chicago, Mayor Byrne on this subject? You know we all know that there's a financial problem there and it has to have a solution but to this date I fail to see where she's acted She's not made any suggestions. It sounds like she refuses to negotiate and if she refuses to meet with Governor or the legislative leaders down here, perhaps she'd like to meet with the ... other than the leadership and the Governor and I'd be very happy myself, personally, to arrange such a meeting if that's what it's going to take. It ... that's your city, it's our city, it's the State's city...." (cut off)

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike to explain his vote for one minute."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Most people recognize that when I get up to talk I speak for the right's of working men and women and I find it rather comical that the other side gets up and says this Bill is not anti-labor and then I pick up the Bill and see how it's amended and see what they've done to people that for a living. The Bill says that employees of the Authority shall be given seniority, credit, sick leave, vacation, insurance, pension credits, in accordance with from the the records of labor agreements transportation system and it further says that the members shall have rights with regards to wages, salaries, hours, working conditions, sick leave, health, welfare, pension, retirement benefits and all of the language is stricken from the Bill. Republican Sponsors of the Bill get up and say, well this isn't anti-labor. It's just that they've stricken everything in here that protects working men and women..." (cut off)

Speaker Peters: "Representative Koehler to explain her vote. One minute."

Koehler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would suggest that more importantly this Bill asks for self-reliance, taking care of our own problems. Our downstate people pay our own way. There's no reason why the CTA can not make their own decisions and pay their own way. It's a good local control Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neff to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 829 went through Committee. We put it in a sub-committee and it was studied there for about three weeks to give a thorough going over, recommended out, 'do pass'. Came back to the full

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Committee and was voted out, 'do pass'. This Bill, I think, many people are taking the wrong conception of it. It's a Bill that may...would set it up to where each one would pay their own way and I...even the Chicago people that's voting against this. I don't understand it because it's a fair Bill for all the State of Illinois as far as mass transit, and I would hope that we would get more green lights."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas to explain his vote."

- Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it just Kulas: "Mr. warms the cockles of my heart to see and hear the compassion that Representative Vinson has for the people of Chicago, for my constituents. I am just overwhelmed by his compassion to stick it to the people of Chicago who are now paying the highest sales tax in the State, who are now paying the highest fares in the country. Well. I would Representative Vinson that if he is interested in Chicago politics, maybe he should run in шv district so that my voters could annihilate him. and Gentlemen, mass transportation is not just a Chicago problem, it's a statewide problem. Let's not stick it to one group, let's work jointly and work this situation: out. I would urge more 'no' votes."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester to explain his vote.

 Gentlemen and Ladies, please be patient. There are a lot

 of lights flashing here. We'll attempt to get to all of

 you. Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I notice that there are still some downstate Democrats who haven't cast a vote on this issue yet. This is a Bill that when we go back to our constituents and they want to talk about transportation they tell us, we want you to vote for transportation for the whole State but we don't

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

want to get fouled up with funding of Chicago mass transit and we've always said, let's separate the Bill. If we can separate the Bill then we'll vote for a road program and we'll let Chicago decide what they want to do Well Ladies and Gentlemen, here is that Bill. Here is a Bill we told our constituents that we would provide to them. Too long now, downstate Democrats have been sucking the hind teat of Chicago. It's time you broke Break away and stand on your own, because downstate downstate Republicans and collars and Democrats and suburbans, we can change the power structure in this State. Do it, do it now, show your independence, vote for downstate on this issue."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."

Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. House. I rise in opposition of this Bill, because it seems to me the only thing that ... that we say we're going to do, is to send it over to the Senate and then they'll work on something to solve this problem. Well, that may be thing...reason to vote for it but let me tell you this, we're never going to solve the problem with the philosophy that's in this Bill, that's setting up a chinese wall around the City of Chicago or trying to get Chicago to secede and become its own State. Chicago does need downstate and the suburbs. But let me tell you, suburbs and downstate need Chicago just as well and this is not the way we're going to solve the problem and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. Very briefly. I believe that the Membership of
this Body well knows that the provisions in House Bill 829
will not accommodate or help the mass transportation system

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

in this State at all. In answer to a Gentleman from the other side of the aisle, who criticized the Mayor of the City of Chicago, may I point out to this Body, that the Mayor was the first person to call for a summit meeting on mass transportation problem in this State. She also supported the Governor in his position on the five percent gross sales receipts tax on gasoline in this State. So as far as the leadership from our end of the State, I believe it's proven, but I believe that the Amendment that this Bill has accomplished will really do a total disservice to the people of not only of Chicago, but of suburban Cook. When you're talking about a closing down of a system and the fiscal implications which were just revealed once again in the daily newspapers in the City of Chicago this past weekend, what you're saying is that, yes the General Assembly cannot come to a conclusion. But in turn you're going to say, we'll gamble, we'll close the system and lose approximately a hundred and seventy million dollars a Where the heck are the priorities of this General Assembly in providing the necessity of public transportation, not only in the city but in the entire six county area? How in the world can you say we're going to jeopardize the loss of income..."

Speaker Peters: "Conclude the statement, Representative.

Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted for RTA over in the Centennial Building when we debated it just as loud and just as strong as we're debating this Bill today. We voted it and we voted it up and it hasn't worked. It has caused nothing but problems every since. And now we're saying, let's keep all these problems it's caused and we're going to throw more money

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

into a situation that can't be resolved. This Bill is going in the right steps of resolving a situation. I'm not saying it's the answer, but at least we can go back and start all over again and put the mass transportation system back where it was before we created this monstrosity with the RTA. Before this happened, we always funded CTA. RTA is a new situation which has been a bad deal..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Macdonald, to explain her vote." Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in support of this Bill, because I think most of us that have been here for this part of the decade that RTA has been in existence, know that it has been a failure. Certainly the need for mass transportation is the great and it is getting greater everyday in outer...collar county areas and also in the suburban areas. not anti-transportation or anti-mass So, are transportation. What we need is an equitable system that gives us the opportunity to define and decide for ourselves what is needed in our individual areas. Certainly this Bill is fair, because it gives Chicago its full home rule power to also take care of its problems in terms of mass transportation. Only twenty-five to thirty percent of the suburban areas around Chicago go into the City of Chicago for their work. So, it means that we certainly do need a mass transportation ... "

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi, to explain his vote.

There are still fourteen Members seeking recognition."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about downstate versus Chicago, Cook counties...collar counties. I don't think many Members of the General Assembly realize that over sixty percent of the sales tax generated in the State of Illinois comes from Cook and the collar counties. Same thing for the income tax. Same things for more fuel tax.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Seventy percent of the cigarette tax, seventy percent of the liquor tax, sixty-five percent of the utility tax, sixty percent of the inheritence tax, eighty percent of the racing tax that the rest of the State leeches off of the Cook County and the collar county areas. There are areas the State of Illinois that have State of Illinois governmental units and edifices, that they'd never be able to support themselves. The six county area up in the Illinois of needs eastern counties part transportation. And these attempts to dismantle the idea that they need mass transportation should go down in defeat."

- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Hudson, to explain his vote."
- Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The RTA-CTA complex was a colossal mistake when we first passed it. It still is. It is becoming increasingly known as the black hole of Northern Illinois, into which anything that comes anywhere close to it seems to disappear forever, particularly the taxpayer's money. This Bill in my opinion, will reduce the size of that black hole of Northern Illinois. And for that reason and that reason only, I will support House Bill 829."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff, to explain his vote."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a spokesman for..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Braun, would you please come up. Continue Representative Huff."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a spokesman for the Royal Order of the Spearmen, let me explain what I mean by that. The spearmen are very seldom listened to, but nonetheless we are gratified to hear the conditions are..."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative, I'm sorry, we got you cut off again. Start all over again. With the Royal Order..."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As consistent to our position as the Royal Order of the Spearmen, we're very seldom listened to. However, we sought some gratification out of the conditions that were articulated by the Assistant Majority Leader, in that the Spearmen have been raising these And it's showing itself in truisms for the last two years. Representative Levin was Burlington syndrome. the correct and for that reason we're going to give him an honorary membership to our order. This proposal that we're discussing today, proposes that we dig a grave for Chicago, Ladies and Gentlemen. But, I submit that in the end, it will not be the City of Chicago that will lie in that grave, it will be the State. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Everett Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele, E.G. "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge at least eighty-nine green lights on this good Bill. It provides a problems for mass transit in solution without...without a statewide tax increase. And, I urge that all downstate Legislators of both sides of the aisle support this Bill, because the people of our area, of Alton, of Granite City and of Mt. Olive and of Pocahontas and Effingham, we don't want to be taxed to pay for thirty-five thousand a year bus drivers in the City of We don't want to be taxed to pay for transit costs that have tripled in the last few years. want to be taxed in Effingham and in Quincy and Christopher and in Charleston for taxes that would support midnight bus service running empty in the wee hours of the morning, as they do in the regular course of the day. We don't want to be taxed for Sunday bus service that runs just as many

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

empty buses on Sunday, as during the week. There's a lot of waste and there's a lot of inefficiency and we don't need a statewide tax to solve this problem. This Bill will do it. And the people of our area and downstate don't want statewide tax increase to support these to а inefficiencies. And, I urge the support of all downstate Legislators from both sides of the aisle to support this Bill, so that the tax monies of our area are not going to siphoned off in support for these to pa y inefficiencies."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun, is your...is she...is your speak light on? Greg, make sure you check into that. It does not flash here. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank ... "

Speaker Peters: "Pardon."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Punch your...punch your button Representative.

Your speak button. What flashes here is the red. Go ahead

Representative."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the the switches are Just as House. caught...crossed on my microphone, I want to suggest that the switches are apparently crossed in this room, to see ninety-one votes on a Bill like this. This Bill, and Gentlemen of the House, I urge you not to cut off your nose to spite your face. To erect this kind of a barrier for Chicago mass transit will cripple the economy of the entire state. To preclude state support for mass transit is short sighted, is myopic and I suggest to you, it's going to lead us down the road to perdition. We have to see....have to understand, that Chicago transportation produces benefits for the entire state. And, for that reason the entire state has an investment in seeing to it

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

that Chicago mass transit is viable, that it is efficient, that it is working and that it is continuing to produce the benefits not only for the people of Chicago, but for the people of the rest of this state. To erect barriers like this, to close off Chicago transportation from any support..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative, last sentence. Quick."

Braun: "From the rest of the state, is a serious error. And, I encourage your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuchler, to explain her vote."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. We have before us a good Bill in 829. We have
two chances actually, to address the wrongs that have been
vested on us since RTA was enacted in 1974. We can send
these Bills, 829 and 1270 over to the Senate, or we can sit
here and watch the RTA fall down around our ears and bear
the blame for our inaction. I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster, to explain his..."

Deuster: "To the Representatives in Chicago, we would like to cooperate with you. There's many of us who feel that transportation is a regional problem. I think I was one of the first Representatives in 1973 to sense that RTA was a rip-off and the first sign of that was when Mayor Daley arranged for Pokarski to be the chairman of the board and kind of a stooge really, for Chicago. If we had a fair system for the suburbs and the city and you didn't try to rip..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel, to explain his vote."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my remarks to the suburban Cook County Representatives. Our people in suburban Cook County have been telling us, hey get the RTA off our backs and save us some tax dollars. Well this is the Bill right here, that will save us the tax dollars.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

This Bill will drop us from paying in suburban Cook County, from a hundred and thirty-eight point nine million dollars down to eighty-four point one million dollars, which is a drop from one percent to one and a half percent. This board...you know we hear about this appointive board doesn't serve us in suburban Cook. Well now we are going to have single member district appointed board from our own areas. What is the alternative to this in suburban Cook County? Higher taxes. And, this is statewide, not just in our area. And I don't think any of us need higher taxes at this time in the game. And, all I can ask is that the Members in suburban Cook County would think their votes over and give an affirmative vote to 829."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote." Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm a suburban Gentleman. response t.o the last Representative and I'm voting against the Bill. And I you know, when the leadership quits fooling around and gets serious about this issue, then we may be able solve it. But, this certainly is not an answer. slap in the face, this is a charade. It's not workable. Let's quit fooling ourselves. Let the leadership on both sides of the House and the Senate and Chicago and on the second floor to get together and come up with something will save that's workable, something that transportation for the City of Chicago and the State of Then I'll vote for it. But, not a charade like Illinois. this."

- Speaker Peters: "The Chair will recognize three more speakers, period, in this order. Zwick, Kane and then Balanoff.

 Representative Zwick."
- Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very briefly. We've heard a lot of rhetoric. But

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

I think this Bill is a statement, that we've had enough. I don't think..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Zwick: "I don't think that the Bill is perfect and it's certainly not everything that I want for the 33rd District, but it's a lot better than what we've got. It's a step in the right direction and that's why I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane. Explain your vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's been a lot of rhetoric here, saying that this is anti-Chicago, therefore all of the downstaters should vote for it. Well, I don't think that we're that much of knee-jerk votes. This Bill isn't good for downstate, it's not good for the suburbs and it's not good for Chicago. I think that the only alternative to this Bill, is not simply a statewide tax. I don't think that the Governor's program was a good program. This program isn't a good program and there's no reason to vote for it at this time."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Balanoff, to explain her vote.

 One minute."
- Balanoff: "I think Mr. Bluthardt and Mr. Kane are absolutely right. Those people who use the 'buzz' words to separate Chicago from downstate are doing a disservice to all the people in Illinois. We know that the only way we can solve the problems of mass transportation and correct the road system downstate is to vote for one complete package. You know that Chicago would not vote for one dollar for downstate roads, if there's nothing here for mass transportation. So, let's get rid of this bad Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Murphy, to explain his vote.

 That is the last speaker."
- Murphy: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Coming from the collar counties, I've opposed the RTA since its conception.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Even before it was put on the books, we worked against it. But with the Amendment that you're going to strip the rights of the working people that have contracts with them, I can't support it and I think you haven't left(sic) up on all you've been trying to do to the laboring class of people since we've been in session this year. We've had right to work, we're working on unemployment, we've been working on workmen's comp, Prevailing Wage Scaffolding Act and now you're going after the contracts. I disagree with the whole package, it's a setup."

- Speaker Peters: "Have all those who wish voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 99 "ayes", 60 voting "nay". Representative Levin."
- Levin: "We would ask...we would ask for a verification of the affirmative vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for a verification.

 Representative Stanley asks for a poll of the absentees.

 Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose do you rise,

 Sir?"
- Van Duyne: "For a moment of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Por four years now, we have a young man who has attended our school in Providence High School in Joliet; brought extreme athletic recognition to our school and put it on the map, so to speak. For the next four years he's going to attend DePaul and play senator...center, excuse me, for that team. And, I believe he's going to make DePaul a greater school than what it is right now. And, I'd like to recognize his mother at this time, who's up there in the balcony, Mrs. Goldie Downing."
- Speaker Peters: "For the information of the Members, a quick statistical information. We have now 382 Bills left on the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

calendar. Leaving two minutes for each Bill, we would need twelve hours and forty-four minutes. We have eleven hours and twenty-three minutes. There will be an update the next hour. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bowman, Epton, Flinn, Garmisa, Hanahan,..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I'm recorded 'no' and I should be 'aye'. Would you please change that, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Clerk Leone: "Huff, Margalus, Redmond, Slape, Telcser and White.

Concludes the poll of the absentees."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed with the verification, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman, Alstat,
Barkhausen, Barnes, Bartulis, Bell, Birkinbine, Boucek,
Bower..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative....yes, Representative Levin, for what purpose do you rise?"

Levin: "I withdraw my request for a verification."

- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdrawss his request for a verification. On this question, there are 100 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, for what...no. Representative Piel. What purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Piel: "Mr. Speaker voting on the prevailing side on House Bill 829, I would move that we reconsider the vote by which it passed."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis. Gentleman moves to table.

 Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed.

 It's tabled. What's the next Bill? 1270, who's the Sponsor? House Bill 1270, Representative Pullen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1270. A Bill for An Act in relationship

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

to public mass transportation in Northern Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr., Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1270, gives us the opportunity to do constituents have been asking us to do. provide a comprehensive solution to the severe problems faced by the CTA, without forcing the rest of Illinois to pay higher taxes to subsidize the CTA. It does not propose a five percent oil receipts tax or any other statewide tax increase. It should be supported by each and every Legislator, especially those who do not represent Chicago. It will set the city free to solve it's own mass transportation problem. It does abolish the CTA Board and transfer the powers of the board to the Mayor and the City Council and it gives the city government of Chicago, the elected city government, three options in how to solve the By raising fares, by cutting expenses or CTA's problems. by raising taxes. And, that should be up to the elected officials of Chicago to decide and under this Bill it would Outside of Chicago, this Bill would create two suburban Cook County transportation districts. One North of the northwest tollway and one South. The districts would be governed by eleven members elected from single member districts. Each collar county would be charged with operating the bus and para-transit service desired as well as subsidizing commuter rail service of its residents, as Railroad service would be under the jurisdiction of a commuter railroad corporation and the Governor would appoint eleven regular rail commuters to run the system. The RTA does remain under this plan, but only for planning, for applying for and distributing any federal assistance that may be forthcoming and acting as a centralized

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

It would be financed by voluntary purchasing agent. contributions from the various parts of the system, just the way the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission is board would be immediately financed now and the It does break up the RTA in terms of reapportioned. operating transportation. The RTA operating debts would be assumed by each district in direct proportion to the operating subsidies provided in 1980 which did not come Interim financing is proposed in this from RTA ta xes. Bill, to be backed by one year's taxes levied by the In the collar counties, the county boards could district. levy and borrow up to the present quarter percent sales tax, suburban Cook County's two districts could levy up to one half percent, a fifty percent cut and still more than amount needed to run suburban transportation suburban Cook County. Chicago City Council could levy whatever tax or taxes it wished, except an income or payroll tax. This Bill pertains to the labor provisions in therefore might the present RTA act and objectionable to some Members from the other side of the aisle than the previous Bill. I urge your favorable of House Bill 1270 to solve the mass consideration transportation crisis, by allowing people to pay for their areas and to provide that transportation in transportation as they desire, to put elected officials in charge, to bring some accountability to the system and to preserve mass transit in the six county area."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Kelly."

Kelly, D.: "Yes. I'd just like to ask the Sponsor a question or two about these eleven members that are going to be elected. You mention that they would be South of the tollway. Is that the East-West tollway....what tollway is it we're talking about?"

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Pullen: "Sir, I said that it would create two suburban Cook transit districts. One North of the Northwest tollway and one South of the Northwest tollway. So it would make a North suburban and a South suburban transit district."
- Kelly, D.: "Okay. What I'm interested in, is the...these members and you say there's eleven that are going to be elected?

 Like in my South suburban Cook County area, who would we have a choice of or who...what are the boundary lines for a representative that we would elect from that board?"
- Pullen: "Well they would...there would be eleven elected from that area and they would be elected from single member districts and they would be apportioned according to population."
- Kelly, D.: "Well, I'm just interested in knowing what that circumference of that particular district. Just like we're interested in knowing what the boundaries are going to be for our legislative districts. I'd sort of like to know what the boundaries are going to be for my mass transit district."
- Pullen: "This Bill sets up the boundaries for the South suburban transportation district, but it doesn't set up the individual election districts within it, because that would have to be done on the basis of..."
- Kelly, D.: "Okay. What about the salaries? What kind of a salary are we talking about in comparison to the current salaries being paid by the board of the directors for the RTA system? I think you're on the right track of something I'm interested in, Representative, but I just want to sort of tighten up some of the loose ends."
- Pullen: "I believe the salaries for the directors are...of the transit districts are ten thousand dollars, which is considerably less than the RTA salary now."
- Kelly, D.: "Okay, thank you."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Is there any further discussion? There are two
Members seeking discussion on this...to this. Three. In
this order, Representatives Levin, Madigan and Ewell.
Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To be brief, since this Bill is somewhat similar to the previous Bill, but this Bill goes even farther than the previous Bill. This Bill doesn't just say City of Chicago you're on your own, this Bill says City of Chicago you've got to pay the debts that currently exist for the RTA, irrespective of who's incurred the debt. Now what that means, is that the eighty million dollars that the RTA has been improperly withholding from the CTA, we're going to have that shoved down our throats. And in addition, there's approximately fifteen million dollars owed to commuter railroads, the CTA is going to have to pay for part of that as well. You talk about a prescription for bankruptcy and irresponsibility, this Bill is even worse than the last one. Now, this Bill goes another step farther, this Bill that we create sa ys transportation districts and the county boards are going to be the districts, whether they want to or not. And, we learned earlier that the county board presidents don't necessarily want these responsibilities, but under this to assume they're going have to Bill Now, in our investigations of local mass responsibilities. transportation in the suburbs and who is concerned, we found that the county boards are not terribly much However, we found that the suburban mayors and concerned. the village presidents are, they're the ones that came down and testified, there at the Committee of the Whole. They're the ones that have been talking to their local Legislators and they're the ones that should have the input

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

The county boards in terms of suburban representation. couldn't care two cents. Our proposal, on this side of the that came out of the Democratic Task Porce, aisle. recommended that in terms ο£ setting up suburban nomination should come from the representation. the suburban mayors and county board...and suburban village They're the ones that are concerned and as a presidents. result I would suggest that we defeat this Bill. even worse than the last one. It's even more punitive. It saddles upon the City of Chicago responsibility for almost all of the debts of the RTA."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Τ rise in opposition to this Bill for the same reasons that I enunciated in opposition to the previous Bill. there are many good concepts contained in the Lady's idea. Very few of us, probably none of us, will stand the development of local autonomy in opposition to Northeastern Illinois for transportation services. None of us will stand in opposition to the elimination of excesses by organized labor. But, we must always remember that this problem, the problem of moving people to and from work and to and from their homes and places of recreation will not be solved until and unless this Legislature provides a stable long term reliable source of financing for transportation in Northeastern Illinois. It will not suffice to develop patchwork arrangements that treat local problems with local solutions, but ignore the outstanding long term need that this Legislature and that this State is mandated by it's Constitution, provide financial support for mass transit."

Speaker Peters: "The final speaker, Representative Ewell."

Bwell: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? The question

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

is..."

- Speaker Peters: "She indi...Rep...she indicates she will.

 Representative Pullen."
- Ewell: "Question is, the three thirty seconds of the state's sales tax, how is that to be distributed? Or is that suppose to be the financial base of the RTA?"
- Pullen: "This Bill does not provide for the three thirty second subsidy, Sir."
- Ewell: "What subsidies does this Bill provide for? In other words, how's it suppose to be financed?"
- Pullen: "It's financed by local effort."
- Ewell: "Alright. Now, I understand that somewhere in the Bill that you're going to pass out the debts in terms of the subsidies. Is that correct? That they received."
- Pullen: "The non-sales tax subsidies, yes."
- Ewell: "Well, why would you exclude the sales tax when we in the
 City of Chicago pay a complete cent on the sales tax and
 the other districts pay a quarter cent? Why would you
 exclude that?"
- Pullen: "Because, the sales tax is earmarked and has to be spent
 where raised and actually Sir, I think probably you will
 find that this situation benefits the city more so, than if
 I had included the sales tax."
- Ewell: "Well, I'd like to speak to the Bill again very briefly.

 Again, Chicago is under attack by sources who always pretend that they know better, they know best and they can help solve the problems. They're always willing to dump the problems on us, but they're never willing to take their fair share of the costs for trying to solve these problems. Here again, you have to remember that the City of Chicago is a city which is in essence a repository for problems of the state. When the rest of the state has a problem, basically you decide the way to solve it, is to ship it to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the City of Chicago. But, you always manage to fail produce the finances that are necessary to support these Again, we have the same situation. The City of Chicago has a transit problem. You're telling us solve it. You will not give us any wherewithal to do it. Yet, you advocate that in any mass transit system the rest of state is entitled to money and the benefits except the City We have an inequity, an injustice that will of Chicago. surely come back to haunt you. This concept, although you have some good points, the Bill as it is written is totally unworkable and will create an unrealistic proposition for the City of Chicago to try to survive, unless you're going to allow the City of Chicago to retain part of their motor fuel tax funds which they send to the state, or a part of the Ag Premium Funds, or a part of their even sales tax or income tax. It simply cannot be done."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen, to close."

"First, I would like to comment to the Gentleman me the question about the salaries. I did misspeak, because there was a comprehensive Amendment adopted to this Bill. The salaries are not set in the Act, but because the members are elected, I would expect that their salaries will be considerably less than the RTA salaries. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1270 addresses a major problem facing this General financing mass transit in the Chicago area. It proposes that residents of each part of that six county area It gives the city...the CTA, the City of their own way. Chicago's unlimited home rule taxing power. If the City of Chicago and the CTA are those that have caused the greatest part of the problem in the RTA, then yes, it does cause them to provide the greatest part of the solution, which I think is perfectly appropriate. I don't expect many votes

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

from Chicago Legislators, though I would welcome as many as do wish to vote for the Bill. I do expect the votes of most if not all suburbanites and downstaters. This is one of the few Bills which will allow you to solve the RTA's financial problems without imposing additional taxes on suburban or downstate constituents. And in fact, cutting the tax in suburban Cook. Passage of this Bill, will solve the mass transit crisis once and for all, by allowing those receiving public transportation's benefits to pay for them. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 1270 pass?

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Present. Have all voted who wish? Present. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.

Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I request a poll of the absentees please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady...the Lady requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bowman, Breslin, Epton, Plinn, Garmisa, Hanahan,
Hoffman..."

Speaker Peters: "Hoffman, 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Jones..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative. Jones 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Klemm, Laurino, Leverenz, Margalus, Martire, McBroom, McGrew, Ted Meyer, Ozella, Redmond, Richmond, Robbins, Schraeder, Slape, Stanley, Telcser, White, Sam Wolf and Younge."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins. Robbins, 'aye'. Any further changes, additions? Representative Schraeder. Schraeder, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Pullen. Telcser, 'aye'. Peters from 'present', to 'aye'. Representative Tate. Representative Meyer, Roland Meyer.

1

45th Legislative Day May 18, 1981

Representative Klemm, 'aye'. Yes, Representative
Levin."

Levin: "Yes. If this Bill receives 89 votes, I...I'll request a verification."

other additions? Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Any What's the ... what's the vote, Mr. Clerk? There are 89 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'nay', 12 voting 'pres... Stanley, 90. You're recorded, Representative. There are 90 voting 'aye'. Representative Levin, asks for a poll of 91. Representative Christensen, 'aye'. absentees. Representative McBroom, 'aye'. That's 92. Anyone else before we start with the verification? Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman, Alstat..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Levin.

Representative Vinson asks to be verified. Does he have
leave? Leave is granted. Representative Schuneman for..."

Schuneman: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Does Representative Schuneman have leave?

Representative Levin."

Levin: "I would withdraw the request for verification."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for verification. What's the vote, Mr. Clerk? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Martire."

Martire: "'Aye'."

Speaker Peters: "'Aye'. Representative Leverenz, 'aye', Martire,
'aye'. Anyone else, now that it's passed? Representative
Laurino. 'No'. Representative Laurino, 'no'. Okay?
What's the count now? On this Bill, this Bill, there are
94 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'nay'. How many 'present'? 11
voting 'present'. This Bill having received the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel rise?

- Karpiel: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Lady moves to reconsider the vote.

 Representative Mays moves to lie on the table. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Motion prevails. On that...Representative McPike, in giving you the list earlier, I did not give you one Bill, which is 155. It belongs in that same order. 155, Representative Stearney. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 155. A Bill for An Act to amend the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 155 would establish the Chicago Transit Finance Commission, whose purpose is to exercise financial control over the Chicago Transit Authority Act. Now mind you, I submit to you and I say to you, this is probably one of the more realistic measures before the General Assembly dealing with the subject of mass transit, simply because it does not, does not provide for any new taxing powers, but simply addresses itself to the problem of how to hold down costs. Now the Commission would consist of three members, one appointed by the Governor, one by the Mayor of the City of Chicago and one Chairman appointed jointly by the Governor and the Mayor. Now the Bill, mind you, is an attempt to control the financial mismanagement that we have in the CTA. Remember the CTA receives the largest amount of subsidies from the RTA namely over 72 percent. However, they only contribute, the city only contributes 40 percent

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

of the RTA sales tax revenue. Now it's felt by many, including myself, that little control is placed on the CTA to keep costs down. The labor costs there are the highest in the nation and the fares have failed to keep pace. Now, this Commission mind you, which is the ... which has the essential power of rejecting a budget if it's not balanced and reject contracts that would cause an inbalance, here. I say, is a one feasible alternative to addressing ourselves to controlling costs. Because, if we do not you'll be back here eight months, one year control costs, from now or a year and a half from now debating the very same measure, namely whether we create a new five percent sales tax on petroleum products, raise the BTA sales tax or reimpose the gas tax in Cook County and the collar You've got to do something to address the counties. subject of costs, otherwise you'll always be faced with increasing taxes over and over. I'd be glad to answer any questions on this measure."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steele, Everett Steele."

Steele, E.G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this measure. Sponsored by Representative Stearney. It creates the Chicago Transit Finance Authority. I think it's a good concept. It provides oversight authority over the costs and helps to curb some of the abuses. This is the purpose, this is the concept in which it will control some costs and help to curb the abuses that many of us are very concerned I think it's a means of solving the problem without, without a statewide tax increase, which is a critical concern and a critical consideration. I think it makes sense. It helps control costs. It helps crisis every six months, as we've seen happen here in the last several years. It passed our Transportation Committee by an overwhelming majority and I urge your support."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is purely punitive and it has no benefits at all for suburbs or downstate. What it does, is to create a new level of bureaucracy. You still would have the RTA, but between the RTA and the CTA, you'd have this additional bureaucratic level and this bureaucracy isn't limited in terms of size. The Bill provides that this Commission can take as many employees as they want from the CTA., So, all this does, is to add to the cost of mass transportation which means that there's going to be less money for everybody else. We still would have the one cent sales tax in Cook County. We would still have the quarter cent from the collar county, but that sales tax revenue would now have to go to fund this new bureaucracy, as well as existing mass transportation. It's something which is simply going to add costs, it's not going to do for anybody. It's purely punitive, it doesn't provide for local autonomy in the suburbs. It in fact takes away from local autonomy in the City of Chicago. And as a result, I would arge a 'no' vote on House Bill 155."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

. Madigan: . Thr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stearney. He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Representative Stearney, what would be the complexion

of this board in terms of the appointments?"

Stearney: "Could you rephrase...could you rephrase your question please?"

Madigan: "How many members would serve on the board and who would make the appointments?"

Stearney: "We're talking about a Commission, not a board."

Madigan: "Okay. How many members would there be on the Commission and who would make the appointments?"

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Stearney: "Well as I said, this is a three member Commission.

One appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Mayor, one appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the Governor and one the Chairman, appointed jointly by the Governor and the Mayor of Chicago."

Madigan: "Was Amendment #1 adopted to the Bill?"

- Stearney: "Yes. It deals with the CTA board, not the Financial

 Oversight Committee. You're...you're a bit confused
 there."
- Madigan: "Thank you. And then, who would make the appointments to the CTA board?"
- Stearney: "Well, as we discussed the other night, the Governor would appoint five of the seven members."
- Madigan: "But today the CTA board, which is responsible for mass transportation almost exclusively in Chicago, consists of seven members. Four are appointed by the Governor and three by the Mayor. Can you offer any specific reason for the one change?"
- Stearney: "Well, you asked me that question the other night, when we adopted this Amendment. And the House thought my suggestion was best, simply because the Chicago CTA is unable to handle its own financial matters and continuously comes to the Legislature for a handout every six months or a year. And most Members who voted for that Amendment, felt that the state should put an end to this. At least create a board and create a new method of appointing members to that board, so that we could hopefully stop this profligate spending."
- Madigan: "I thought that would be the intent of the Commission."

 Stearney: "And the board as well. But, if you want it, in the

 Senate you could abolish the board...the CTA board as

 well."
- Madigan: "I see. Mr. Speaker, may I..."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Stearney: "If you're agreeable to that, I'll..."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "May I address the Bill?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this Gentleman offered a concept which most of us find acceptable. Governor Thompson in his transportation tax plan, Amendment as offered by the House Democratic Task Force. Both propose that there be created a fiscal oversight agency to oversee the financial activities of the CTA and also other mass transportation carriers in Northeastern However, as I have said in regard to the Illinois. previous Bills, although this Bill contains a concept which deserves favorable consideration, the Bill fails to address the outstanding need of mass transportation in Northeastern Illinois and for that matter, all over the country. transportation needs financial subsidy. It simply is not enough to say that we shall create a vise which will squeeze everything and therefore bring the budget into That's not enough. Mass transportation balance. Chicago, in Boston, in New York, wherever you go in the United States needs subsidy and this Bill fails to address that need. And for that reason, I stand in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion on this Bill?

Representative Yourell. You wish to speak, Sir?"

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Yourell: "Representative Stearney. Just on the overall concept of the theory of legislative efforts, haven't you always been opposed or a Co-sponsor of Bills to eliminate Commissions in the State of Illinois?"

Stearney: "No."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker. This is an inquiry not related to this Bill, but there are a number of Members back here who now feel that the chamber is warming up quite a bit. As a matter of fact, it's uncomfortably hot here and the haze from the smoking in here is getting thicker by the moment. So, I would certainly appreciate it if the Speaker could see that the ventilation is turned on, if it can't be cooled down. And it would be greatly appreciated if the Members would refrain from smoking until we cool this place down and ventilate it a little bit."

Speaker Peters: "Point is well taken. Representative Jones."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Jones: "Representative Stearney, is there a companion Bill, a companion Appropriation Bill with this legislation? I didn't hear you."

Stearney: "Not that I know of, but if we need one we can always get that."

Jones: "Well, I mean are you proposing that the Governor appropriate monies to the CTA, to help run the CTA?"

Stearney: "Not in this Bill."

Jones: "But, are you anticipating on doing this?"

Stearney: "No. We have a number of other measures. And as you know, when the Conference Committee Report comes back, there will be probably some alternative, some proposal in there to accomplish that funding."

Jones: "Well the reason why I asked you this question, is because I see on your appointment to the board, that the five members are going to be appointed by the Governor and yet and still you're not going to see to it that the CTA has any financing. Who's going to pay for the financing to run the CTA?"

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Stearney: "Well, hopefully the General Assembly can agree on some proposal. I don't know just exactly what the panacea will be. But, as to the board members, those seven members are already being paid. So the funding is already there. I'm not doing anything in addition to that."

Jones: "But, you are taking the authority and giving it to the Governor of the State of Illinois to appoint the board members and yet at the same time you're not even considering any financing. So, all I'm trying to understand, what you are...what are you attempting to do?

If...is the citizens of the City of Chicago going to raise their own revenue for a subsidy for the CTA?"

Stearney: "I think you've missed the point, Sir. The purpose of this Bill is to control costs, not to increase taxes.

Other Bills will do that."

Jones: "Well ah..."

Stearney: "First, before raising taxes..."

Jones: "I cannot see..."

Stearney: "...you have to control costs."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I'll just address the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Jones: "Here again, we have the old situation wherein the citizens of the City of Chicago who have been paying their way all along, we have a piece of legislation here that's going to be given to the Governor to control the board and at the same time tell the people of the City of Chicago you raise your own revenue. I've never seen anything so ridiculous in all my life. This piece of legislation, he's going to say we're going to give you five members of the board that will be appointed by the Governor and the Governor is not going to come up with one dime, not one penny to aid the CTA and yet and still he wants to control costs. You're not controlling costs that way. If you were

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

really concerned about transportation in the Chicagoland area, then you would let the people, the people who pay the tax at least have a controlling interest on any board. This is ridiculous, this legislation should be defeated.

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall the main question be put?

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed.

The 'ayes' have it. The question is, shall House
Bill...I'm sorry. Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I say to you that the Financial Oversight Committee is an idea whose time has come. Not only in Illinois for which we implemented this same proposal for the Chicago Board of Education, but it's going to come across nation simply because people in power who are not elected, but appointed by others are simply unable to control the ever staggering costs. Now, the other Gentleman asked me some questions and I say as to a bureaucracy will consist of three members. And that is not much of a bureaucracy. He mentioned punitive measures, but I think punitive measures are now needed simply because the costs are overwhelming and continue to mount month after month and there's never an end to this perennial and becoming a semi-perennial financial crisis. They say the But, the RTA may go. We've seen a lot of Bills just pass the House today, that may just do away, But we know one thing, and all of you can rest the RTA. assured, as sure as that sun rises in the East and sets in This is ridiculous. This legislation should the West. be defeated."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall the main question be put.

Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. The
'ayes' have it. The question is shall House Bill, or I'm
sorry, Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I say to you that the financial oversight committee is an idea whose time has come. Not only in Illinois we've implemented the same proposal for the Chicago Board of Education, but it's going to come across nation simply because people in power who are not elected but appointed by others are simply unable to control ever staggering costs. Now the other Gentleman asked me some questions. And I say yes to a bureaucracy would only consist of three members. And that is not much of a bureaucracy. He mentioned punitive measures. But I think punitive measures are now needed simply because the costs are overwhelming and continued amount month after and there's never an end to this perennial and becoming a semi-perennial financial crisis. They say the but the RTA may go. We've seen a lot of Bills just pass the House and they'll..today that may just do abolish the RTA. But we know one thing, and all of you can rest assured, as sure as that sun rises in the East and sets in the West, and as sure as rivers run downhill and not uphill, the CTA will continue to exist. And the CTA will come back year after year after year. Remember their budget is approximately 560,000,000. As of 1981, Cook County will contribute \$252,000,000 from the RTA sales tax. And of that amount over 73%, namely 183,000,000 will sent..be spent on services for the CTA. This cost is growing and growing and growing. The only way to attack it is to create such a financial oversight committee that is going to restrain spending and cost. Need I remind you

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

that bus servicemen, mind you, with their benefits are earning \$45,000 a year in Cook County. Those are fellows that wash the buses and clean up. Information clerks, a person who picks up the phone and tells you how to get from one end of the city to the other is getting...belongs in the very same union and is earning up to that same amount, Now tell me, you can create any new tax \$45,000 a year. you want. You can impose on your constituents downstate a 5% sales tax on petroleum products. You can create any new But one year from now you're going to be confronted with the same, same crisis, creating a new tax to fund mass transit. You've got to impose some overall restraining authority on spending, otherwise, you're...you'll have a never-ending problem. That is a simple elementary I ask you to vote 'yes' on this basic Bill." proposition. Speaker Peters: "All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 59

voting 'nay'. The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Bowman. Caparelli. Epton.

Plinn. Garmisa. Hanahan. Kane. Margalus. McGrew.

O'Brien. Peters. Polk. Pullen. Redmond. Richmond.

Satterthwaite. Slape. Stuffle. Telcser. Van Duyne.

White. Wikoff. Sam Wolf."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, Wikoff votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "And Wolf and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Any additions? Representative Davis.

Representative Davis, 'no' to 'aye'. Representative

Hudson, 'present' to 'aye'. Any other changes?

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Representative Leverenz, from 'present' to 'no'. Representative 'aye'. Speaker, 'aye'. Peters, Representative Telcser, 'aye'. Any further changes? Zito from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Zito. Further changes? Representative Pechous from 'present' to Any other changes? What's .. what's the vote, Mr. Clerk? This question there are 91 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 186, O'Brien. Representative Levin, for what purpose do you rise?"

- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, as a Joint Chief-Sponsor of this Bill, I'll be handling it."
- Speaker Peters: "Gentleman asks leave to handle the Bill for Representative O'Brien. Is there objection. There being none. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 186, a Bill for an Act to abolish urban transportation districts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Ladies and Gentlemen of Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House, this Bill takes a step in the direction I think this House would like to go in. It is expressed in some of the previous Bills of having local financing of local mass transportation. years the Legislature Several ago established the Urban Transportation District Act. terms of providing capital money for mass transportation. There was only one such district established and that is in the downtown Chicago area. And that district operated for several years and collected approximately fourteen million dollars in property taxes from the property owners in the downtown Chicago area. Now that district was going to be used and those funds were going to be used for a Franklin line. This line, however, Street subway

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

de...designated in 1979 jointly by the Governor and Mayor Byrne and is, there currently no plans to build this line. There are currently no plans also, as far as what to do with this fourteen million dollars. What House Bill 186 which was originally sponsored by Representative McCourt does is what is in Amendment \$2. The Amendment \$2 was agreed to in the Transportation Committee the text of it although it was offered on the floor of the House. And what that provides is that the revenues currently held by the Chicago, by the Urban Mass Transportation District would go to the CTA for capital expenditures within the boundaries of the district, the downtown area. And they would have to be used within the next five years. I urge your support for this legislation."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion on this issue? There is one speaker, Representative Lechowicz. Proceed, Sir. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this is on short debate is it?"

Speaker Peters: "Pardon."

Lechovicz: "Is this on short debate?"

Speaker Peters: "No."

Lechowicz: "Okay. First of all, I'd like to ask the Gentleman a few questions if I may."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Lechowicz: "On the fourteen million dollars that was raised by
the taxes raised locally on property, is there any rebate
in your Bill as far as that money being returned to those
property tax owners?"

Levin: "No."

Lechowicz: "Is there any rebate in reference to the federal money that has been raised?"

Levin: "Representative, there is currently no federal money that

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

they're holding."

- Lechowicz: "Of the fourteen million dollars there is some federal money."
- Levin: "Representative, the fourteen million dollars was intended to be used as a match for the federal money."
- Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly I m going to speak against this Bill. This is a Bill that is not new in its concept. Unfortunately, the taxpayers of the City of Chicago in 1969 by referendum which was approved by this Body adopted a proposal that would be self-inflicting tax on real estate for the purpose of eliminating the loop L structure within the City of There's been a lot of discussion and a lot of Chicago. money raised for that project. I personally believe that there's a very small group of people who think that with the elimination or the proposal that this Bill presents will alleviate a problem and help the CTA or the RTA Board. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I've got a parliamentary I'd like to know if a matter that's been approved inquiry. by a referendum by the people of Chicago in 1969 can be abolished by this Bill. Number one or else do you need a referendum to do it?"
- Speaker Peters: "The chair will study that question while we hear from Representative Davis. Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is an item that is presently within the courts. If you recall that the previous Mayor of the City of Chicago, Mayor Balandick, also filed a suit in the courts asking that the money that's been associated in this venture be transferred over for a different purpose. I personally believe that if we are going to abolish this system it should be done in a

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

justified equitable way. The people of that area should also have an opportunity to vote upon it if they want to dissolution the system and should be some provisions of returning that money that was raised by property taxes for a specific purpose in that area. I think that the CTA accidents that occured at the corner of Lake and Wabash was an indication that maybe the structured 'L' system as it exists should be renovated. There was a concept of a new 'L' system being created for the near north Michigan area where there's a tremendous growth of housing trying to bring people in from that area of the city to the immediate loop area in a quick and efficient manner. That was the purpose of that Board and for this reason I'm going to be I'm still waiting for the voting 'no' on this Bill. opinion of the Speaker or the Parliamentarian. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he'll respond."

Davis: "Representative Levin, if your Act succeeded it to the Governor's desk and was signed and the fund was abolished is the money to be used, and perhaps it wasn't listed close enough in debate, is the money to be used for capital improvement only?"

Levin: "That is correct, Representative. In capital improvement only within the original boundaries of the transportation district. It could not be used anywhere else within the CTA system. So, it would have to be used in the downtown area for capital improvements only."

Davis: "Now, what you're saying in other words, is that as it's currently structured and by the referendum and I'm interested in the chair's definition of that, that if the money is transferred to capital it can only be used in that small defined area that for which the referendum was

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

intended, when it was raised, and when the property tax was increased. And only for capital. Is that correct?"

Levin: "That is correct. Those are the property owners who paid the tax within the boundaries of the district and the capital expenditures under this Bill would have to be made within those boundaries."

"Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I somewhat agree with Davis: Representative Lechowicz, however, it's been pointed out to me that the referendum was very clear on that issue and I think this is a matter for probably adjudication. However, if this Bill should succeed there's fourteen million dollars sitting in that capital account at this point in And the referendum specified it be used in a well time. defined area within the CTA and the taxes were raised by those people for that purpose. That should be enough to sway 'yes' votes right there and certainly mine. I also vested interest in that during the another adjudication process in referendums of some ancient history can have a way of being interpreted by those in judicial system who have a reason and an agreement to do so. If we ultimately would pass this Bill, it's probably right that it should stay in the capital account for that well defined area. However, there may be an opportunity through the legislative or judicial process or by some agreement with a further referendum at some divert these monies that were raised locally in the City of Chicago, to operating expenses of CTA. And I have no quarrel with that because it's totally consistent with the idea that's germinated within House Bill 829 that we just passed. All of that going aforesaid and with the judgement of the courts awaiting us I suggest that it's not a bad idea that we do pass this Bill and that we do send it on to the Senate and that we wait and see what happens in the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

next six weeks regarding a substantial amount of money that may or may not converted to operating but certainly has been raised in that defined area and should be by referendum spent in that area if the courts decide. I think it's a good idea to vote 'yes' on the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for a Motion and then a comment if I may. The Motion is to move the previous question. I just observed we have about nine and a half hours to go. If we only took five minutes for every Bill, which I know is impossible because we just cannot constrain some of our Members from speaking out on every issue and explaining their votes six times a day, we will handle 114 Bills. I don't know how many we have on the calendar but I would guess to two to three hundred are going nowhere. I would again renew my Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin, to close."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply takes the fourteen million dollars that was raised for capital improvements within the designated area and which does not currently have a use and provides that they be used within the boundaries of that area over the next five years. I urge your affirmative support of this measure."

Speaker Peters: "In answer to the Gentlemen from Cook's question, it would appear that that is a question which should this legislation pass will be one which will have to be adjudicated by the courts. The chair does not feel competent to rule on that question and feels no precedent by which he can end up ruling. The question is, 'shall House Bill 186 pass'? Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question, on this question, what happened? On this question there are 58, alright, 58 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'nay', 17 voting 'present'. Representative Levin. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. On page thirteen, House Bills, Third Reading. The next in order is House Bill 542, Representative Wolf, J. J. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 542, a Bill for an Act to amend various

Acts relating to prisons and jails. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

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

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, excuse me, Representative. We are on the Regular Calendar, page 13, House Bill 542. Proceed, Sir."

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Wolf: "Thank you, prompted the introduction of this legislation was that I was reading Reader's Digest sometime back and happened to note that the State of Michigan has implemented a law that they've had since 1935 which would require wealthier inmates to help pay for their own room and board. this is leveled at, Mr. Speaker, is not designed to force indigence, of course, which would be excluded from this, indigent prisoners confined to a penal institution to pay their room and board. It's an honest attempt to recover costs from those who have large assets or who have enriched themselves because of notoriety gained during their trial. It just seems to me that a Silas Chang or a Richard Speck or a John Wayne Gacy should not be allowed to make millions of dollars for the sales of books or movies, and that the taxpayers be compelled to pay for the maintenance of that The Bill was amended, well, it's been added to person.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

this. It is an Amendment which was requested by the Illinois Department of Corrections which would authorize Director..Director of Corrections ŧο designate..designate work or day release facilities to be used as halfway houses for parolees or persons on mandatory supervised release. This legislation could save Department of Corrections the cost of processing and maintenance of individuals, and the cost to keep these people in halfway houses could be offset by their paying for the food and maintenance when they get out of...when they work. It also allows for misdemeanants to be awarded good-time credit at the same rate which is now applicable to convicted felons. Under the present law, a convicted felon gets one day off for each day of service and a misdemeanant receives less. This would allow misdemeanants to serve less time in the institution thereby reducing the cost to the State and help to reduce overcrowding. ask your favorable support of this Bill which is supported the Department of Corrections and also from bу Administration, the Chief Justice Division Chief of Attorney General's Office."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Katz."

War. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that promises more than it delivers. It sounds very well to say that well-to-do prisoners are going to have to pay their own way. The only thing is that there are not very many prisoners who are well to do, and the experience in this kind of legislation has been very poor. In Florida, for an example, where they have this law, the State of Florida spends twenty times more in administrative costs than they collect. Now I don't really believe that the taxpayers want to go through motions, take this kind of stance of we're going to charge wealthy prisoners and end

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

up spending twenty times more in public funds than is ever collected. There is nothing really to commend this as a practical matter. And I would urge that we not undertake programs that in Florida and Michigan where they have it have not worked out at all and will be simply a more waste of taxpayer money."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf to close."
- Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, all. did not lose money Michigan, first of administrative costs. I have that on good authority. checked with the Attorney General of Michigan, and I would like to point out that the Community Correctional Services Work Release Program of the Department of Corrections under a similar program collected over \$360,000 last year and And I also mention reports no administrative problems. that this does...Bill does more than that yet it does give misdemeanants the same good-time credits that we already I think that's fairness in allow to convicted felons. equity and I would ask for your votes."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 542 pass.

 Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. It is now the intention of the Chair to go to page 4 of the Regular Calendar, House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate. The first Bill, House Bill 113, Representative Kosinski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 113, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Unified Code of Corrections.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill that will notify your local this is law authority...enforcement agencies before we release convicted criminal back into your community. I think it's extremely important. I think it's a Bill we can all It is further been strengthened and amended with Amendment #3 which is a senior citizen portion of the Bill, not mandatory, but indicating that one of the aggravating circumstances for a judge to consider in putting down a sentence is the advanced age of one of the victims of a felony. I think it's a Bill we can all support. I solicit your vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 113 pass. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 150 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 128, Representative McGrew. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 128, a Bill for an Act to amend State

Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 128 is fairly simple in its report. It provides that the state employee health plan shall include the dental. As originally introduced, it also included optometric, but I was unable to get any information in order to argue the cost of the program, so

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Amendment #1 deleted optometric from the plan. I have also restricted it so that instead of 151,000 employees that we now have in the State of Illinois would..it would only cover 115,000, only those that are actively employed for the State of Illinois. The Fiscal Note filed from Department of Insurance Group...I'm sorry, the group insurance section of the Department of Personnel says will cost about \$10 per month per individual. proposals written that would be much different than In: fact the proposal is \$4.70 per person. The State of Minnesota, I'm sorry, Wiscon...I'm sorry, I was correct. State of Minnesota just adopted a plan and there the original plan costs \$4.85. The second year it costs \$5.80. If we use those figures and multiply..I also included a 20% employee pay, so it would only be 80% of the State. total cost of this program would be reduced to 5.52 million dollars. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, I don't necessarily want to speak in opposition of the Bill, but, you know, this is another mandate on our group insurance program. We have a very, very serious problem on the dependent coverage that the employees cannot afford \$100 a month already. And we can't even get support for that portion. All you're doing is adding on another additional cost, and I think it's the wrong time and the wrong place and we should be addressing ourselves to the high costs of medical care, let alone adding on some additional coverages. And I would, you know, urge a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew to close. One minute.

You are on Short Debate."

McGrew: "Well, thank you, I would just point out in regard to the opposition that it would amount to the employee proportion

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

of the pay would be about \$1 per month, so that for \$12 employee contribution per year we'd have the dental plan. As I say I've made every attempt to address the objections to the Bill. I have amended it down for only active employees, and I think it's a realistic program, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Question is shall House Bill 128 be adopted.

 Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Representative Wolf to explain his vote."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would also like to oppose this legislation. As was pointed out previously, we have a serious problem with increased costs with our dependent coverage. We're trying to work That's going to cost about something out there. \$9,000,000, and this Bill here is another 14.6 million dollars, something clearly we can't afford at this time. I see we have ... "
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'.

 This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 181, Representative Pullen. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 181, a Bill for an Act to amend The School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this
 Bill would extend the period of time for filing petitions
 for a backdoor referendum in the case of working cash fund
 bonds in school districts from ten days to thirty and
 reduce the number of signatures required from twenty
 percent to ten percent of the registered voters, which is
 the same provision as for other school bonds. It would

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

also do the minor things that we addressed last night in House Bill 1750 which passed overwhelmingly in requiring the school board to publish in its notice the number of voters required to sign a petition and the length of time required and to provide a petition form to anyone requesting one."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Being none, the question is shall House...Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "Thank you, I'm sorry, but is there, Representative
 Pullen, did this Bill not lose in Elementary and Secondary?

 I can't understand why it's on the floor. Did it go to
 another Committee?"
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "It was approved by the Elections Committee, Sir. And an identical Bill passed overwhelmingly in this House last year."
- Schneider: "Oh, I see, now I have the digest in front of me, it's moved after it had been defeated in Elementary and Secondary, then it went over to Elections where you had a better trigger on the Committee. Is that right?"
- Pullen: "As a matter of fact, I wasn't...as a matter of fact I
 was unfortunately not even able to be there that day
 myself, but the Elections Committee did approve it."
- Schneider: "Well, on the matter, thank you, Mr. Speaker, again it's a difficult thing to, and I'm reluctant to always to stand up on all these issues or these types, but the local tax problem for funding whether it's schools or other kinds of referenda are faced with all kinds of difficulties. Some of those which we have imposed on, the locals themselves. This merely makes it much more difficult now to address the issue of local participation. We have, I think, found in the past adequate mechanism for providing for backdoor referendum. This does nothing to improve

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- that. I would encourage a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Question is shall House...do you wish to close,

 Representative? One minute."
- Pullen: "Just to say, Mr. Speaker, that the current law provides for backdoor referendum but the requirements in it for petition signatures are so huge that it is impossible actually to call a backdoor referendum. This would make it feasible, and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 181 pass.

 Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
 all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
 record, Mr. Clerk. On this..alright, Representative Davis,
 do you wish to explain your vote? On this question there
 are 109 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'.
 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is
 hereby declared passed. House Bill 239, Representative
 Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 239, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

3 x . x . . .

- Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 239 adds in conditions in aggravation for eligibility for the death penalty for certain child abuse murderers."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Pierce.

 Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "I'm reluctant to do this, but talking about the death penalty in a whole new series of categories. It sure shouldn't be on Short Debate. I don't know how I feel about it, but I want to hear more about it. I would ask some people to join me to take this off Short Debate."
- Speaker Peters: "One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight...nine, ten. Proceed, Representative Johnson."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Johnson: "I just wanted to get it off Short Debate. I'll just sit...I'm not going to talk on this, I just want to listen to what Representative..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker."

ع المدانقين العدادة

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Braun: "If that is the case, then I will debate the Bill in opening, if it's within the..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Davis: "The Bill was on Short Debate for a number of reasons. The Bill was on Short Debate because I think the leadership on both sides recognized the efficacy of the Bill. recognized a problem in the State of Illinois that was addressed philosophically by this General Assembly in 1977 when this General Assembly in both House and Senate and signed by the Governor passed the Capital Punishment sponsored by Representative Kosinski. This Short Debate because 80% of the people in this State overwhelmingly endorse the notion of capital punishment as a deterrent and, yes, as a vengeance matter. When this Bill was heard in Committee, I was accused at that point, or not accused, poor choice of words, strike it. said that is there a deterrent value to the death penalty? None of us really know the answer to that question. of us who voted for the Act in 1977 believe that it is a deterrent. Society believes it is a deterrent. And I can tell you Ladies and Gentlemen that in that Act of 1977, you're going to vote today on a philosophical question. And if you voted for the death penalty in 1977 to invoke as a deterrent effect the death penalty for a policeman, a fireman, a correctional officer, a contract for.. for someone who has committed felony murder or someone who has burned people in their homes and killed them, an

A A TA

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

arsonist. If you invoked the death penalty for these people, then you certainly should invoke the death penalty yes, society demands some as a deterrent factor and, vengeance, as a deterrent factor for those people who have murdered children under the age of 16 and those people have murdered those children after a history of abusing that child or torturing that child or feeding that child whiskey or drugs to the ultimate demise of that child or in the case of the Madden child in Quincy for the 171 bruises on the body and organs displaced and out of place and This Bill, yes, has a starved and on and on and on. deterrent factor. This Bill says that if a murderer is convicted of killing a child under the age of 16 years and in the separate hearing, Ladies and Gentlemen, the separate hearing, for aggravation and eligibility of the death penalty, if the State chooses to go that route, if it can prove that this person, this convicted murderer who has killed the child, convicted already in one tribunal and now on an eligibility has perpetrated repeated abuse or torture that child prior to the killing of that child, then he is then eligible for the death penalty. There are 47 Cosponsors on this Bill. I think there were 125 votes to discharge this from Committee, and I recommend it to you the Bill as a severability clause and a later as..and effective date at the request of Representative Kosinski so it won't cloud the issue. It won't cloud the issue of the Capital Punishment Statute of 1977 that this is a good Bill. The people of Illinois all over this State have to me and said, hooray for you, hooray for the General Assembly. Vote for the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Here we go expanding the categories under which we

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

will kill people for their actions. It seems to me that at the rate we're going we might well find ourselves in another few years imposing the death penalty for things like adultery and crimes which already engender the penalty in other countries. There are those of us who believe it is never morally right to kill people lesson that killing people is wrong. But at the same time recognizing the emotional significance of child I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that while our hearts bleed when we read of the cases of child abuse of little children victimized in this way, at the same time it is most inappropriate for us to seek to kill people for their actions in this regard. A parent that kills his or her own child is a sick person. It is not up to us to stand in judgement to have that person's life taken at..under the auspices of the State when indeed I submit they have already lost their most precious possession. Those people need to be institutionalized. They need to be They need to be put away, but I submit to you treated. that in no case would the existence of a penalty death penalty be a deterrent to actions which are already classified as sick, classified as anti-social, classified as beyond the reach in the scope of the law. We Putting together a death..or cannot stop child abuse. requiring the death penalty for child abuse will not child abuse. All that it will do, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House is expand the category of cases in which most grave punishment is..is applicable. And I submit may well go to making the death penalty statute in Illinois unconstitutional. I've got to say, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that for those of you who for religious or philosophical or whatever reason, do not believe in the death penalty, that this is just yet another example of the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

door that we open when we proceed to take people's lives to prove to them that the State can kill in response to their killing action. I urge a 'no' vote on this legislation, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall the previous question be put. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Well, I simply would respond to the last Speaker. It's a philosophical question. You either believe in it or you do not. The Bill, this particular addition will not have any on the constitutionality of the 1977 Capital impact Punishment Act, because it has a severable clause. a post date effective of July 1, 1982, so as not to cloud that particular issue. I would submit to you that the recent rash of child abuse killings after torture and after repeated abuse were not done by parents, were not done by parents, but other people living in the home or taking care of children. And those people that are currently under indictment for murder in those cases have been certified as competent to stand trial at this point in time. And I submit to you also that the deterrent value is definitely there at least for that person who has done that particular deed."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 239 pass.

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, voting is open. Peters, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Stewart to explain her vote. Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Yes."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "To explain her vote."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am mindful of all the green votes and of our time, however, I would say that certainly people who take the lives of their own children are sick, troubled people. It has never been documented and proven that...that the capital punishment is in fact a deterrent. Pirst of all, particularly for these kinds of crimes of passion and the like. And I think that the green vote is an impudent vote..prudent vote. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 124 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 249, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 249, a Bill for an Act concerning drug related offenses. Third Reading..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 249 directs your attention to a very serious problem as it relates to those who distribute and sell drugs. What we've done with this legislation is to make the bail as in the same amount as the street value of the drugs confiscated. And we've also amended it further to in addition to any other fines imposed by the court, that the fine must also be mandatory...or must be in the same amount as the street value of the drugs as determined by the Department of Law Enforcement or the enforcement agency that's charged with that responsibility. It also creates a drug prevention fund so that those fines and the bail money when it is rescinded goes into the drug prevention fund administered by the Department of Law

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Enforcement for the combat of drug use in the State of Illinois. I think it's good legislation. The time has come for it. Similar legislation has been introduced in Plorida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, California and in the Congress of the United States. I move for a favorable Roll Call. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 249."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 249 pass. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Telcser in the chamber? Representative Telcser, if you're in hearing distance, please come to the podium. House Bill 535, Representative Catania. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 535, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 535 provides that people will be able to get into apprenticeship programs up to the age of 40 provided, of course, that they meet all of the other criteria. The problem right now is that some apprenticeship training programs cut off at the age of 25 so that many people who haven't grown up planning to become an electrician or a plumber or a carpenter or whatever find out that when they get around to deciding that maybe they'd like to get into this line of work that it's just too late for them, because they're over the hill at the age of 26 or 27. The Bill

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

came out of the Labor and Commerce Committee with no dissenting votes and is supported by the APL-CIO. Representative Satterthwaite put an Amendment on on Second Reading which includes 21 to 39 year olds in the group who cannot be discriminated against because of age in the Human Rights Act, in real estate transactions, financial credit and public accommodations. This was at the request, I am told, of the Human Rights Department, because it was only 40 to 70 year olds who were protected before this Amendment came on. And I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 535 pass. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this...Representative, Representative Hudson, do you wish to explain your vote? On this question there are 148 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 568, Representative Wolf, J.J. Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 568, a Bill for an Act creating a commission on the status of men. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, read the Bill."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly, we have recognized for sometime that there are a number of problems unique to women such as job discrimination, credit application and the like. We have attempted to address these problems through legislation by establishing a commission to handle some of these problems or look into them. In addition the Governor has appointed a women's advocate. I believe that there are also special problems

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

for male members of our society not only among minority groups but for others as well which might include employment of males over 40, divorce laws, child custody, child support, alimony and the lack of programs for husbands and fathers. This Bill is supported by the 40 plus of Chicago and I would solicit your support."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Macdonald?

 No. All those in favor, Representative Nelson? In opposition."
- Nelson: "Yes, I'd like to speak in opposition. I have with me...okay, guys, listen to this. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is an editorial from the <u>Hinsdale Doings</u> this week and it says, 'Now it's perfectly alright to take a slap at feminists, for that matter any group, but to take the time of the now over—burdened legislature service unit that drafts legislation and Amendments of the Committee that will have to consider this Bill, and then if it is passed of the House Membership will have to take the time to debate this Bill and then vote on it is not a good idea.' And what they called this Bill is a childish little sneer, so that's why I'm voting against it."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 568 pass. Yes,
 Representative, we are on Short Debate. Explain your vote,
 fine. The question is shall House Bill 568 pass. Those in
 favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'.
 Peters 'aye'. Representative Catania to explain her vote."
- Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just want to rise in support of this and quote from a book called <u>The Hazards of Being Male</u> to let you know why you have such terrible problems and why we need the Bill.

 'Though there are approximately 105 male babies conceived for every 100 females, in the population at large there are approximately only 95 males for every 100 females. From

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

birth on the rate of attrition is significantly higher for the male. There are approximately 115 male fetal deaths for every 100 female fetal deaths. At nearly every age level from birth to death, the male mortality rate is significantly higher. Specifically from birth to age 1, the male death rate is 33% higher. And it goes on and obviously we need to find out what's killing the men. And I think that this commission should certainly study it. However, I want to point out that the staff of the commission on the status of women has said that you should start out just like we did with an appropriation of \$5,000 a year for your first ten years, so we'll have to remember that when the appropriation Bill comes around."

- Speaker Peters: "To explain her vote for one minute,

 Representative Macdonald."
- Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise to support this Bill. I don't think it's capricious. I think there are reasons, and I'm very happy that the Sponsor is Jake Wolf because under ordinary circumstances the Sponsor's usually made the Chairman of the Commission. And I think he is well able to take care of that chairmanship. So I enthusiastically support this Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in addition to those arguments already given, I, too, rise in support of this measure and wish to put into the record that the PBI statistics show that a woman is being beaten in America every 18 seconds, but that little has been done to prevent abuse by helping the abuser. This is another topic that could well go on the agenda for the commission along with those issues brought up by the fathers fight for rights

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

indicating that the courts have been discriminatory in regard to custody and child support in always or nearly always expecting the Mother as the best custodial parent. And so I think the agenda will be quite full. I'm sure that the editorial that was quoted earlier was assuming that this was a frivolous matter which I think we should not assume at all. And I wish you well on the commission."

- Speaker Peters: "The chair will recognize four more Members in this order: Schraeder, Chapman, Jaffe, Priedrich.

 Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that the women are represented on this commission so they don't get left out of all that important legislation we're going to come up with. If they haven't got a sounding board now, they're going to have one with this."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Chapman. Explain her vote for one minute."
- Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I heard the Sponsor of this Bill say that men have a lot of problems. I've been around here since 1964 and have been observing my colleagues all that time, and I would say that I would have to agree with the Sponsor of this Bill, Representative Wolf, that some of the men I know do have a lot of problems. But talking very seriously, when I saw this Bill at first, I really was quite angry, because it appeared to me this is just one more time that men are showing that some of them do not understand the serious problems women face and are only too happy to ridicule women at every time they have that opportunity. One in four women will be raped or before she's 18 years old. A woman with similar education, experience and job longevity as a man will be paid only 59¢ for every one dollar he is paid in..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe to explain his vote...one

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

minute."

- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am voting against this Bill. I do think it's capricious, but I would like the Representative Catania. I think I know what's killing men. It's having to deal with women like Representative Susan Catania."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich does not wish to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 576, Representative Alexander.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 576, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Alexander."
- Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, and to Members of the House, Bill 576 does exactly as the synopsis says. It changes the offense of harassment of jurors or witnesses from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 4 Felony. I know of no opposition to this Bill at present. I solicit your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall House Bill 576 pass. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Woodyard. Peters 'aye'. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 158 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 577."

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker and to the Members of the House..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "House Bill 577..."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Wait a minute, hold it."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 577, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "House Bill 577 is a companion Bill to 576 which increases the penalty from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 4 Pelony for any person who would interfere with a juror or a witness who has been summoned or who is serving in the capacity of a witness or a juror. I solicit your 'aye' vote. I know of no opposition at present."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? There being none the question is shall House Bill 577 be adopted. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Peters 'aye'. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this voted who wish? question there are 158 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Ronan. Out of the record. Bill 582. you want this Bill called now, Representative Ronan? House Bill 582, Representative Roman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 582, a Bill for an Act in relationship to licensing the burglar and holdup and fire alarm businesses. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very simple concept. It passed out of the Registration and Regulation Committee unanimously 14 to nothing. What this does is it develops with the Department of Law Enforcement the licensing of burglar alarm installers. We've got serious problems in this State that have occurred over the last couple of years with the increased concern on the part

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

people involving the issue of security in their homes. Consequently there has been a tremendous growth in the burglar alarm industry with an increase in dishonest operators going into people's homes and potentially causing This Bill will license this industry problems. obviously protect the senior citizens and people who need to have this type of protection, but at the same time want it done on a fair, honest and equitable basis. There is no opposition to the Bill. There was once..there had been some concern the Department of Law Enforcement was opposing their it, but that is not the case. I talked to Legislative Liaison this morning. So there is no opposition to this legislation. It's a fine piece legislation. I move for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "This is a Bill that we ought to get off Short Debate.

It's another licensure, so I'd ask ten people to join me."

Speaker Peters: "Are there...there are."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, addressing the Bill. I understand the objective that Representative Ronan is directing himself to. But in a time when the voters on November 4th spoke very clearly that what they wanted was less government, this is an example of a Bill where we get more government. And in a time when we have sunset laws efforts to try to reduce the number οf other and professions that are licensed and regulated, this adds professions and businesses that are regulated and licensed. It's simply a fact of life that many of the problems we have economically and socially and otherwise in Illinois and around the country are due to too much government. Too much government regulation of the private sector, to the place where it's almost impossible to distinguish our system from some of the other systems of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the world where the government controls everything. This is a small step. A 'no' vote on this, but if we carry that philosophy across the board, we can do something to reduce government. And for those reasons and for all the reasons that are, I think, apparent on this kind of thing, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill did pass out of Registration-Regulation, but I do say on behalf of the Sunset Commission, we have not heard this yet in Sunset, and we do not..therefore, it has not justified, in our opinion, whether or not under the Sunrise provisions this should be regulated."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill, and I fail to understand the reasoning of my colleagues on the other side Many of those colleagues saw fit to vote of the aisle. against the regulation of handguns in Illinois, and now indeed, they're also voting against or speaking against the regulation of burglars in Illinois. This Bill is needed so when a senior citizen throughout this State, whether it be Chicago or elsewhere, hires someone to put in a burglar alarm system in their house, that indeed they have some protection and some knowledge and some solace in the fact that the burglar alarm system will indeed work. This Bill is needed. It will protect the citizens of Illinois, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is a piece of legislation and all it's doing is going to raise the cost of burglary, namely a burglar alarm system. Mainly the people that would like to buy these won't be able to afford

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

them, because this is going to add cost on to it. It's going to add cost to the State of Illinois. And it has been repeated before, we definitely do not need more regulations in the State."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in support of this Bill. There is a need for this. A lot of unscrupulous burglar alarm operators are in the business now. Let me tell you in the City of Chicago if you're in a squad car on a rainy night you're..all you're doing is chasing all over the city answering false burglar alarms. Every time there's a thunderstorm, all the burglar alarms in the district go off, because they're properly installed. This would be a measure of saving the police from running back and forth to empty factories people's houses and running to banks and savings and loans These thunderstorms every time there's a thunderstorm. periodically set off about 1/3 of all the burglar alarms in the city. You spend half your day running around answering false alarms."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall the question be put.

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed.

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Ronan to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to clarify a couple of the objections that were brought up. If this is an issue for the Sunset Commission, let them make their..the decision. We are not bound by the Sunset Commission decisions, however, we even have...we have not even had a hearing before them. Tomorrow morning at 9:30, we'll present our facts. We'll present our evidence. And we'll have the opportunity at that point for that Commission to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

make a determination. Let's let them do their job, and they're going to do that tomorrow morning. nothing to do with the merits of this legislation. And I want to make that very clear. Secondly, this isn't going to create any new bureaucracy. It's not going to cost State money. The, the industry supports this legislation, so it's not going to raise the cost to the This is an attempt to protect the consumer. It doesn't cost the State any money. It's not going to cost the consumer any money. It's going to protect people. That's the purpose of this legislation, so people can be protected in their homes. We need support for this fine legislation. I move for its favorable adoption. Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 582 pass.

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Slape to explain his vote."

you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Slape: "Thank Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill and would urge others here to support it. My sister had the problem within about a six-month period of time. She..her home was burglarized. And I can tell you out where we live, these guys move around with these burglar alarm systems in their trunks of their cars. They read the newspaper. out who's been burglarized. Then they come and they sell you a system. They come while you're still excited and still concerned over your house being invaded and they walk..they work on the psychology of that. They force you...they almost force you into buying the darn thing. My brother-in-law and sister bought one, and it was a real good system. You could kick on the door and it wouldn't You could kick on the windows and it wouldn't work, work.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

but every time the phone rang the darn thing would go off. So I guess the burglar would call and make an appointment to what would be a good system. Then whenever they called the guy back to take it out, well then he wanted to hang them up with some installation costs, some fees for estimating their home, and things such as this. And I think if we had this license act, only the reputable people would be in the business and these circumstances wouldn't be occurring."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry to explain his vote."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm surprised to see so many red buttons up there. Apparently they don't know that there are some criminals in the business of policing burglar alarms. Just in the block that I live in, the criminal had set up a system where he had a young man to come back to burglarize a home and then sold a new type of a burglar system. And this type of system needs some cleaning up, because people are ripping off the old and the poor. They're ripping off the people that are even in indecent neighborhoods. So I suggest some of those reds better start worrying about their home and their safety and go to green."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Greiman: "I wonder how many votes this takes in light of Section
29 which says that no unit of local government may enact
any ordinance or rule which is contrary and inconsistent
with the..."

Speaker Peters: "Let's see the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative,
would you please repeat your statement for the
Parliamentarian here."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Greiman: "Well, I..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, my question was merely how many votes this takes.

Section 29 on page 24 of the Bill says that no unit of local government which which is state may enact any ordinance or promulgate any rule or regulation which is contrary to or inconsistent with this Act. And I wondered whether that was a home rule issue that might require 107. Just a parliamentary inquiry, that's all."

Speaker Peters: "It's the ruling of the Chair that it does place some limitations although ambiguous on local government, and will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this Bill. think it's one of the strongest Bills, and it doesn't go strong enough, however. Not only should they be licensed, but they should be bonded by the State of Illinois. There's too many instances where a burglar alarm system has been installed in a home. Within a three to five weeks afterwards, that home has been burglarized, and the alarm system has been by passed, indicating that the people who alarm system either are selling the installed that schematics for that system in a particular homes or they themselves are coming back within the three to five week period and burglarizing those homes. This has happened on three occasions within our neighborhood, and it's a bad But I think this Bill will correct that and not system. only should they be licensed but they should be bonded. And I'd ask for a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas to explain his vote."

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm amazed to see the same people that voted for licensing of horseshoers are now voting against licensing an industry

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

which affects the health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. I would really like to see a little bit more green votes up there."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yea, Mr. Speaker, while I was over on the other side the aisle talking to some of my colleagues, I heard the most erroneous, egregious ruling of this session. I cannot believe that you're saying that this legislation needs does not pre-empt home rule. There is no votes. It question that it doesn't pre-empt home rule. There's no limitations on home rule. And if it's going to be a partisan decision, just because I don't happen to be somebody's friend, well, let's make that ruling, that Roman doesn't have to be somebody's friend. But don't try to kid the Members of the General Assembly that this has anything to do with home rule. It does not pre-empt home rule. There's no limits on it. And that's the most absurd ruling heard of. a parliamentarian or a parliamentarian. There's no question about it that this does not pre-empt home rule. And I appeal that you look at that very closely, because there is no intent at all to involve the home rule limitation. And I'd like you to take a real close look at that."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair will be happy to have the Parliamentarian look at it again."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your compassion. I've known you to be a compassionate man ever since you've taken the Chair four months ago. That's why I've supported your rulings consistently. And if you take a real close look at this one, I'm sure that kind of bipartisan support will continue from at least this Member on the Democratic side of the aisle. So if you'd take a real close look, I'd appreciate it."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stearney on the Bill."

Stearney: "Well, I just wanted to make the observation to Mr.

Ronan. How does it feel now to be on the other side?

Well, now you know how I feel when it's been your team
winning with the Parliamentarian when it came to my
interests being adverse to yours. Now as to the Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "You don't have a friend here, Representative
Ronan. Proceed, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Now as to the Bill, it seems to me that after hearing Representative McAuliffe speak about all these burglar alarms going off during the city whenever you have a serious rainstorm, maybe 1/3 of them. I asked Roger, I said afterwards, 'Jeez, who's going to be installing these burglar alarms if we pass this Bill? Well, lo and behold, you look at it, they re going to be grandfathered in. the same people that are installing these...burglar alarm systems are going to continue to do so. And the Chicago Police Departments are going to be continuing to run around these false alarms. But if you look on page 3, really, you have those..all those individuals grandfathered in supposedly if they've been in business for ten years. how are they going to every deny, how can R&E ever that they were not in business for ten years? Everybody in business will be grandfathered in so everything you're hoping to do by passing this Bill will be nullified, really. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Topinka to explain her vote."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, when my illustrious colleague from Chicago presents a people's Bill, generally, I sometimes question what people. This time, I think, it has a general application, and that's exciting. Judging by what our Police Chief has said in our district and in my community especially, who's helping me

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

personally help out people with burglar alarms as to which ones will work, where they can get some service, and having a number of burglar alarm companies who are concerned by this, because there are some less than scrupulous operators within the business. I think this is a piece of attention here we should give to this particular industry. It's getting bigger. Obviously there is a concern for crime and I think we should pass this piece of legislation, so I think our, my colleague here does have indeed a real live people's Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

Reane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this I agree with someone that spoke here in legislation. debate that said that we should reduce the number of those being regulated by our need. I agree with that. However, I think that for a profession or a group that has had a lot of problems and has had a number of black eyes in the public area where they ve had some fly by night outfits putting in inadequate burglar going in and inadequate fire devices and also where the people have been burglarized soon after the installation. In many cases possibly by those who installed the devices, that I think this legislation is most timely. I agree with another Gentleman on the other side that said that I think we should bond these people. I would agree with that and I think that the Sponsor would also make the same recommendation later. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'aye' vote, I
would like to point out to the Assembly that a couple of
years ago there was a Bill that was introduced by
Representative Huff here that made it a Class or a felony

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

to tamper with any smoke detector devices. This Assembly in its wisdom passed that Bill overwhelmingly. What we're talking about in this Bill is similar to what we're talking about with that kind of legislation. We're providing safety. We're providing protection for the people that need it most. So I see nothing wrong with this legislation in that we are trying to help provide safety, whether it be burglary or a burglary smoke detective....or detection system. I think that this is legislation that does have merits and should be passed by this Assembly."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Ronan on a point of order."

Roman: "No, Mr. Speaker, I want to explain my vote. I think that we've got a situation that's going to develop where that there's a possible ruling of the Chair that's going to be clarified or at least that's the indication I have been And since I didn't have an opportunity to explain my vote, I want to. I hope people really look merits of this Bill and don't get caught up in some of the arguments that have been erroneously given. You know, this legislation is not going to cost any money. It's going to protect the citizens of the State of Illinois. It's legislation that the industry has asked for, because they want to clean up their own house. They don't want situations where there are illegal operatives moving around the State preying on poor people. And we need opportunity at this point to do something to help business in this State and also protect the citizenry of this State. That's why I hope we can vote on this legislation based on its merits and not based on some arguments that we've already heard. Obviously my position on the 107 vote has already been clarified. There is no intent at this point to pre-empt home rule. That is not part οf this

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

legislation. And I'd like that position to be made very clear for the permanent record. And that's all I've got to say."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'.

The Gentleman asks the Bill to be placed on Postponed...Representative Ronan."

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

Speaker Peters: "Poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt. Bowman. Epton.

Garmisa. Griffin. Margalus. NcBroom. Pierce. Redmond.

Telcser. White. And J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider. Schneider from 'no'
to 'aye'. Representative Zito. I'm sorry, Representative
Collins."

Collins: "Is your ruling as to 107 your ruling or have you..."

Speaker Peters: "107."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Zito.

Representative....Balanoff. Currie. Anyone else? This

question there are 89 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'no', 2

voting 'present'. Representative Ronan, Postponed Consideration? Pardon? I didn't hear him. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 594, Representative

Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 594, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Comprehensive Budget Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 594 as amended simply begins the process of getting our own House in order

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

by putting a 6% limitation on the growth in state limitations. We've lectured state governments or local governments for several years about how they ought to control their own spending. All this does is begin the process of controlling ours by putting a 6% limitation on the growth in our appropriations. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative

Satterthwaite. Excuse me, will the will the Gentleman

around Representative Satterthwaite give her clear view.

Thank you."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition and hope that everyone was listening when Sponsor indicated that what this does is puts a 106% limitation on the total of appropriations made from road funds and general revenue funds. Certainly for all of the downstaters that should be a very great concern. The staff has provided for me the statistics indicating what increase in the road fund appropriation has been over the last few years. It has gone from 18.7% in Fiscal Year 80, 11% in 81. When we are in a 33% in that a11 o£ our conservative year, we will find appropriations this year will be fairly limited. To put an unnatural cap of a 6% growth on that is certainly going to be detrimental to our downstate program, road programs and will also be detrimental in the general revenue fund area. We are saddled with increasing appropriations to fund our retirement systems for instance. And so for many of the state agencies this increase may in fact be totally absorbed by that 6% and nothing would go to employee benefits or to other benefits that would be helpful to the agency in maintaining even the program level that they have currently. I think this Amendment is entirely too

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

restrictive and I would urge your rejection of it. The only loophole and way out as listed in this Amendment would be for us to put in new taxes. That's the only way we could exceed that 6% growth limitation."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly to close, one minute."

The last Representative who Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. incorrect. The Bill: does not apply to spoke is appropriations for construction or maintenance of highways, road operations of the Department only to I still say that it's time for us to get Transportation. our House in order and begin to bring some limitation into state spending. We've lectured local government. We ought to pay attention at home and put some limitations on our own spending. I would move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 594."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 594 pass.

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
'nay'. Representative Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. Representative Satterthwaite was absolutely correct. If you take a look at Amendment #2, it's even more restrictive than that. It provides that the General Assembly accept the Governor's revenue projection. No one else is not economical and fiscal and on that basis we limit it to 106%. Unfortunately I believe that is truly restrictive and if you took a look at the balance of the road fund in the beginning of Pebruary and you took the approach of this recommendation, you would be really stifled, not only for next year, but every year thereafter. Maybe the concept is good, but there should be some latitude as far as which figures you're going to be using as a base. And for this reason at this time, I'm going to be voting 'no'."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It may be true that this is very restraintive, but I think we're in a period of time...That was a quick minute, thank you. I think this is some time we really may need to have some belt tightening and restraint, that this period of time is good, it's well founded, and a 'yes' vote is what this particular Bill needs."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Emil Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "Yea, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House, I rise with mixed emotions on this piece of
legislation, because I don't know if my constituents back
in Chicago will want me to vote for something that's going
to affect them downstate. And I think you downstate
legislators should...you downstate legislators who are
constantly voting against Chicago, now you're looking to us
for help. But when we needed help, you turned your back.
So I don't know how I'm going to vote. I think I'll vote
'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We do
a lot of political things here. We do a lot of phony
things here, but this is probably the most political and
the most phony thing we're going to do all year. If we
want to stop spending, all we have to do is to not vote the
budgets or to vote a lower budget. But to sit around and
say we're not..we're going to pass a law to keep us from
voting higher budgets, that's crazy. All we have to do is
just..."

Speaker Peters: "Finish up, Representative."

Kane: "All we have to do is exercise some restraint when we get the budget Bills next week. I think that this is just a phony way of doing things and it has no..makes no sense at

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

all."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative John Dunn to explain his vote.,
 Proceed, Sir."
- Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Everybody ought to know this Bill is nothing more than a press release. It contains no penalty section. There are no restrictions if the provisions of the Bill are violated. It's just a PR gimmick to make someone feel that maybe some phony limitation is going to be placed on state expenditures. We are charged with the responsibility for determining what level of appropriations are needed to meet the needs of the people of the State of Illinois. We should not abrogate that responsibility to anyone. This Bill should be soundly defeated."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all..have all spoken who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, David, take the record. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'nay', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received...Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Verification."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for a verification.

Representative Reilly asks for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Balanoff. Bowman."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Something's wrong with my buttons here."

Speaker Peters: "How do you wish to be voted, Ma'am?"

Balanoff: "No."

- Speaker Peters: "Vote the Lady 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite, her light is on, would you...would you...thank you. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Bowman. DiPrima. Epton. Garmisa. Hanahan.
 Margalus. McGrew. Mulcahey. Redmond. Slape. White.
 And Sam Wolf."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative, the Gentleman has leave.

Proceed with the verification, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Abramson. Ackerman.

Alstat. Barkhausen. Barnes. Bartulis. Bell. Bianco."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechovicz: "Could we have a little order, please."

Speaker Peters: "Would you give the Gentleman order so that he may see who is and who is not here, please."

- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative. Birkinbine, Boucek, Bower, Breslin, Brunner, Christensen, Collins, Conti, Daniels, Davis, Deuchler, Deuster, Donovan, Jack Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Fawell, Findley, Plinn, Virginia Prederick, Dwight Friedrich, Griffin, Hallock, Hallstrom, Hannig, Hastert, Grossi, Hudson, Huskey, Johnson, Karpiel, Katz, Jim Kelley, Klemm, Leinenweber, Koehler, Kucharski, Kustra, Kociolko. Martire, Mays, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, Macdonald. McMaster, Ted Neyer, R.J. Neyer, Miller, Neff, Nelson, Oblinger, O'Connell, Ozella, Pechous, Peters, Piel, Polk, Rigney, Robbins, Pullen, Rea, Reed, Reilly, Schraeder, Schuneman, Irv Smith, Stanley, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Swanstrom, Tate, Telcser, Topinka, Tuerk, Van Duyne, Vinson, Watson, Wikoff, Winchester, J.J. Wolf, Woodyard, Zwick and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz, on the verification.

 Excuse me. What is the beginning count, Mr. Clerk? Okay.

 Representative Lechowicz, we are starting with 96

 affirmative votes."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is Representative Abramson on?"

Speaker Peters: "Abramson is in his seat."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Lechowicz: "Ozella."

Speaker Peters: "Mr....Representative Ozella. Is the Gentleman

in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the roll."

Lechowicz: "Bartulis."

Speaker Peters: "Bartulis is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Boucek."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Boucek is in the chamber."

Lechowicz: "Bower."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Lechowicz: "That's right he was...I'm sorry."

Speaker Peters: "Yes. He had leave to be verified."

Lechowicz: "Christensen."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Christensen. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the roll."

Lechowicz: "Johnson."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Johnson. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the roll."

Lechowicz: "Katz."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Katz is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Flinn."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Ted Meyer."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Meyer. Is he behind there? Mr. Meyer. How

is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Take him from the roll."

Lechowicz: "R.J. Meyer."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Pechous."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pechous. The Gentleman's in the aisle."

Lechowicz: "Stanley."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Stearney."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stearney is in the aisle."

Lechovicz: "C.M. Stiehl."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady is in the chamber."

Lechovicz: "Okay. Topinka."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady is in her seat."

Lechovicz: "Donovan."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Donovan. Mr. Donovan. Is the Gentle...
Yes, he's here. He's on the aisle."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Fawell."

Speaker Peters: "Miss Fawell is in her seat."

Lechovicz: "Huskey."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huskey. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded."

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

Speaker Peters: "Take him from the roll."

Lechowicz: "Karpiel."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel. Is the Lady in the chamber? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "One second now. Return Representative Huskey to the roll. Proceed, Sir."

Lechovicz: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McBroom is in his seat."

Lechowicz: "Ted Neyer...ah Ted Neyer we got. Who is this?

Polk."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Polk is in the aisle."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Lechowicz: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen is in the center aisle."

Lechowicz: "Schuneman."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Schuneman is at his seat."

Lechowicz: "And, Zwick."

Speaker Peters: "Mrs. Zwick is in her chair."

Lechowicz: "Did you remove Representative Karpiel?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Return Miss Karpiel to the roll."

Lechovicz: "Jim Rea."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry."

Lechovicz: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Peters: "Jim Reilly?"

Lechowicz: "Rea."

Speaker Peters: "Rea. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Take him from the roll. Return Mr. Christensen to the roll."

Lechowicz: "Representative Tate."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tate. He's in the rear."

Lechowicz: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Hoffman."

Lechovicz: "He's right there."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, please change my vote to

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as 'aye'.

Prom 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Please change me to 'aye', please."

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

Representative Mautino. From 'no', to 'aye'.

Representative McGrew. Record the Gentleman as voting

'aye'. Do you have all that, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "All duly recorded."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sam Wolf. 'Aye'. Representative Mulcahev. 'Ave'. Representative Steczo. 'present' to 'ave' on Steczo. Representative Pierce. 'Ave'. Have all who wish to be recorded made their requests? What's the count. Mr. Clerk? On this question. there are 100 voting 'ave'. 56 voting *no*. 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. You are on...you have been verified off, Mrs. Barnes. House Bill 597. Representative Ralph Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 597. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Dunn."

Ralph: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Dunn. House Bill 597 applies only to non-township counties. is a Bill that would apply to the seventeen, most a11 downstate counties and eleven of them are in mine and Representative Winchester who's my chief district, it would allow county board's, it's a permissive Bill, allow the county board's by resolution, to decide to run the two, every four years there's two commissioner's run, it would allow them if the county board wanted to, by resolution, they would not run against each other, they would run for particular positions, as position A and position B for county board membership. I'd be glad to answer any questions about the Bill. I'd urge an vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? There being none seeking recognition, the question is shall House Bill 597 pass?

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Woodyard. Peters 'aye'. Wolf 'aye'. Thank you, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Clerk-Would you add Representative Leon, Mr. Clerk? You're on? On this question, there are 151 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, without objection, add Representative 'ave' and Nelson 'ave' and Domico 'ave'. Is the vote...no it's closed. It's closed. Was that the last one printing, Jack? It printed. We have a new one. It printed out, but didn't lock. We shall now lock it. Take the record. On this question, 166 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Don't monkey with the buttons, you'll tear the whole thing down, we'll be here for six weeks. We'll have to call the next Bill orally. Just to make certain that the record is clear on House Bill 597, the vote is 166 voting 'ave', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional: Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 645, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 645. A Bill for An Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Third
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 645, is the Bill that codifies the rulemaking actions of the Dangerous Drugs Commission during the prior two year periods. It includes recodification of sufentanil and tilidine in accordance with international treaty as set agency. forth bу the drug administration Bnlk also in accordance with treaty dextropropoxyphene, obligations. Phenylacetone, again in accordance with DEA regulations. And, pipradrol and SPA, again in accordance

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

with treaty obligations. There was an also a reclassification based upon new information of pentazocine with aspirin. A (talwin) compound from Schedule II to Schedule III. I know of no opposition to this and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? Representative Kelly."

Kelly, D.: "No, I don't have any opposition if somebody's going to, but I do want to ask a question if I have that..."

Speaker Peters: "To expedite matters."

Kelly, D.: "I just want to ask you, Mike, if there's any change in the cocaine, changing that in a category in any way under this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "No."

Speaker Peters: "The answer is no."

Kelly, D.: "Okay."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 645 pass?

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Peters 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 162 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having reached the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, add Representative Laurino voting 'aye'. House Bill 646, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 646. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Dangerous Drug Abuse Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 646 adds the Director of Aging to the membership of the Dangerous Drugs Advisory Council in accordance with a congressional

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

act...enactment of two years ago."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition?"

Getty: "In addition, it also reschedules...strike that. It takes care of a prior inconsistency in saying that a quantity of more than five hundred grams of cannabis is not subject to alternative treatment and in accordance with a decision in the case of People vs. (Teshner), sets out language that cross references 561 of the Code of Corrections. I would ask for your favorable support. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Peters: "Question is...is there anyone in opposition? No one standing. The question is, shall House Bill 646 pass? Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. On this question, there are 161 voting 'aye', none 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill voting received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Peters 'present' to 'aye'. House Bill 659. Read the Bill. Nr. Representative Deuchler. Deuchler. Clerk. Excuse me. Are we...alright, let's just hold just one second until the Clerk catches up. House Bill 659, Representative Deuchler. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 659. A Bill for An Act to amend an Act relating to fire escapes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the fire escape statute and requires that stairwell doors at each floor level of high rise buildings be left open or unlocked to afford ready egress from the stairwell. As many of you know, in the Las Vegas and New York City high rise fires, the problem was that individuals within the stairwell were unable to get out of the stairwell and were overcome by smoke."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuchler. Put the Lady on."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Deuchler: "I ask for an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Repre...Anyone in opposition? Representative Ronan."
- Roman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since this Bill obviously preempts home rule as opposed to my legislation rule, then I'd like you to look on page two of this legislation. I want a ruling on home rule provisions."
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Katz, do you wish to speak on this..."
- Katz: "No, Mr. Speaker, I was going to raise a parliamentary inquiry on the same question as to the vote required for passage."
- Speaker Peters: "It is the ruling of the Chair that this legislation comes under Sections H of the Constitution and therefore requires only 89 votes. The question is, shall House Bill 659 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Ewell, to explain his vote."
- Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think some times we ought to let well enough alone. There may be various reasons why the cities and municipalities have the right to decide what they want to do with the doors. If it's a fire hazard, let them decide it by home rule, but for us to sit here in Springfield and mandate particular things, becomes a little bit ridiculous. I think the time comes that if the people who live in the city, they have all their own ordinances in terms of fire, safety, etc. We are mandating when it might be a safety factor. And, I don't think it proper for us to sit here from our small jurisdictions and try to tell the people who live in the districts with high rises, how they ought to do it."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- 109 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay', 9... Representative Leinenweber."
- Leinenweber: "Well, that was the Lady's first Bill. I think we ought to give her a hand."
- Speaker Peters: "109 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. If you're in charge of the thermostat, and you did a good job the last time, it's getting awfully cold in here again."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Collins, House Bill 674.

 Representative Collins. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 674. A Bill for An Act to provide a subsidy to port districts and regional port districts.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 674 is the Bill that would authorize the subsidy to Illinois ports, of twenty-five cents per ton for import and export shipments. This is another Bill in the effort to make our Illinois ports competitive with other ports and to stimulate trade and the economy of the State.

 It came out of the Executive Committee by a vote of 20 to nothing and I would solicit your support."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one seeking recognition, the question is, shall House Bill 674 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Hold on. Hold on. Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Are you sure you read the Committee report vote

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

correctly? That came out of the Executive Committee you said? Well I see Members of the Executive Committee voting 'no'. Could they have voted unanimously in Committee and now 'no' on the board?"

Collins: "Inconsistency is the mark of great minds."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 145 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 725, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 725. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of the Inheritence and Transfer Tax Law. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill repeals the requirement that the circuit judge and the clerk of the circuit court for each county, file every three months a statement detailing the amount of state tax due from that county. The purpose of the Bill is that the...that requirement is obsolete. The requirement came into the law many years ago, before it was necessary to obtain inheritence tax consents to sell property, before any property could be sold in an estate. With inheritence tax consents, that is a much better way of making sure that the inheritence tax is properly paid. It's supported by the Attorney General, it's supported by a number of judges. It simply reduces a duplicative report that is no longer necessary and I would urge passage of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one standing, the question is, shall House Bill 725 pass?

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 150 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 734, Representative John Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 734. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of an Act to regulate the advertising of

gasoline..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Dunn."

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

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a consumer Bill, this is a Bill that would mandate that gasoline dispensed from gasoline pumps in the State of Illinois, be dispensed on a gallon basis and that the price be shown on the pumps on a gallon basis and that any other basis would be optional and duplicative. The reason for this, is that there has been some concern recently about a switch to metric standards, but the National Metric Board has removed all deadlines with regard to this. Detroit is not urging that mileage be measured on a liter basis and it's very confusing. The consumer's want this Bill and I would recommend an "aye" vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative
Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're attempting to pass a Bill which really isn't needed. This is 'Big Brother Governmentism'. We're trying to tell business people how to run their businesses. The Illinois Department of Agriculture opposes the Bill. It violates the Metric Conversion Act of 187...1975. It's contrary to the conversion plan for retail motor fuel dispenser's as established by the Petroleum and Natural Gas

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Sector Committee and endorsed by the National Metric Counsel. It will impact retail marketer's who are currently dispensing petroleum products by the liter. I don't see any reason for us once again to...everytime when somebody complains about not understanding what's going on and they insist to have the law to do it the way that they feel more comfortable in living. This is 'Big Brotherism', it's 'Big Government', it's contrary to the national mood and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Dunn, to close. One minute." Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason we have this problem today, is the Department of Agriculture thought it was confusing to have the half gallon price on the pumps that couldn't switch when the dollar...when the price of gasoline went over a dollar. This is more confusing than that. burdened by the Department of Agriculture regulation. There are thirty thousand gasoline pumps in this State and only about five percent of them have been switched to metrics. The great number of independent producers of gasoline and marketer's of gasoline have switched to gallon A great many of those people have pumps on order. There are very few, except two major brands who are talking about using the sale of gasoline on a liters basis. should pass this Bill to mandate price per gallon, so we'll know how much we're paying for gasoline and we'll know how much mileage our cars are getting as we buy them from Detroit and try to decide what's an efficient car and what is not. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is...we... The question is, shall House Bill 734 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Neff, to explain his vote."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...the Department of Agriculture is opposed to this legislation and I do appreciate the fact the Sponsor's got a Bill here that some of us may kind of like. But, we've got to remember that this will cost many stations five hundred dollars for a pump to change and who's going to pay this. This is going to be the consumer's and again this is going to create more inflation. So, this should be opposed."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 88 Clerk. voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared 765. Representative House Bill lost. Representative Steczo requests leave to handle that Bill Is there objection? for Representative O'Brien. Read the Bill, Mr. being none, Representative Steczo. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 765, a Bill for an Act creating the
 High Rise Fire Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 765 creates the High Rise Fire Study Commission that would consist of nine members, three appointed by the Speaker, three appointed by the Senate President and three public members appointed by the Governor. Their purpose would be to study methods of preventing fires in high-rise buildings and to prepare a safety manual to be distributed to residents of all high-rise buildings and to come up with recommended techniques for fire departments for fighting fires in high-rise buildings. The Commission will report to the General Assembly by January 1, 1982 and would be repealed by July 31, 1983. I ask for your favorable support."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one standing, the question is, shall House Bill 765 be adopted?

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Peters, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 112 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 772, Representative Hoxsey. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 772. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of the Township Zoning Act. Third Reading of the

Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoxsey."

Horsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 772 deals only with those areas in townships who are not involved in a county that is already zoned and it has no effect on a county zoning ordinance or a There are counties in this State of Illinois ordinance. that are not zoned and townships are in the process of trying to zone themselves. This Bill, at the present time, it is the prerogative of the township board to implement a zoning ordinance. What this Bill does, its says that a zoning ordinance may be implemented by a township board with fifty-one percent of the voter's in that township At present time, they're allowed to signing a petition. have a hearing. What I find is, that not enough people in that township know what a zoning ordinance is. So, this will be one way that they would be informed. They have the same privilege of rejecting an ordinance by the same This is democracy as far as I'm concerned and if process. an ordinance, a zoning ordinance in a township is not acceptable by fifty-one percent of the voter's there, it

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

shouldn't be implemented. And, I would ask your favorable support."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall House Bill 772 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 130 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 782, Representative Van Duyne. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 782. A Bill for An Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Van Duyne."

- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The explanation of this Bill, House Bill 782, is contained in your analysis. If you want to follow along, it's in the last four lines and I don't have to go into it in any detail. It just says the Dram Shop Act only provides for the sale of alcoholic liquors in parks, not included within a municipality. And, the Bicentennial Park is contained wholly within the City of Joliet and therefore in order to sell liquor it needs this exemption. This is asked for by the City Council and also the Bicentennial Commission. I'd be glad to answer any questions, but I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, shall House Bill 782 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 134 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

hereby declared passed. House Bill 794, Representative Stuffle. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 794. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, this is a very simple Bill that takes care of about five hundred extremely old retired downstate school teachers, provides them with the same three post-retirement benefit that we've given the post-1971 retirees in this pension system. As I said, it affects some five hundred people. These people average now only fifty-eight dollars and seventy-nine cents a month in their annuities. The Bill also corrects a minor technical error that was made in the passage of House Bill 1009 in the last legislative session. If this Bill passes, these people will average about an eight dollar per month increase as I indicated and a fifty-eight dollar a month average annuity. This is a closed group of people that averages in their seventies in age. What we're doing here, is providing what we've done in many of the other systems and other Bills do on the floor of this House this year and that's bring these pre-1971 retirees into the same position as every employee who came on board after 1969, with regard to this minor pension benefit. I would urge a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 794."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Really not necessarily in opposition, but I just...on pension Bills, I think it should be brought out, the annual cost according to our analysis here, is forty-eight thousand dollars a year and about three quarters of a million increase in the unfunded accrued

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

liability. I'm not speaking in opposition, but so that the Membership knows when they're casting their vote, what it's costing."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "I would yield to my hyphenated Sponsor, Representative
Schraeder to close."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this takes an unlimited number, as

Larry said, it's about five hundred people, eight or nine
dollars a month and these people are just getting by. And

I just suggest, how could you lose...live on sixty or
seventy dollars a month. I think in all humanity, we ought
to give them this small increase. And, I'd ask for an
'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 794 pass?

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 138 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 803, Representative Bianco. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 803. A Bill for An Act to amend an Act regulating dentists and dental surgery. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bianco."

Bianco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 803 amends the current Dental Practice Act into a more definable and explicit explanation regarding any improper, unprofessional or dishonorable conduct in the dental profession. Simply, this legislation enhances the Department of Registration and Education's power to suspend dentists who are in violation of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

malpractice standards and thereby better police the profession of dentistry. The legislation is supported by all associated; the Illinois Dental Society, The Department of Registration and Education and the Department of Public Health. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? No one standing. The shall House Bill 803 pass? : Those in favor question is, will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Voting is open. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, who wish? there are 157 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', This Bill: having received the Constitutional 'present'. Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Darrow, House Bill 808. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 808. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Darrow."

- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill does, is allow a person who has not been convicted of a moving violation for three years prior to time to take his driver's test, to be exempted from that test. If you haven't been picked up for a moving violation and be...and convicted of that for a three year period, you would report to the Secretary of State's Office, take a eye examination, have your picture taken and issued a license. Unless the Secretary of State in his discretion feels that more of an exam is needed, he then has the authority to give you the written test or the driving test. I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Mrs. Smith, do you wish to speak in opposition to this? Your light is on Ma'am. Representative Greiman, no? The question...the question

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

is, shall House Bill 808 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Greiman to explain his vote."

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'no' on this Bill, simply because what the Sponsor presumes is that the driver has spent three years of good driving. As a matter of fact, the driver just may not have been driving, and it might be that very person who needs to be retested. Very often there are people who don't drive a lot and so they don't get into a lot of...they don't have any moving violations, they don't have any driver's problems. I think there's nothing wrong with us testing and retesting people. It's sort of a pain, I've gone through it. I think it makes sense and I see I'm convincing a lot of people."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all...Representative Alexander, to explain her vote."
- Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that unless I'm mistaken with the new current international road signs and things that just came current within the State of Illinois, I feel that every driver should take a test so that they can stay current on these changes that take place with these international signs and things like that. So, I'm voting 'no'."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there 121 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'nay', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having reached the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 819, Representative Steele, E.G. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 819. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the law and in relation to plats. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Steele."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Steele, E.G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 819 reduces one of our state mandates, by providing that two acres rather than five acres be the criteria below which land would have to be subject to the Plats Act. This law is similar to that in near..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steele."

Steele, E.G.: "Yeah. This law is similar to that in nearby State of Indiana. It's supported by the Illinois Board of Realtors, many farm groups who feel that present statutes are causing farm land unnecessarily be taken out of cultivation. It was passed by the Committee ten to one and the Amendment on the floor says that nothing herein shall prevent or preclude individual counties from establishing standards which exceed or supplant the requirements herein. It passed Committee ten to one. I believe it's a good Bill. I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Reluctantly, I would stand in opposition. I think perhaps down where the Gentleman lives, it's not a problem, you're going to encourage rather than retard subdividing and selling off of land along highways which is not subdivided and which is therefore not subject to the various requirements of ... that counties impose, when they subdivide for sewer water runoff and that sort of thing. It's going to make it easier, rather than harder. you don't want to subdivide and go through the now, if the subdivision trouble of complying with all of you sell off five acre parcels. This has ordinances, caused a very haphazard development in areas that are undergoing rapid development. You're going to make it easier, you're going to find very few people bothering to

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- subdivide if we do this. And, reluctantly..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Steele, to close. For one minute."
- Steele, E.G.: "Yes. This reduces another state mandate, it's a good thing for the farmers, it's good for the consumers and I think it's a Bill similar to one in Indiana that reduced another mandate of the State. And, I think it's a good Bill and good for the people of the State."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 819 pass?

 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Hoxsey to explain her vote."
- Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 There's a decided effort to preserve farmland in the State of Illinois and to encourage plats of less than five acres is a very necessary...this is a good Bill. I've got a farm house out there now, that I would like to sell with one acre of ground under it. I really don't want to sell four good acres of farmland with it. And, I suggest to you, that this would encourage the counties in those areas to go this route."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 138 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 823, Representative McCormick. Representative Kelly, for what purpose do you rise?
- Kelly, Dick: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask an inquiry of the Chair and that is I...you are doing an expeditious job of going through these Bills, one after another, but we have reached quite late in the afternoon and it's very obvious that we're not going to go through this calendar.

45th Legislative Day

Bill."

May 18, 1981

And I'm just wondering, what are we going to do? Is there going to be any changes in plans to eliminate any explanations of votes, or are we just going to let all...most of these Bills die at twelve o'clock?"

Speaker Peters: "The people have spoke...the people have spoken.

House Bill 823, Representative McCormick. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 823. A Bill for An Act concerning financial institutions in Illinois. Third Reading of the

Speaker Peters: "Representative McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 823 is a Bill requested by the Retail Merchant's Association and it's been cleared by all of the banking facilities that know of in the State of Illinois. And what it does, it provides, it provides that the date that you open an account in a bank be printed on the check that they order for you. It is one of those things that we need Southern Illinois and I know we do in all of Illinois, to help the merchant determine whether a person's check is any good. Now, it isn't a written guarantee, but it does not add any cost to the checks that are to be printed, it adds no cost to the customer. And, I know of no opposition to the Bill. What it will do, it will be a great help to most of our State's Attorneys, because everybody knows it's a violation of the law to pass a bad check, but if we as merchants and we people taking them can help keep them from going through as bad, why it will make it a lot simpler on them. I would appreciate your help on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? No one standing. The question is, shall House Bill 823 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting "aye", those opposed by voting "nay". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

question, there are 144 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 847, Representative Klemm. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

O'Brien: "House Bill 847. A Bill for An Act to amend

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 847. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "This simply allows, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, counties and municipalities can adopt and enforce ordinances regulating pollution control. providing that the regulations and enforcements are in accordance with and no more stringent than the terms and provisions of this Act. Home rule municipalities already are allowed to ordinances to help the Environmental Protection Agency enforce the regulations of the Act and we're asking that the counties and smaller municipalities have that same authority."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition?"

Klemm: "It came out of Committee twelve to nothing. I ask your vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There's no one standing.

The question is... Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill preempts home rule. I question the ruling. How many votes is it going to take?" Speaker Peters: "Give us the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, give the Parliamentarian the Bill. The Gentleman questions whether this preempts home rule. And the answer is... The ruling of the Chair, it takes 89 votes. The question is, shall House Bill 847 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 136 voting

45th Legislative Day

Hay 18, 1981

- 11 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 857, Representative Redmond. Representative...just a second. On House Bill 85...847, add Representative Mulcahey as voting 'aye'. House Bill 857, Representative Redmond. Representative Daniels asks leave to handle that for Representative Redmond. Is there objection? There being none, Representative Daniels."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 857. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Nr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House
 Bill 857 amends the Election Code by changing the titles of
 the Chief Clerk and Assistant Chief Clerks of the Board of
 Election Commissioners to Executive Director and Assistant
 Executive Director of the Board. I know of no opposition
 to the legislation."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 857 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 156 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 882, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 882. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of an Act in regard to limitations. Third Reading

 of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill places dentists in the same position as

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

medical doctors and hospitals with regard to the statute of The statute of limitations says at the end, limitations. some period of time, a person alleging damages can no The purpose for that is, evidence grows longer claim. stale, it may not even exist and at some point there has to be an end to everything. In this particular case, statute of limitations would be two years after the person knew he'd been injured, but in no case more than four Again, this places dentists in exactly the same position we have previously placed hospitals and doctors. I would urge your support for the Bill and request a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the questions is, shall House Bill 882 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, On this question, there are 154 voting 'aye', 3 Clerk. This Bill having voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Add Jim Kelley 'aye'. 155 voting 'aye'. House Bill 913, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 913. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Huff, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege. I'd

 like leave to recommit House Bill 625 to the Executive

 Committee on Interim Study."
- Speaker Peters: "Where is that at on the calendar, Sir? Page 14."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Huff: "It's on Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "And the number again, Sir."

Huff: "House Bill 625."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks that House Bill 625 be placed in Interim Study. Can we do it from here, or does he have to come up here? But if he doesn't can we..."

Huff: "It's on page 14, Mr. Speaker."

The Clerk will take note of that. Speaker Peters: "Fine. anyone else is interested in putting Bills in Interim the Clerk has forms here. House Bill 913, Study, Representative...Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise, Sir.?"

Is putting Bills in Interim Study the only Kane: "Inquiry. alternative we have? Is there going to be provisions for either a Fall or a Spring Calendar as there was two years ago?"

Speaker Peters: "I don't believe that question has been decided as yet, so anyone who is thinking about doing that, I would suggest that you wait a little bit of time yet until we figure out whether it would be best for you to put them in Interim Study or a Fall or a Spring Calendar."

Kane: "How much of a head start are we going to have?".

Speaker Peters: "Oh you'll have enough time."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "House Bill 913, Representative Giorgi. The Bill has been read. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the digest is correct."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi, excuse me. Punch your light."

Giorgi: "It's on."

Speaker Peters: "Greq it's not working here. The light up here is not working. Proceed Sir."

Giorgi: "Mr., Speaker, the digest is correct. It provides that

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the Secretary of State shall not release an abstract of a driver's record or make available information about a driver's record on a computer processible medium, without the written authorization from the driver. The only exceptions are law enforcement agencies. And, I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative
Leinenweber."

Leinenveber: "Well, there's a lot of important uses that various industries can make of a person's driving record, the most important one is the insurance industry. They routinely obtain this information in order to evaluate a potential risk and if we deny them the right to have this information, they will not be fully informed so that they cannot properly evaluate the risk. This will mean that they will take...insure people that are not proper risks. It will increase the cost of insurance to those people who driving records. good So, I think have I really don't...there was no explanation shortsighted. given by the Sponsor of any reason why a person's driving record ought to be sacrosanct. Police records are not sacrosanct. You can obtain someone's police record to find out how many times they've been convicted, by contacting Driving records. police department. computerized, so it's a very convenient way to obtain that through the Secretary of State's Office. Without any better explanation of why this information ought to be privileged, I really don't see that the evil results which will be higher insurance costs, warrant it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not true. Anyone that wants insurance, goes into the insurance company and authorizes them to get a copy of his motor vehicle record. We're just

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

saying that this record shouldn't be made indiscriminately available to everyone and to anyone by just calling the Secretary of State's Office for two bucks. If you want insurance you go to the insurance company and you tell them, I give you authorization to get my MVR report. And, I urge your support of this Bill, because this is a terrible invasion of privacy."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 913 pass?

 Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Hr. Clerk. The voting is open. Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."
- Friedrich, D.P.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand this Bill for the reasons that to in opposition Representative Leinenweber mentioned. It's an automatic thing and I can assure you that when people come into an insurance agency and you ask them about their driving record. thev don't always tell you the truth particularly those who have problems. So, all you're doing is creating a lot of paper work that has to go through mill, when now you can get this automatically. But, you are working a hardship on the good driver."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

 Robbins: "I stand in opposition also. When one of your constituents has trouble with his driving record and calls on you to help, why you have to get written permission and file all these things too and it creates quite a problem.

 If you worked on...with some of the federal things you'll understand what I'm talking about."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote."

 Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out this

 was heard in the Motor Vehicles Committee. It had a very

 very thorough hearing and the facts were such that the

 Committee voted almost overwhelmingly in favor of it. I

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

think it's a good Bill and ought to be supported."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Whenever I had a constituent problem with unemployment insurance or the area of motor vehicles, I always get a written permission from the person coming into my office. It's a simple protection of privacy for everybody and I don't see why anybody would vote 'no'. All it is, is a simple form that you have to sign in order to go into that person's files. It's a simple right of privacy and everybody should be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Would you please poll the absentees?"

Speaker Peters: "Poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Barnes, Bianco,
Bowman..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Vote Representative Barnes, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Breslin, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Epton, Garmisa, Hoxsey, Leverenz, Macdonald,
Margalus, Mautino, McBroom, Polk..."

Speaker Peters: "Vote Representative Polk 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Redmond, Telcser, Vitek, White, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Vote Representative Macdonald 'no'. Any other changes? 85 voting... Vote the Speaker 'no'. 85 voting 'yes', 77 voting 'no'. Postponed Consideration. House Bill 92... Representative Davis, House Bill 927, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 927. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to private
employment agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. The employment agency industry is one of the few agencies regulated not by the Department of R&E, but by the Department of Labor. They've been having some problems with the Department of Labor and the legislation was introduced to start as a negotiating point. Now, 927 is an agreed Bill so that the licensure activity is tightened up and the industry has requested that it be tightened up and the Department of Labor is in perfect agreement. I know of no opposition to the Bill whatsoever. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, shall House Bill 927 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voted who 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. wish? On this question, there are 149 voting 'aye', 4 Clerk. This Bill having voting 'no', none voting 'present'. received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 940, Representative Stuffle. Read the passed. Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill:940. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. This is a very simple
little Bill that amends the University Retirement System.
It doesn't cost the Pension Pund a dime. It merely
provides that the annuitants of the University Retirement

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

System can earn money up to the difference between their final rate of employee earnings and the pension that they took home. Currently these people can only earn up pension monthly annuity amount. There's no opposition that I know of to this particular Bill. ¥e amended it on Second Reading to conform with the request of the Pension Laws Commission, that this apply to people age sixty and over. The Pension Laws Commission supports the Bill and I would ask for an affirmative vote on House Bill 940.

- Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, shall House Bill 940 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 161 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 942, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 942., A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester. Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a merely Bill that passed out of Committee on a twelve, zero zero vote and under present statutes there is no authority to allow a losing candidate who petitions for a discovery proceedings to examine voter affidavits. This would allow it, if it's signed into law. And, I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one, the question is, shall House Bill 942 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 160 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 947, Representative Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 947. A Bill for An Act to amend the law in relation to vacancies in county offices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill also passed out of Elections Committee on a thirteen, zero zero vote. In case of vacancies, it requires an appointee to a county office vacancy, must have voted in the last General Primary of the political party which the former officeholder was affiliated. The current requirement, is that the appointee be of just the same political party. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being question is, shall: House Bill 947 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 140 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'nay', 1 This Bill having received the voting 'present'. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Read the Bill, Bill 959, Representative Younge. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 959. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Promotion Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Younge."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 959 amends the Illinois Promotion Act to provide that the Department of Commerce shall have the power to help municipalities develop new tourist attractions. Right now, the law reads that they can promote existing tourist attractions and with this Amendment, they would be able to promote new tourist attractions. It has no fiscal impact. The Department of Commerce wants the Bill and the Hotel Association wants the Bill and there is no opposition."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 959 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question, there are 158 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none Bill having received the This voting 'present'. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 961, Representative McBroom. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 961. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning aquariums, museums and public parks. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative McBroom."
- McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very simple Bill. It increases the museum tax from one and a half cents per hundred, to three cents per hundred. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 961 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 972, Representative Ronan. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 972. A Bill for An Act to amend an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan."

Roman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is a very simple concept. I want everybody to vote their conscience on this Bill. isn't a partisan issue. All we're doing here, is trying to provide services to the people of our districts. If you have a district office, I'm sure you want staff in that district office, you want phones, you want to do mailings and things like that. Inflation dictates that the costs have gone up, consequently our ability to deliver services have gone down. Now see, this isn't a Bill that really I In our ward, we have a full-time staff people deliver services to the people of our ward and I'm very proud of that. I'm sure a lot of you other folks don't have that ability, because you don't have the type of staff available that we've got. This is a Bill to help you folks so you can deliver services to your constituents. Don't be boondoggled by the media. This isn't a pay raise Bill. The TV is going to say you voted for a pay raise when you didn't vote for a pay raise. What you are doing, is voting for services. For once in your life, forget about the TV, forget about the newspapers, forget about the radios, vote for the poor people of your district. But, if you do want to cower to the media like you do most of the time, go on and cower and don't vote for the Bill. This is for the people of your district. Face up to reality and vote for this fine piece of legislation. If not, cower to the media like you always do and give me a resounding 'no' vote. Thank you, very much."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. In the next session of the General Assembly when
we'll be reducing the size of this House, I think it's time
that we reduce our office expense allowance by five
thousand dollars. I think it's time that we show the
people that we really mean to cut down and I certainly
encourage everyone in this General Assembly to vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan, to close."

Ronan: "Yeah, in response to Representative Boucek's argument, he obviously gave every reason in the world why we should vote for this. Next session, there are going to be fewer Legislators which means you're going to need staff to solve the problems for the people of your district. If you don't worry about the people of your district, if you're cowered by the media, then vote against this fine Bill. But, if you want to vote for the people of your district to provide services, to answer constituent complaints, to do things for the people of your district, so you can put somebody on the payroll to respond to their needs, vote for this fine legislation. If not, cower to the media and vote against it. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 972 pass?

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Cullerton, to explain his vote."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my "aye" vote, I want you to consider the fact that we don't have to spend all the money that's made available to us. Some people in this General Assembly make a big deal, as a matter of fact, out of returning this money back to the General Assembly. This Bill if passed, will offer you an opportunity to return

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

even more money to the General Assembly. I think therefore, it's an excellent idea if everyone would vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote." there's been such a misconception over Matijevich: "You know, office allowance. I had a call about three weeks ago when one of these raise Bills came up and one of my constituents talked to me and I mentioned the district allowance. And, that constituent was of the impression that if you didn't use your allowance, that that was part of your salary. I've never seen any type of business where you have expenses for that business, that anybody would consider that that is money that you have earned. Yet, because of the way that this has been twisted, that's exactly what our constituents think. And I just think that's a shame. This is a service that we afford to our constituency and I'm not I think that anybody who votes ashamed to admit that. against this, is saying that they don't want to provide any service for their constituency, that's all there is to it. And, if you don't have the guts to say that, you don't belong here. It's simple..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "I really don't mind subsidizing my district to the tune of three to five thousand dollars a year, because I decided when I ran for office I would serve the people. I do have qualified staff and then on top of that, why I do quite a bit of traveling and pay for it out of my own pocket, which I wouldn't be able to do out of this. I'm going to vote 'yes', because the fewer Legislators, if they do their job, are going to have to have more staff in their office."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker. I'm not running for election to the House again, I plan to run statewide, so this won't particularly

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

help me, it might hurt me in my election, but I'm voting for this Bill. The only way the people in the state can deal with the complexities of state government, with the bureaucrats of state government, is through their elected State Legislator in his district office. Most of them can't afford to take the time off to come to The only place they can deal with state government, is back in the district in the district office. I know: my allowance will run out before the end of this fiscal year, if it hasn't already and that's true of most of you. Let's be honest, this isn't our money, it's all vouchered out directly for rent, for secretarial service, for office supplies. The newspapers obviously aren't honest enough to They think it's part of our pay. For years print that. I've been trying to get the Maukegan News Sun to put in that this money is vouchered directly from Springfield, from the State Treasurer and Comptroller to the to the telephone company, to the secretary or to the supplier of office supplies and we never see this It doesn't come through us. Newspapers will never say That's true, it's not part of our salary, it never has been. And so, I'm pleased to get up and vote 'aye' on this Bill, because it's something that does serve the public, that aids the public and doesn't aid us personally, but those voters who are frustrated with the bureaucracy of state government. If you believe in state government, if you don't have anything to flow to Washington, then vote this and let's serve the people through state government."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vitek, to explain his vote."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker. Not to explain my vote, but I feel the statement made by one of my good friends that if you vote against this, you are not giving your constituents fair

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

service. I work at the headquarters, at my office and I offer those people good service all the time, whether I get a raise or not."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger, to explain her vote."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I'm

probably not quite as wealthy as my seatmate, I spent over

four thousand dollars of my own money last year to run my

two district offices and I don't know if I can continue to

do that. Maybe the people in Chicago are able to serve

their people, but when you serve a county where you have to

drive seventy-five miles to your other office, you're not

going to be there and in this county too. We do need this

kind of help, if we're going to serve the people in more

than one city or one ward."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz, to explain...."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me explain that I see time and time and time again, that everybody does not operate in their district office or even sometimes they don't even have a district office. Perhaps we see a Senator saying I'm giving half of it back. Well, he's going to give a little more back. Last year, we gave over a million dollars back that we didn't use. This merely allows it to be there. The people have to justify it's use on an individual basis. Therefore I vote 'aye', so that we do not have to have fund raisers to pick up the difference. That's ridiculous."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman, to explain..."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's a limit to how much you can ask your landlord to subsidize your district office, how much you can ask your secretary to subsidize your district office.

Because, those of you who run legitimate district offices and provide the kinds of services that the people deserve,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

know that you can't do it for seventeen thousand dollars. There's no way you can pay Xerox and the postal service and the secretary and the landlord with that kind of money.

Now we're talking about three thousand dollars here and since we..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoxsey, to explain her vote."

Hoxsey: "Yes. I think this is the time for people to be up front. If you believe that you need more money in your district office, to provide that service to the people, now's the time to be up front and say so. I for one, have been subsidizing my district office out of my own pocket in addition to the seventeen thousand since I first started it. And I'm telling you now, that I can't provide the kind of service that I want to give my people out there without additional funds. I subscribe that you should vote 'yes' and be honest about the thing right now."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I supported and voted for the last increase, I believe it was needed. At this point in time, I'm one of those who returns money. I told Representative Ronan in Committee, that I thought a better Amendment to this Bill would take that money that those of us who are lucky enough to return it to the State, take that money and redistribute it among those who...who spend it all. That's okay with me and seems to be a more reasonable approach."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf, J.J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I lapsed some money last year too, but I know a lot of our Members don't. Now your secretaries haven't had a raise for the last four years, we give it to every other state employee. You vote for it for the universities, for everybody else. Postage has gone up this year. If you rent a copy machine,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

that went up I think, about forty percent this year. There are a number of Hembers in wide number of county districts that need the money. If you don't want it, get your press release out, go to the press and tell them how marvelous you were and you returned the money. But, I don't think we should penalize those who need the money to run an office."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelley, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't think anyone of us would hesitate to say we need more money. the year that we're cutting down money to the But. in elderly, to the blind. to law enforcement. day care centers, to every other group that qovernments, depends on us for increases, I don't know how wе justify increasing our own expenses when we're cutting other people who depend on our votes. I know most of us take money out of our pockets to do our job at home, but I think that is individual preferences, whether we want to do that or not. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bell, to explain..."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In contrast to what Mr. Kelley just said, we're not trying to help our own selves. What we're trying to do, is wwe're trying to help our employees back home. I've only been here two years. In two years my secretary hasn't received a raise. My rent's gone up, my postage has gone up, my utilities have gone up, everything else has gone up. I think that we should all be honest here. We know that we need the extra money, it's There's nobody in the galleries here who not for us. We expect all hasn't expected a raise in the past year. other state employees to receive a raise. I don't know why we can't give a raise to the people who run our offices back home. I certainly request a 'green' vote. you."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Topinka, to explain her vote." Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House. With the costs going up as they have been, I know in our case we run a full service, five day a week operation and we take care of everybody and they come in not even from our district, but from other places as well where they can't get taken care of. There is absolutely no way I can keep paying and subsidizing people with off year fund raisers to keep operative in the way that we want to do it and what the people have come to expect. And, I think it's just really up front to just come out and just say it. There is no way I can keep begging people to volunteer their time to When we checked into what it would cost just to do this. send a newsletter, with the increase in postage, and found out the postage would be between eight and ten thousand dollars, that put us over the top. We can't even afford to do that. So, I would urge everybody to just consider this just come on out openly about it and if you wish to return money and feel you can afford to give five thousand dollars back to the pot, more power to you. Thank you." Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester, to explain his vote." Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was one of those Legislators, one of the few Legislators South of Springfield that voted for the pay raise Bill a couple of years ago and I got burned pretty bad as well as everybody else did. But, I see this as a different type of Bill. This is not a Bill to put money in our pockets, this is a Bill to help us provide the needed services to our constituents back home. My telephone bill runs about four hundred to five hundred dollars a month. I

represent twelve counties and every call from Rosiclare is a long distance call. And I have a secretary that I can

only afford to pay two hundred and fifty dollars a

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

and I can only afford to have her there three days a week.

We processed over six hundred senior citizen circuit

breaker applications last year alone. I think that our

constituents back home would support us in voting for this

type of legislation, because it is legislation that is

going to be tools to help do our jobs back home. And I

would ask all those downstate to vote for it too."

"Representative Greiman, to explain his vote." Speaker Peters: Greiman: "Like Representative Winchester, I also have to violate the Minimum Wage Act from time to time and lay on volunteer people and bring them in and cajole them and beg them and turn them away when it's time for a raise. As I recall, when I came into this General Assembly, that was eight years ago, we were getting twelve thousand dollars. seven...that was when we changed it. That means for the last six years, for three terms, it's stayed at seventeen. My goodness the cost of living....my rent in my office went from a hundred and forty to two hundred and fifty Doubled. Certainly....or almost doubled. Certainly this is just a minimal thing to catch up. And it's absurd and we better bring the wagons around in a circle if we're so afraid to do anything."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Dick Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly, D.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I recall

when I came down to Springfield about nine years ago and I

want to especially point this out to the freshmen

Legislators, we didn't even have secretaries and we didn't

even have offices. Our term was the first one to have that

honor and there was only a couple of thousand dollars to

run an office. I have to agree with my colleague across

the way, I think that seventeen thousand should be enough

to run any office. And I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider, to explain his vote."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Schneider: "Well, Dick Kelly's right. A couple of years ago when we all came down here, I came down here now ten guess, we didnot have anything. We had fifty bucks for mailing, we had to tackle a secretary up on the sixth floor and I always could do that I guess, but basically, what you had to be aware of was that you had no resources to be able to communicate your with constituents. extraordinarily stupid that we're sitting here toda v. saying we want to serve our constituents and we're reluctant and unwilling to do it. Hoffman's right, you can't run an office out of our area, by allowing...asking the landlord to subsidize you. You can't run an office with volunteers, they come and they go. There's got to be level of expertise that's got to be maintained. can't raise this small amount, we're doing ourselves and our constituents a disservice. It's abominable that a lot of us who have been here awhile don't really that over a ten year period, we've enhanced our ability to serve only because we've been able to maintain a secretary in the district. Perhaps she or he can do some research, we can have a phone, we can have occasional mailings. We enhance our ability to serve by being able to increase this I certainly hope you understand, that after a period of ten years, when you move from fifty bucks terms of your expenses, to seventeen, you made a dramatic change. But, now that ... "

Speaker Peters: "Raise it to twenty. Representative Koehler, to explain her vote."

Koehler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I

don't think I probably need to explain my vote, but I would

remind you that we are asking all our departments to cut

back. We're asking both state and federal government to

cut back. We're asking citizens to tighten their belt. It

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

seems inappropriate to me, that Legislators would at this time, be increasing their allowances. And I would warn you of the dire consequences if this might pass. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative....Representative Alexander, to explain her vote."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to use some statistics. At present we are representing a hundred and eighty-eight thousand persons by three Legislators. Which means, each of us are roughly handling sixty-three thousand persons with mailing and what not, if you want to go one on one. With the purported cutback that will take place at the new election, we will be handling, two Legislators, ninety-four thousand persons individually and collectively. That is an increase..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed. Proceed, Representative."

Alexander: "That's an addition for every Legislator who will return here with the cutback of thirty-one thousand individuals to make contact with above what they have been doing. You need this raise."

Speaker Peters: "Representative...Representative Roman to explain his vote."

Ronan: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know I spoke cause it's my Bill, but let's get one thing straight. Let's have the Peoria Journal-Star, the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Sun-Times, all these phony press people attack me. It's my Bill. Lay the blame on Ronan so we can let these other Legislators off the hook. It's Ronan's Bill. Put the heat on him. I'm robbing from the taxpayers. I'm the bad guy. But like I said, I don't need it. I want to help my good friends downstate, my suburban colleagues. But just make sure the heat goes on me. So all you hot shots in the press, Ronan's Bill and don't criticize these poor guys from Peoria and all these other places like you do all the

45th Legislative Day

May 18. 1981

time. I'd like the phony media to direct the heat where it belongs, right on Ronan so that my colleagues can vote for this fine Bill. So, press, it's Ronan who put this Bill in and lay off these other poor cowboys. Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Plinn to explain his vote."

Plinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those who don't have a home office and I turn back in more than half of the allowance now. But I do have a suggestion as to how we can get the Bill passed and get it off to the Senate here. Why don't we back the thing up and have an Amendment and all those who are voting 'no' don't get it. And I'm almost sure we'll pick up a few 'aye' votes that way."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Turner? Representative Turner to explain his vote."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a freshman, I've learned that the \$17,000 just won't do it. My district takes in half of Chicago and part of the suburbs and I'm willing to serve the people of the State of Illinois, open up two district offices with a measely salary of \$17,000. It's very hard to do. It's coming out of my pocket, my folks' pocket, the taxpayers' pocket. I just think that we all ought to vote today so that we can provide the kind of representation that's needed back home in the districts and that this raise will only do just that."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair will recognize the final two speakers.

Stuffle and Neff in that order. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Simply to say that it's impossible now to run an office on what we are given. People complain all the time that we're not open enough, that we can't meet their needs quick enough and that we don't respond quick

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

The same number of people, in fact probably more, enough. are going to be coming to your office whether this passes or not. They're going to want the same services. going to want the same things done for them; only quicker. It's impossible to do now. Since this passed as an increase some years ago, I believe six, telephone bills have doubled in our districts, rent has gone up by 40%, utility bills have almost tripled, the cost of postage has If you want to go back and say that up four times. against something that you're going to you voted something out of, fine. But we don't get a dime out of this. Our constituents do and even though you know and I know that some people are going to begrudge us the money to help the people that complain, that's the only way you're going to be able to continue to help them and if you want do a good job I guess we'll have to take a little heat for this particular vote on a Bill that does..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in explaining my vote, I think some of you folks have only been here a few years, should go back to when we didn't have any money whatsoever. As someone brought up here, we had \$50.00 allowed for stamps and stationary and so forth. And I tell you, when we look back there, \$17,000 looks like a lot of money to some of us. I think we're getting allowance well and therefore, I can't understand why anybody would ask for an increase."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel to explain her vote."

Karpiel: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know we've had all kinds of explanation of votes on this, but as a conservative who usually votes 'no' on these types of issues, and you would vote 'no' on a pay increase or a per diem increase because that would go into

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

my pocket. I do have to suggest that I think a lot of people who are voting 'no' on this are wrong in that I have to agree that we cannot serve the people with the kind of money that we are getting now and it should be noted for the gallery and for the newspapers who might not realize, we don't get this money in our pockets. We have to voucher for it before any kind of a bill is paid. I have...I live in the largest district and represent the largest district in the State of Illinois. It has almost 300,000 people in it right now. There are three Representatives representing that district. That's about 100,000 apiece if you want to break it up that way. To any way or shape try to mail that district and try to mail newsletters..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bluthardt to explain his vote.

One minute."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I've been down here a while too. When I came down here we received no per diem: we received no office expense. We had no secretary; we had no office; we had no telephone at our desks. I've voted against this expense allowance for offices. I think if we had less expenses and less office forces, we'd have less Bills filed in this House and we...instead of breaking or killing 300 Bills on the deadline night, be...wouldn't be killing that many. We'd get through the schedule. Now I'm going to vote for this though because may the good Lord strike me dead if I ever come back here I don't want to come back. I don't want to come back and I'm going to vote for it so you can go ahead drive the people crazy with your local offices, snooping around trying to find something from which you introduce a Bill, clutter up the Calendar. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I just took a little inventory of myself

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

here a couple minutes ago, well, for the last ten minutes or so, and I'm voting 'no' and I've been sitting here saying, 'Hail Mary' after 'Hail Mary' that the damn thing would pass. So I'm going to vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom just said a 'Hail Mary' that you did just that. Representative Ewell."
- Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, a little honesty in government, I'm tired of hearing people talk about what they didn't have umpteen years ago when they got here. Umpteen years ago they had a lot of shoe boxes. And I would say again today, it's still the same old proposition. If you have your coffers filled by special interest, of course you don't need anything."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Giglio to explain his vote."
- Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Giglio: "Thank you. Gentlemen of the House. I really don't understand. You permissive legislation. know, we talk about else...And what could you say about this? This is what permissive legislation is all about. You don't take the money and keep it. Turn it back. But give it to the people that need it in the districts that they have travel two and three counties to find out what they're And back home when I was out and now that I'm back, I never had so much work since I've been back this last Every Bill, every vote, I never had so much letters in the time that I ve served since 1972. A few more votes will put it lover and I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are... On this question there are 80...Take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye', 72 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kelly?"

Kelly: "I'm going to verify it."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees..."

- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Wait a minute. So that you will know, there are...Representative...Make a note for the electrician. Representative Braun and Kelly, their lights do not work here. Poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Bowman. Epton. Garmisa.

 Huskey. Margalus. Redmond. Stearney. Telcser. Van

 Duyne. White. Yourell. No further."
- Speaker Peters: "Does the Gentleman persist? Representative Kelly."
- Kelly: "Well, I'm going to persist with the verification. I've seen too many people, not on this issue, but on other issues, involving self-interest where you let Bills go by that are very narrow and I mean, if you're going to vote 'no', you've got to be consistent. If you want to oppose the legislation, then I think you should be consistent and you should try to be seated if you can. If there's Members that are being voted that aren't here, unless you want to take one more Roll Call then I'll roll that way."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser, tayet.

 Representative Plinn?"
- Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman's request for a verification is timely. You declared the Bill passed."
- Speaker Peters: "The...The Gentleman's light here is not ...is not working, Representative Flinn.."

Flinn: "Well, have him call the electrician then."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

Flinn: "Have him call the electrician."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ted Meyer?"

Meyer: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Representative Huff?"

Huff: "Well, he may not have a phone in his district office, Mr.

Speaker. So you may have to put that request in for him."

Speaker Peters: "I didn't understand that. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson...."

Speaker Peters: "Representatives Hoffman and who else asked to be verified? Hoffman and Flinn and Ted Meyer. Alright, proceed."

Bell. Bluthardt. Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Barnes. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Chapman., Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Domico. Doyle. Ewell. Ewing. Deuster. DiPrima. Farley. Fawell. Plinn. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Henry. Greiman. Griffin. Grossi. Hanahan. Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Karpiel. Keane. Kornovicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Kustra. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McBroom. Levin. McClain. McPike. Ted Meyer. Mulcahey. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Pullen. Rhem. Rigney. Ronan. Schneider. Slape. Irv Smith. Margaret Smith. Stanley. Steczo. Stewart., Stuffle., Telcser., Terzich. Topinka. Turner. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Zito. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly, Dick: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Abramson."

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

Kelly, D.: "Hanahan."

Speaker Peters: "Hanahan. Representative Hanahan...Kelly, I believe there was some agreement to verify both Representative Conti and Hanahan, because they are ill, if we need to drag them over we can, but I don't think that's

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

necessary. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know where we're starting this verification."

Speaker Peters: "The count is 91, Sir."

Ronan: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

- Yourell: "Yes, since neither one of the colleagues in my district have offices, I wasn't here when this vote took place, but I do have an office and have had one ever since I first took office sixteen years ago. I'm going to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Peters: "Add Representative Yourell as 'aye'.

 Representative Preston asks to be verified. Leave to be
 verified, Representative? Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since my two colleagues in the 59th District feel that we don't need this money, then God forbid that I would cast a vote that would give it to them, so vote me 'no'."
- Speaker Peters: "Change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no'.
 Winchester from 'yes' to 'no'. The starting count is still
 91. Am I correct, Mr. Clerk? Proceed, Sir. Proceed,
 Representative Kelly.
- Kelly, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I had about six or seven down here and everyone of them that I see are...appears to be present.

 And I'm going to let it go now."
- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 91 voting 'aye', 72
 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared
 passed. House will be at ease for a minute.
 Representative Ryan in the Chair."
- Speaker Ryan: "Can we have a little order...special business we'd
 like to take care of. We have a new Member of the Illinois
 House that's going to be sworn in here by Judge Ackerman.
 Robert Barr from the 11th District in Chicago to replace

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Jim McCourt. Gentlemen, do you want to come up and go through your ceremonies."

Judge Ackerman: "Mr. Speaker....are you ready to take the oath as a Representative from the 11th District?"

Barr: "I am, your Honor."

Judge Ackerman: "You'll raise your right hand and repeat after

me. I, state your name."

Barr: "I, J. Robert Barr."

Judge Ackerman: "Do solemnly swear."

Barr: "Do solemnly swear."

Judge Ackerman: "That I will support the Constitution of the United States."

Barr: "That I will support the Constitution of the United States."

Judge Ackerman: "And the Constitution of the State of Illinois."

Barr: "And the Constitution of the State of Illinois."

Judge Ackerman: "And that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the Office."

Barr: "And that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the Office."

Judge Ackerman: "Of State Representative."

Barr: "Of State Representative."

Judge Ackerman: "From the 11th Representative District."

Barr: "From the 11th Representative District."

Judge Ackerman: "To the best of my ability, so help me, God."

Barr: "To the best of my ability, so help me, God."

Judge Ackerman: "Congratulations."

Barr: "Thank you, Judge."

Speaker Byan: "Thanks very much, Judge. Representative Barr will address the Body for a couple of seconds. I'm sure most of you know who he is. He's the Republican County Chairman from the County of Cook, a very successful attorney like most of them out of the City of Chicago. And as I said

45th Legislative Day May 18, 1981
earlier, he's taken Representative McCourt's place.
Representative Barr."

Barr: "Mr. Speaker and my new colleagues in the House, it's a great honor for me to be here today. I guess this is like learning to swim by jumping off the deep end. I rode down on the plane a couple hours of ago from Chicago. Representative O'Brien, he assured me that he and many of the rest of you would be glad to assist me and give me advice on how to handle the many matters that are before the House today. I'm looking forward to working with all of you, both sides of the aisle. I appreciate this opportunity. Thank you very much for your warm welcome."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Barr. Mr. Collins and Mr. Sandquist will escort you to your seat, Mr. Barr. Show him how to work the voting switch, would you, please."

Peters: "Representative Peters in the Chair. Special order of business, page 24, Consideration Postponed, House Bill 677, State-wide Grand Jury. Representative McClain, you have a question."

McClain: "Well, first of all, Mr., Speaker, I hope you're joshing."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

McClain: "Are you joshing?"

Speaker Peters: "Have you ever known me to josh about serious subjects?"

McClain: "Are you serious? I mean are you serious..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz...Yes, Sir."

McClain: "I mean if you're serious, then I would object strongly.

Mr. Peters, there's many Bills on the Calendar right now
that have not been considered..."

Speaker Peters: "We'll note your objection for now. Page 6,
House Bill 974. But don't fall asleep. House Bill 974.
Representative Kosinski, you could return. House

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- Bill..House Bill 974, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 974, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thanks for the surprise, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 974 simply changes the definition of textbooks under the textbook program to allow reusable workbooks and manuals in looseleaf form which is intended for the principle source of study. Under the present program the books that are used in the textbook program cannot be used or generally are not used for third-grade, second-grade, first-grade and kindergarten students. This would allow textbooks to be given to students in those grades and I would appreciate your affirmative vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There's no one rising.

 The question is 'Shall House Bill 974 pass?'. Those in
 favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting
 'nay'. Representative Turner, to explain his vote.
 Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Mr. Speaker, I just had a question but we've already started on the vote, but I wanted to know what's the non... the qualifying non-public schools. Is it too late to ask that question?"
- Speaker Peters: "Well, Representative Steczo, please reply."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, this program will provide, does provide the textbooks to public and private schools. So, that may answer your question, Art."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Hr. Clerk. On this question there are 121 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'nay', 12 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 978, Representative Sandquist. Read

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill:978, a Bill for an Act in relationship to weather modification. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."
- Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is Sponsored by myself, Representative Currie, Representative Pierce, Representative Darrow and Representative Kustra. It comes from the Sunset Commission and this is the one that we're recommending that the weather modifiers be kept in. If we do not pass this legislation, the weather modifiers will go out of the licensing as of October 1 of this year. We do make a change in that we change the weather modifiers from being under the Department of Registration and Education to under the control of the Institute of Natural Resources. I don't believe there's any opposition to this, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is 'Shall House Bill 978 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 979, Representative Currie. Out of the record, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 979, a Bill for an Act in relation to structural pest control. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House

 Bill 979, like the one that preceded it, is also a
 recommendation from the Sunset Committee. It has to do

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

with structural pest controllers that are known as termite inspectors and exterminators. Under federal program regulations right now, Illinois, like 40 other states, has its own inspectional and competency testing program for those people who in large buildings, hotels, tall highrises and what not inspect for pesticide damage. This... Our proposal is to retain that program to beef up enforcement powers in the Department of Public Health and I would urge your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bil 979 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Woodyard, Peters 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 141 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 980, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 980, a Bill for an Act relating to the enforcement of water well construction codes. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."
- Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the professions that we did recommend be eliminated and go out on October 1st was the water well drillers, but we do recommend that there are certain changes that should be made in the Water Well Code so that it would be more easily enforced. Now, I do want to point out that you may want to keep the water well drillers in, but that's another Bill and you'll have a chance to do that, but what this Bill does is to put more affective provisions in the Water Well Code regardless of whether they stay in. I don't

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

believe there's any opposition to this and I'd ask an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Woodyard?

 Anyone in opposition? There being no one, the question is,

 'Shall House Bill 980 pass?'. Those in favor will signify
 by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all

 voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this
 question there are 157 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none

 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the

 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 983, Representative Findley. Read the Bill, Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 983, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Findley."

- Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. The Small Business Purchasing Act was established in 1972 to allow independent closely held small businesses to participate in a special set aside program administered by the Department of Administrative Services for certain state contracts. Since 1972 the dollar volumes that a business may have in annual sales to be defined as a small business have not changed although inflation has brought about increase in the size of small businesses. The Department of Administrative Services and many small business associations that support this Bill feel that the...that there are not sufficient small businesses participating in the program. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call and will answer any questions."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being no one,
 the question is shall House Bill...Representative Greiman."

 Greiman: "Yeah, I had a question. I wondered...how many

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

businesses are there that have been participating in the program and how many will there..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you stand?"

Greiman: "We're on Short Debate."

Ebbesen: "We're on Short Debate. That's right."

Greiman: "I never thought you'd say that."

Ebbesen: "So if he wants to oppose it or whatever, he shouldn't be asking questions."

Greiman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I will speak in mild opposition then for Mr. Ebbesen. I wouldn't want him to be overburdened with knowledge about the Bill. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have some concerns about it. Indeed there has been inflation, but perhaps not 300%. This Bill goes from...increases these amounts, these threshold amounts 300%. I suspect that it will take a lot of the small businesses that are now enjoying some of benefits and able to compete out of the picture. it...we'll then have large businesses. The purpose of this was to bring small business into the stream of the market. And I suspect that we...when we increase that by 300%, we're taking small businesses out. I really would have liked to have known the numbers and what we're talking about, but I've been precluded from doing that. So I'm going to vote 'present' on it. And I think that's a pretty good vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Findley to close."

Findley: "Yeah. Al, to the first question, I have asked DAS, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Federation of Independent Business to tell me how many small businesses there are.

They can not tell me. I agree with you that it is a 300% increase. Where I disagree with you is that it will not preclude small businesses from participating. The acting

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

purchasing agent of DAS says that there are currently too few pre-qualified bidders to bid on these special So what they're doing instead of putting them contracts. on the business...small business set aside, they're opening them up for all the businesses in the State. I think is a productive Bill and consistent with good government." Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 9..pardon? The question is shall House Bill 983 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this...Macdonald vote...vote Representative Macdonald 'aye'. On question there are 147 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', 5 This Bill having received voting 'present'. is hereby declared passed. Constitutional Majority Representative Davis 'aye'. House Bill 999, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 999, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Criminal Code to create the offense of interference with emergency communications. Under the Bill a person who knowingly interferes with the transmission of an emergency communication over a citizen's band radio channel would commit this offense. The channel that most people use for emergencies is channel 9, so therefore I've used House Bill 999 to be the vehicle for this Bill. It would bring with it a penalty of a Class A misdemeanor. The Bill is modeled after a law in Texas. And it would permit the state law enforcement officers to pursue flagrant violators rather than wait for the PCC to respond, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 999 pass? Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1005, Representative Barkhausen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1005, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "Mr. / Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1005 removes the cap which now exists on the independent administration of estates which is a section of the Probate Act which was enacted in 1979 when the Probate Act underwent a rather comprehensive reform as I understand At that time, independent administration of estates was established as a separate section under the Probate Act which permits an executor, an attorney handling an estate to make out an inventory and a final account in an estate without actually having to file it in court. There is certain safeguards written into the Act which permit anyone having an interest in an estate to petition the court for a full-blown hearing on an inventory on a final account if that person seeks it. What this Bill does is to eliminate independent the \$150,000 cap which now exists on administration of estates where the testator, the person making out his or her will, has expressed a desire in that the executor be able to use independent administration of estates. And I would ask your...this Bill has the support of the Chief Judge of the Probate It's sponsored by Court, Judge (Dole) in Cook County. the....and endorsed by the Chicago Bar Association, and I would move for the favorable consideration of this Bill." opposition? Representative Peters: "Anyone in Speaker

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a rather important
Bill, and I would ask that it be taken off Short Debate."

Speaker Peters: "Are there ten Gentlemen joining him? One, two,
three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven,
alright."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, independent administration of estate is a new concept in It went into effect January 1, 1980, so it has been around for slightly over a year and five months. original concept was an Illinois State Bar Association proposal. And it was somewhat controversial. At the time proposal had opposition from the Probate Division in Cook County and many other people and industries in the However, after many negotiations, it was decided that an experimental period was called for, because there lot to be said for the idea of independent Now many may not realize administration of estates. exactly what that is, but when an estate is administered in normal fashion, the ... all of the actions of the executor or the administrator is done under the jurisdiction and with the approval of the Probate Court and reports are made independent administration, it Бas SO on. Under generally...it is done without court supervision. At . the time that the Act went in...or the Bill was originally passed in 1979, because it was a new concept, it was felt that there ought to be an experimental period to see if So a cap was placed on the there were problems arise. estate so that there could be independent administration of estates for \$150,000 or less. It was felt that the larger estates, those over \$150,000, should continue with court Now it's been in effect only, as I said a supervision. year and five..four or five months. And it is the feeling

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

of the Illinois State Bar Association and many probate people that there is insufficient time to analyze how. the program is working. So it was for this reason, certainly not because of any animosity towards the concept. Illinois State Bar Association originally proposed independent administration of it's estates was because of this reason that they wanted to see how well it would work to see whether there were problems arise that they felt that the larger estates ought to continue with court supervision and they could experiment with the smaller estates. As I said, it's only been a little over a year, and the Bar Association feels quite strongly that there needs to be more time before we take the cap off. So it is for that reason, without any animosity towards the concept but towards the idea that we ought to see whether problems many estates will...that...who are are arising, because administration will be...just be subject to any kind of will be able to really tell whether closing. So no one there have been problems. And again I can just tell you that the beneficiaries or the heirs of an estate really are They are advised that they are not very knowledgeable. receiving something, and they don't pay any attention to what's going on. They don't know what to do. And they are...they can be subject to a lot of maladministration problems. So we want to be able to find out whether there have been problems before we extend this concept across the board, so for that reason, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none the ques...Representative Barkhausen to close."

Barkhausen: "I think it's important to understand, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that independent administration does not...does not mean a total lack of supervision of the administration of a probate estate. It

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

just simply permits two minor short cuts in that in the preparation of an administration, and that is inventory and a final account, both of which have to be prepared in full under administration and mailed to all the The only thing that independent administration heirs. potentially allows is the saving of two trips to court. other words, a slight bit of attorney's fees by the executor or the attorney handling the estate in the filing an inventory and the final account. This is really an independent administration innocuous Bill that originally proposed contain no cap and was approved in this House without that \$150,000 cap two years ago. And that was only placed on the Bill over in the Senate because of some pressure from the corporate fiduciary's lobby. This Bill was approved in the Judiciary Committee. It is in fact approved by Judge Walter (Dole) of the Cook County Probate Court and former State Representative Joseph Gibbs of the Chicago Bar Association of which I am a member. They had a newsletter just a couple of weeks ago in which they had...they listed as one of their Bills that they wanted approved in this session, this very proposal. And I would ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1005 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. wish? voting 'aye', 20 On this question there are 131 Clerk. 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, House passed. Priority of Call. House Bill 1012, Representative Daniels. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1012, a Bill for an Act to amend

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Sections of the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1012 amends the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act to defer repeal of Detection of Deception Examiners Act from October 1, 1981 to October 1, 1991. Now, in Legislature has regulated and passed regulating the licensing Act. They did this in order to achieve the highest degree of accuracy. That is, the examiner must have received proper training and know how to interview subjects and formulate proper questions and be familiar with behavior systems. In recommending that no action be taken on the repeal of the Detection of Deception Examiners Act the joint Committee on Regulatory Agency reform, in my opinion, misapprehended the purpose of the Legislature in passing the 1963 Act. The select joint Committee based its recommendations on the conclusion that the Act was no longer needed because it achieved its original purpose. But the purpose of this Act that was passed in 1963 was not to just stabilize the market but was rather to assure the highest degree of accuracy in If you've ever dealt with lie detector detector tests. tests you know the importance of proper formulation of the questions and the proper handling of the test. For that reason, I'm suggesting by this Bill that we not defer repeal of that Act and solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask that this Bill

go off Short Debate and on to long debate. Like many other

Bills in the Short Debate Calendar this one is highly

controversial."

Speaker Peters: "Is the Lady joined by ten people? Long debate.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

The Chair will accommodate the Membership. Representative Currie. $^{\prime\prime}$

Currie: "Thank you very much, Ar. Speaker. Contrary to Representative Daniels' allegations, the Sunset Committee considered very carefully the purpose of the Act existed the protection of lie detector testers, Deception of Detection Examiners. And we concluded that effect of that Act in place in the State of Illinois is to increase the dollars that come into the lie detectors We heard the argument that the purpose of this pockets. Act is, in fact, to safeguard the consumer of the services the person whose employment record is at stake, whose opportunity to be employed or whose likelihood of being fired depends upon the outcome of a lie detector test. the basis of the testimony presented to us by the Deception of Detection Examiners themselves it is quite clear that there is no necessary accuracy in that kind of testing. only in the.. in 80 to 85% of the cases can even those people who are right now so carefully licensed by the State of Illinois guarantee any accuracy in the predictive value of the lie detector tests. There is a Bill on the Calendar in the Senate, Senate Bill 60. That Bill would certainly protect the consumers, the ultimate consumers of the lie detector tests. It would, in fact, bid the use of lie detector tests in any kind of employment situation. For anybody on this House floor who is concerned about the employee who might be fired or the perspective employee who might not be hired if we do not reinstate this particular regulatory program, I would urge you to look in a different direction. If you're concerned about that fellow, the employee of the firm, vote to get rid of lie detector testing in employment situations. In no way are protecting that employee if you vote to reinstate this

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

expensive regulatory program that Representative Daniels offers to us in House Bill 1012. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Kucharski."
Kucharski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?" Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the the previous speaker would go upon the old legal action that we've heard let the buyers beware. I haven't talked about any employees not being hired or somebody being fired. I'm talking about the realization that today, under current law and by Supreme Court decision, by the way, handed down on December 1, 1980. The Illinois Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Detection of Deception Examiners Act and prohibited the instruments which do not permanently and simultaneously cardiovascular and respiratory the subject's record Now, if you're at all familiar with lie detector tests you know the urgency and the importance of making sure that they are properly formulated and the questions are properly formulated. How many of the lawyers in this House have had their clients come into them and say, 'somebody wanted me to take a lie detector test. concerned about those results. How many of you know how careful these tests have to be analyzed. And that's why I'm saying we shouldn't repeal this very important Act and it's for that reason that I'm suggesting to you. very, very important that we maintain this regulatory Body and hold it in operation. I'm asking to vote 'yes' on this very important piece of legislation."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1012 pass?'

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
'nay'. Representative Sandquist, to explain his vote."

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

I want you to know that we had extensive hearings under our Sunset provision on this and what Representative Daniels is talking about is not what's involved here. What... al this does and we got off the hearing the public is not protected by this. The only one protected are the lie detector examiners who want their protected title. And that's not what we're in business for. The state should not be doing this protection and therefore, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Darrow, to explain his vote."

Parrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to reiterate what Representative Sandquist said. We sat on the Sunset Commission. We hear from a number of lobbying groups. It's a Commission where we take quite a bit of heat from lobbying groups. Special interest groups. Again, this would only protect the people who administer lie detector tests. It wouldn't help anyone who has to take one. If they want to go and take a lie detector test they can get a reputable one through their experience. It no longer is necessary to have them licensed. We can save the tax payers money by taking this regulation off the books also. And I'm glad to see it's getting 53 votes. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Vinson."
Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is to
extend the life of licensing for polygraph operators.
There is no area conceivably possible where the validity of
the operator, the reliability of the operator is more
important than in this. And a good polygraph operator
produces reliable results. Some of the most reliable
results you can have. I would urge an "aye" vote."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative O'Brien, to explain his vote."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill and I'm not sure what the membership.. if the membership is aware of the consequences of this Bill. If the licensing provision for polygraph examiners is not continued to be in operation in the State of Illinois, what you're going to find is the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, all your bankers, all your operators of stores such as Marshall.. (cut off)."

Speaker Peters: "Let him finish. Proceed."

O'Brien: "I don't know if I got a full minute on that."

Speaker Peters: "Not quite. We short changed you."

O'Brien: "All the people who run retail operations where there's a tremendous amount of cash flow on a daily basis. People that operate cash registers. What you're going to have is a problem with people who will be working those cash registers who will not be screened. And that's what they do with the polygraph examinations. They screen those people to see to it that they are honorable. And you're going to find a void in the State of Illinois if this does not continue to be in operation. This is a good program. It provides for quality employees in sensitive cash flow positions."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 83 voting 'nay'. The Gentleman asks Postponed Consideration.

House Bill 1016, Representative Daniels. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1016, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill 1016 amends the Criminal Code and provides a rewrite of legislation dealing with controlled substances. What it does is it adds a new section of proposed legislation based upon the street value of drugs. And by adding and changing some of the elements of the street values, it's more incurrent to what's happening on the streets today. This Bill has the support of State's Attorney Richard Daley in Chicago and came out of the Judiciary Committee with a favorable vote, and I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to point out what happens in a criminal court when we in the Legislature introduce mandatory sentencing. What the judges do is say to themselves, 'Well, I don't feel like giving that particular criminal this particular sentence, for a number of reasons that are known to them at the time, and they say, 'Well, the Legislature says I have to so what I m going to find the person guilty of a lesser included offense. So whenever you have mandatory sentencing...whenever you have mandatory sentencing, you, in effect in the long run, end up getting fewer convictions for the offense that you are really trying to stiffen the penalties for. It just does not work in practice. This is what you call a kind of a press release kind of a Bill. It, you know, it sounds good to say I toughened the penalties, but you're in effect reducing the penalties getting convictions for lesser And that's why I'm opposed to this particular offenses. Bill. I opposed it in Committee, and I'm opposed to any legislation that has mandatory criminal sentencing."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not a mandatory sentencing

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill. What it does is it addresses the very important subject of drugs and drugs on the street and drugs people that have been...people that have been selling drugs to our kids in the streets all over the State of Illinois. And if anybody stands on this floor and say that they're concerned about any mandatory sentences or judges being tough on criminals that are selling drugs to our kids, then I'll take exception to that. This Bill has been proposed by the State's Attorney of Cook County because of the serious drug problem that they are facing in Cook County. And I happen to concur with it, because as you all know this problem is extending all over the State of Illinois. It's not a mandatory sentencing Bill as the previous Speaker suggested It has three other sections to it dealing with to you. definitions of heroin and morphine and peyote and some of the experiences on the streets today. And I ask for your favorable support on this very important legislation dealing with the subject of narcotics."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1016 pass?

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. To explain his vote, Representative Ewell. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Levin, would you..I have something for you. House Bill 1020, Representative McPike. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1020, a Bill for an Act to add sections
to an Act to provide the manner of levying and imposing
taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

House. House Bill 1020 provides a method for disconnection of territory from a special service area under very limited and very special conditions. Those that would like to disconnect must petition the court. have to prove in court that the territory was not, not..the territory was not, is not and is not intended by the corporate authority which created the special service area to be either benefited or served by the special In other words, if you're not receiving a special service. service in the past, you're not receiving it in the present, and the corporate authorities say to you that you will never receive the special services. Under those very limited circumstances, you can disconnect from the special service area at the..at the direction of the court. I *d ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one, the question is shall House Bill 1020 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question who wish? there are 166 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1043, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Nr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1043, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to clerks of the courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1043 is a Bill which will bring into line the fees being charged in the Circuit Court of Cook County. Presently, the Circuit Court of Cook County is operating at a very substantial deficit in the millions of dollars. This will provide the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

additional revenue so it will at least be a break-even operation. I know of no opposition. It passed out of Committee unanimously. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1043 be adopted..passed? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1052, Representative Ewing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1052, a Bill for an Act to amend..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "I had two Bills immediately following Representative Getty. I want to know why they were passed over."

Speaker Peters: "Sir, we are on the blue sheets, the Priority of Call. Representative Ewing, 1052."

Clerk Leone: "Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is put in to correct a technical inequity in the Personal Property Replacement Tax. When that Bill was passed there was a 8% capital investment tax on those people who were engaged in transmission utilities. General Electric is a large corporation in our state which has one small investment in the amount of some \$200,000 in the transmission line. Technically under the terms of the Replacement Act as passed, all of GE's capital investment

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

in the state could be taxed at the capital investment rate. This is to make it clear that only that which is involved in the transmission area should be taxed. It came out of the Revenue Committee unanimously, and it is to alleviate any inequities which might have occurred as a result of the passage of the replacement tax."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being no one, question is shall House Bill 1052 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 157 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting *present*. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. To the record, on House Bill 999, presented insure Representative Cullerton, the vote on House Bill 154 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay'. That Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1073, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1073, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to revise the law in relationship to sheriffs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the
Bill provides that the court services customarily performed
by sheriffs shall be provided by the sheriff or his
deputies. It specifies that the expense of the sheriff in
carrying out such duties shall be paid to the county from
fees collected pursuant to a court order. And I would
appreciate a favorable vote. It came out of Committee 12
to 1."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being no one,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the question is shall House Bill 1073 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1097, Representative Swanstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1097, a Bill for an Act to repeal sections of an Act in relationship to public health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1097 repeals an outdated statute. Under present law counties and municipalities still report to the Illinois Department of Public Health annually the names and addresses of all their local officials. The Department of Public Health does not need this information, therefore, both the Department and local officials desire to eliminate these unnecessary reports. This Bill comes at the request of the Department of Public Health and the County Clerks Association. It passed out of the Committee on unanimous consent. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is shall House Bill 1097 pass? Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Woodyard, Peters 'aye', Wolf 'aye'. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 167 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1136, Representative Greiman.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1136, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the State Comptroller's Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen this Bill was filed at the request οf the Comptroller to provide us with solutions for several..for The first one where a contract has not problems. been reduced to writing and meets the threshold. It provides for an affidavit to be filed with the Comptroller and with the Auditor General as a cross-check. The second problem allows for an affidavit similar to that to be filed with the Auditor General where the contract for good cause shown has not been filed in a timely fashion. The third be resolved increases the threshold for problem nonprofessional services as contracts which must be filed \$2500 and it takes care of some relatively minor problems that the Comptroller has. Т ask for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1136 pass? Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1139, Representative Deuster. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill 1139 will allow the juvenile officer to Hause condition release of a minor who has been arrested for a crime taken into custody upon the minor's agreement to either perform public service work or make restitution to the victim of the crime. The Bill does require that this conditional release does require or must have the consent of a parent or a guardian as well as the consent in writing by the minor. Presently, this Bill will give flexibility to the juvenile officer in dealing with minors who have arrested. It will codify the informal station been release...station adjustment practice of some juvenile officers. It will facilitate restitution to the injured victim of juvenile crime, and it will encourage public service work benefiting the community. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police and it came out of the Judiciary II Committee 15 to nothing which is something I've never been able to do in five terms. I think it's a constructive and effective law enforcement tool, and I urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1139 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1144, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1144, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the County Auditing Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is the first of three Comptroller clean-up Acts. The first two were requested by the Auditor General, and House Bill 1144 provides that if the annual audit report is not filed within six months after the end of the fiscal year, the Comptroller can notify the County Board that the report is due and may grant an extension of 60 days. If he doesn't do it, this Bill allows the Comptroller to hire an accountant to perform the audit. And I would ask for a favorable..."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman would like to explain and ask leave to hear House Bills 1144, 1145 and 1146 on one Roll Call. Is leave? Leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1145, a Bill for an Act in relation to elimination of requirements that certain local government statewide summaries of fiscal status be published. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the audit of certain governmental units. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

- Keane: "House Bill 1145 simply deletes the requirement that the State Comptroller publishes an annual state—wide summary of the financial status of local government units. It saves money. The publication is very rarely, if ever, used. The information is available. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is are, considered, I'm sorry, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Yes, I stand in opposition to the Bill. I really don't believe the State Comptroller should come down to the various counties and set up and establish county procedures in telling them when their books should be audited and doing the work of the County Board. I really think this is

- 45th Legislative Day May 18, 1981

 an intrusion in local government. And I oppose 1144

 particularly."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bills 1144, 1145 and 1146 be adopted? Representative Keane to close."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only problem with it is..with the last Gentleman's statement is that if he feels that way, he should amend the law. Presently, the law exists and the Comptroller is given that responsibility. The Comptroller is just fulfilling his responsibility in..in doing what we have told him to do. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the three Bills."
- Speaker Peters: "All those in favor of House Bills 1144, 1145 and 1146 will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wolf, you hit my wrong button. Thank you, Sir. I don't want to speak. Okay. Have all voted who wish? On these Bills the vote is 155 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Hajority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 1150, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1150 will amend the Probate Act to provide that the Probate Court may make a determination that a disabled person, without appearing in court, is not in need of the appointment of a guardian ad litem. At the present time the court is required to have the disabled person personally appear before the court, and this is a very difficult circumstance in many instances. The alternative is the appointment of an attorney or guardian ad litem to represent the people

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

for a short period of time to make an investigation and then report back to the court that it is not necessary. This results in additional attorneys fees of sometimes two or three hundred dollars, but it does not give substantial additional protection. By deleting this, we will remove a burdensome difficulty in making people who are disabled appear in court or in the alternative of giving them a substantial additional monetary burden. I know opposition. Ιt passed out unanimously from Commis...Committee. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1150 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 163 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', three voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1155, Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 11..."

- Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 1160,
 Representative Ryan. Representative Reilly asks leave to
 handle the Bill for Representative Ryan. There objection?
 There being none, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Comprehensive Budget Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, House Bill 1160, simply provides a mechanism for implementing that section of the Illinois Constitution that prohibits the Legislature from appropriating more funds than it estimates to be

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

available. It forces us to deal in a comprehensive way with the entire budget, not just pass one appropriation after another. Ιt does not disturb the present appropriations' process but sets some limits on it. very similar to a Bill I introduced four years ago and to a Bill that passed virtually unanimously out of the House two ago under the sponsorship οf myself Representative Madigan. It's about time we implemented this constitutional I would ask for a provision. And favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1160 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'may'. Voting is Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? open. Bill Take the record. Mr. Clerk. House 1155, Representative Vinson asks to take that out qets something solved. House Bill 1161, Representative Lechovicz. Read the Bill, Ar. Did I give the vote? On this Bill there are 161 Pardon? voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1161, Representative Lechowicz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act in relation to certification and regulation of geologists. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1161 is an Act that pertains to the certification and regulation of professional geologists by the Department of Registration and Education. This Bill is the genesis of the thoughts of Doctor Duster who is the Gentleman in charge of the Geology Department of Southern Illinois University. In the discussion with Doctor Duster,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Choate and myself, we were Clvde talking about the mineral...the people investing in mineral rights in the State of Illinois in the field of coal and in the field of oil. Doctor Duster pointed out that this is one state that does not have any type of registration program in the field of geologists. And people that make an investment whether it be coal or in oil rights or in oil drilling or in the exploration of minerals in this state, it's one the few states that does not have a certification procedure for geologists. And I asked him that if a person making an investment, whether it be from 100,000 to \$1,000,000 maybe for a field of coal or a field of oil that how...what would be the best procedure to protect the investors in reference to the type of exploration, not only in this state but in other states? And he says probably the best way would to have a certification of geologists. And for that reason the House Bill 1161 was introduced at his request and at the request of people investing in this area. qualification to become a certified professional geologist would be to be certified by the American Institute of Professional Geologists or a person who has completed thirty semester hours of accredited schooling in geology or have a minimum of five years work experience within the field would qualify under House Bill 1161. If there are any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them. not, I'd be more than happy to ask for your 'aye' vote on 1161."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I don't want to speak in opposition at this point, but..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me..."

Friedrich: "Is there any grandfather clause? Is there any

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

grandfather provision?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "There is a grandfather provision as far as a minimum of five years experience in the work field at the present time, and it's contained in the Bill."

Priedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "In opposition, Representative Robbins. Were you in opposition? Representative Robbins. Go ahead."

- Robbins: "I'm in opposition to this for this reason. The University of Illinois with all of its' maps and all of its core drills and..and what have you, cannot tell you exactly what is under the State of Illinois, whether there is coal or oil and at what depth, with all of their geology things, and I think it's just another wasted form of government, another step of bureaucracy which is not needed, because I can assure you that there is oil underneath this Capitol, but I can't tell you whether it's hair oil or oil that can be produced. And that's about the same as a geologist can do in the country. They can tell you the rock strata, but they can't tell you where there's any oil there, and they can't tell you the quality of coal 'til it's core drilled."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechovicz to close for one minute."
- Lechowicz: "Well, based upon that opposition, I would strongly recommend an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1161 pass?

 Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. Representative Sandquist to explain his vote."
- Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was going to rise in opposition to this, but Representative Robbins did. This did appear before the Registration-Regulation Committee. It has a very fine

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Sponsor, and it flew out of that..flew out of my Committee. However, I must point out that this is something again that the Sunset will be looking at. To me it's nothing more than a protected title for the...for a geologist and it's nothing that the state should get into. And I'm not speaking for the Commission, I'm just speaking for myself, cause we have not heard it yet. And therefore, I'm going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 'no'-The Gentleman requests a poll of the voting absentees. Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock votes 'aye'. Let's wait 'til he gets the paper out. It's going to get complicated. Let's just hold on one second Get my paper out. Where are we starting with, here. 88? Representative Bullock votes 'aye'. Representative Katz. That's 89 minus Katz. Katz from 'aye' to 'no'. Pierce. 'Present' to 'aye'. Pierce. Alright. Representative Conti from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Ropp from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Deuster from 'aye' to 'no'. Do we have that, Mr. Clerk? Representative Hoxsey from 'present' to 'aye'. Any other changes? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 91 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1168, Representative Levin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1168, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

House. House Bill 1168 amends the Condominium Property Act. Under the existing law, that was passed in 1977, in condominiums formed after January 1st, 1978, unit owners have the right to attend meetings of the board of managers of the association. This Bill simply extends that right of unit owners to condominiums formed before January 1st, 1978. I ask for your "aye" vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Being no the question is shall House Bill 1168 pass? Those in will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 1179, Representative Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1179, a Bill for an Act to provide for forest preserve districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1179 simply provides as Amendment #1 indicates in your digest, that commissioners of forest preserve districts in counties of less than 3,000,000 population may set their mileage at a rate of not more than that allowed for members of the county board in the same county. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The question is shall House Bill 1179 be adopted? Representative Kane. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Just a question. When it says that they can't get paid more than members of the county board, aren't these people mileage...aren't these people the same? I mean the commissioners of the forest preserve district and the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

members of the county board are the same people, are they not? They're doing different business, but it's the same people. Just making sure, this seems like a duplication."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1179 pass?

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed..the voting..'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye',

15 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1181, Representative Catania. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1181, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1181 provides that all people in the Department Public Aid in dealing with recipients and applicants, must treat them with courtesy, consideration and respect. This It goes on to say that these is already in the Code. people will be informed of their right to expect this kind of treatment and that they may complain to the Department if this sort of treatment is not afforded. The Department will let them know this through informational brochures and publicly posted information, and such complaints shall be treated confidentially and cannot be used in any way against the applicant or recipient. It is the Department's Amendment that spells out the mechanics of this. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just to point out

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

that this Bill probably followed by one that says that the people in the Public Aid are...feel they have agreed position, will be furnished an attorney at Public Aid expense, and this is just another accumulation of things that we don't need in state government."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania, wish to close?"

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

 I would hope that once people who go to apply for Public
 Aid are informed that they do have certain rights and can
 expect decent treatment, they will not spend so much time
 calling their State Legislators and complaining about the
 treatment that they get in the Public Aid offices. I ask
 for your support."
- Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1181 pass?".

 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1189, Representative Zwick. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act in relation to ride sharing. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative. Greg, Representative

 DiPrima feels a draft. Representative Zwick."
- Zwick: "Thank you. House Bill 1189 creates the Ride Sharing Arrangements Act, which is a centralized Act that will deal with all ride sharing regulation, if there is any. Basically, it doesn't really create any new laws. All it does is expand the definition of ride sharing agreements to include car pools and van pools and bus pools. There was a fiscal note that had been filed, which was withdrawn

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

because of the Amendment which took out two sections, and I have established with both the staff and the Reference Bureau that this Bill does not preempt home rule. Basically, it's a statement by the State of Illinois that we want to go on record or have gone on record as supporting the concept of ride sharing, and I believe that this would encourage more companies to become involved with ride sharing. I ask for your favorable vote.

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, House Bill 1189 pass?. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Take...the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 140 votes voting 'aye' ... 140 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 6 voting... 140 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 6 having received This Bill voting 'present'... Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Someone here has a death penalty Bill, that's a first Bill. Bill 1209, Representative Levin. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1209, a Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act.

Third Reading..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1209 amends the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act to provide that when a...the text of the final regulation is published in the Illinois Register, the agency should include the name of a contact person and phone number that people can call if they have questions about the new regulation. This would avoid people being bounced around from bureaucrat to bureaucrat. It is currently the procedure with respect to the Federal Government. I've talked to Representative Bloom (sic,

45th :Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Senator Bloom), Chairman of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and he has no objection to it. It was reported out of Committee on a twenty to nothing vote and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Being none, the question is shall House Bill 1209 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 139 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1234, Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1234. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of An Act relating to contractors and material

 men's liens. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1234 makes a technical correction in the present mechanics' lien law and by virtue of House Bill 1234, the municipal corporations are added to the lists of governmental entities to which the mechanics' lien law applies. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? No one standing. The question is, shall House Bill 1234 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 154 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1253, Representative Keane. Read the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1253. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1253 includes the members and staff of the Board of Appeals and the State Property Tax Appeal Board among those who are eligible to receive additional compensation for continuing education under the Certified Illinois Assessing Officer's Certificate Program. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Not. The question is, shall House Bill 1253 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Representative Ewing, to explain his vote."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think people ought to realize that there is some pay increase in this Bill and they should look at it closely, though it's not of any great magnitude."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Keane to explain his vote."
- Representative Ewing is a hyphenated Cosponsor on this Bill, but be that as it may, let me explain in what way more money is involved. The Certified Illinois Assessing Officer's Certificate provides...or it's a program that we passed years ago to encourage assessing...assessors to go and get assessing education. In so doing, we give them a stipend of five hundred dollars a year, if they complete sixty hours of assessing courses and if in the next ten years they take another hundred and twenty class hours of additional assessing training. To do...to get the five hundred dollars a year, they must complete it, so it's

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

something that goes on to about...it can be a fourteen year program. We have, I think anyone who s...anyone who is cognizant of downstate assessing practices, realizes how bad they are and that is why we passed it. This Bill would allow the people in the board...the Tax Appeal Board, people who hear about twenty-five thousand tax complaints a year on assessing practices, to be eligible for the program that we have set up and would also leave those state employees who work for the State Property Tax Appeal Board to begin their...to begin their training. In order for them to...if after four years every one of those who are eligible four years from now, it would probably cost the state about twenty-five thousand dollars. That is the fiscal impact, four years from now, if every one of joins the Certified Illinois Assessing those people Officer's Certificate ... "

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing, on a point of personal privilege. Your name being mentioned. Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the fine Sponsor of this Bill. It is true that he very generously did put my name on this as a Cosponsor. I examined the legislation. There were several Bills that we joined together on. I did go up and have my name removed though after I saw the condition or the type of legislation. And, I'm sorry that I can't support it."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger, to explain her vote."

 Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I

 don't know how many of you have been assessors, but I was

 the assessor of the City of Springfield and the assessing

 officers and the employees aren't paid very well. So they
 all get these certificates which means they are excellent
 assessors. It also help (sic) raises their salary. But

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the members of the Board of Appeals already get sufficient salary. They wouldn't need that for that reason, and I hope they wouldn't be appointed to the Board of Appeals if they didn't know something about assessing procedures."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell, to explain his vote."

- Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an excellent idea, and I would hope that the Sponsor would have the Bill amended in the Senate to include those township assessors in Cook County who do have the AIAOC (sic) Certificates, so that they too can get the additional compensation. Out of the thirty township assessors in Cook County, there's only three that have the distinction of having the IAOC Certificate and one of them is in Worth Township. And I will hope that the Sponsor will entertain an Amendment in the Senate to take care of those individuals who have performed so well."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 84 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no'. Representative Keane."

Keane: "Poll the absentees."

- Speaker Peters: "Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Can we fix that now? Can we fix the machine now?"
 - Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt, Bowman, Epton,
 Garmisa, Huff, Margalus, Redmond, Telcser, White, Younge
 and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Peters: "There are 84 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'nay'.

 Representative Keane."

Keane: "Could I have the count, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "84...hasn't changed. 84 voting 'aye',
79...Representative Huff wishes to be recorded as voting
'aye'. The count is now 85 'aye'. Representative Ozella,
from 'aye'...from 'no' to 'aye'. Ozella, from 'no' to

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

'aye'. Any further changes? Representative Leverenz, from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "If we get there, we'll get a verification."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Rea, from 'no' to 'aye'.

Representative Stearney, from 'no' to 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? The count is... Representative Schraeder. Schraeder from 'no' to 'aye'. The count is now 90 'aye', 75...74 voting 'nay'. Representative Ewing asks a verification of the affirmative vote. Read the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Alexander, Barnes, Beatty, Bradley,
Brummer, Bullock, Capparelli, Carey, Catania, Chapman,
Christensen, Cullerton, Currie, Darrow, Deuster, DiPrima,
Domico, Donovan, Doyle, John Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Getty,
Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Grossi, Hanahan, Hannig, Henry,
Hoffman, Huff, Huskey, Jaffe, Jones..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yeah, can I be verified, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Can the Gentleman be verified? Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jones."

Speaker Peters: "Jack, Doyle. And Doyle, verified. Proceed. Go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jones, Katz, Keane, Dick Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kucharski, Kulas, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Levin, Madigan, Martire, Matijevich, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McGrew, McPike, Ted Meyer, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Connell, Ozella, Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Reilly, Rhem, Ronan, Saltsman, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schraeder, Slape, Margaret Smith, Stearney, Steczo, Stewart, Stuffle, Terzich, Turner, Van Duyne, Vitek, J.J. Wolf, Sam Wolf, Yourell and Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Questions of the affirmative vote.

- A5th Legislative Day

 Representative Ewing. Where are we...what's the starting count; Mr. Clerk? There are 90 'ayes' as a start.

 Proceed."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe there are not 89 or 90

 'yes' votes here. I have a lot of respect for the Sponsor of this measure. It's not that important. I'm not going to waste any further time. Let it pass out, I think it will get its everlasting somewhere else in the process. But, we know they're not there and if there is something important comes up, we can follow it then. But, I will withdraw my request for a verification."
- Speaker Peters: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question, there are 90 'ayes', 74 voting 'no'. This Bill having...three voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

 House Bill 1257, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1257. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the River Conservancy Districts Act. Third

 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a fairly simple Bill. It ought to get us back on the right track. It passed out of Counties and Townships on a nine to nothing vote. It amends the River Conservancy Act. It only...it adds two words to the Act, the two words are, 'water wells'. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 1257 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Woodyard, Peters 'aye'. Thank you. Take

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the record. On this question there are 153 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1263, Representative Zito. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1263, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Zito."

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

House Bill 1263 is a self-explanatory Bill. It adds a
couple of lines to the annexation of muni....the municipal
annexation which brings it into concurrence with the Park
District annexation. I would appreciate a favorable Roll
Call."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition?

Representative...Representative Pullen."

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "What is your purpose for introducing this Bill, Sir?"

Tito: "Well, Representative, several purposes. Municipalities throughout the State of Illinois are constantly plagued with industrial and unincorporated areas that contribute nothing to a municipality. And for those reasons I think any resident that belongs to a city or municipality in the State of Illinois would at least like to have a chance to derive some tax revenue from that area. And I think what we're doing also is bringing the language in the Illinois State Statutes under this Section in compliance with the already existing language in the Park District area."

Pullen: "Does this have anything to do with the desire of Melrose

Park to annex Maywood?"

Zito: "Maywood is a community in itself and I..."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Pullen: "I mean..."

Zito: "And Melrose Park is not specifically interested ... "

Pullen: ".. I mean Maywood race track."

Zito: "....in annexing any property."

Pullen: "I mean the Maywood race track, Sir."

Zito: "No, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Oh, it doesn't? How many unincorporated areas in this state would be affected?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative and Gentlemen, there's about 18
lights up here. I mean we either let this go for two
minutes or we're going to get in a long debate anyway.

It's, you know, half a dozen of one and six of the other."

Pullen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to move that this be taken off of Short Debate."

Speaker Peters: "Are there ten people to join the Lady? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, seven, eight...Tuerk, Priedrich. Nine ten...I've got enough. Proceed, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "How many areas in the state, unincorporated areas in the state, do you think would be affected by this Bill?"

Zito: "Representative Pullen, I'm not aware of that answer. I know as being a municipal official for the past five years, an unincorporated area is, whether they're industrial residential areas, or : otherwise, (they) are areas, constantly plaguing residents from municipalities in local areas because there's constant problems continually with these areas. The local municipality has no control over these areas except to bear the burden of these things. If annexation...All I'm trying to do is add two lines and the two lines are this: ... by real estate owned by a forest preserve District*, and, *..by a state or county highway*. That's the only thing we're trying to add to the Bill and I'm again trying to bring the ..that Chapter

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- compliance with the already existing Park District language and that Chapter of the Statutes."
- Pullen: "Sir, is there anything that says that the property that
 would be forcibly annexed under this is industrial or
 nuisance rather than residential?"
- Zito: "Would you restate the question?"
- Pullen: "Is there anything in this Bill that says that the area that would be forcibly annexed under this is industrial or nuisance type territory as opposed to residential?"
- Zito: "Representative, again, all we've done is add two lines and I didn't speak specifically. I wouldn't want to bog down the General Assembly with undue language in the Bill. All we've done is add two lines and I got those two lines from the Park District Statute."
- Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Gentleman to answer my question, please?"
- Zito: "I'm doing it to the best of my ability, Mr. Speaker."
- Pullen: "Sir, I asked you is there anything in this Bill that says this is restricted to industrial or nuisance land such as you're talking about as opposed to residential land?"
- Zito: "Representative, with all due respect to you, I think I've answered, but I will state it again. No."
- Pullen: "Thank you for stating that finally. What is the language that you are adding to the forcible annexation Statute?"
- Zito: "First of all, I wish you wouldn't refer to 'forcible'. I
 will read the two lines that I've added. '...by real
 estate owned by a Forest Preserve District', and '...by a
 state or county highway or one or more municipalities of
 that state or county highway'. That's the only two
 provisions we've added and again, that is language that
 Greg Zito did not concur. That's language that's in the
 already existing Statutes under the Park District

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

annexation."

Pullen: "So it's adding a provision that if an area is bounded by a state or county highway, it would be able to be annexed.

Is that right?"

Zito: "That's one of the provisions. Right now the Statute, and I haven't changed the Statute...I haven't deleted any language. The Statute right now says that a municipality has to surround that unincorporated area on four sides. I am not eliminating any language. I'm adding two lines to bring it into compliance again with the Park District. A municipality that doesn't surround an area on four sides that has a natural forest preserve or a state or county highway could never hope to annex any property that they wish under the present law because they're bounded by these boundaries. And all I've done is try to add that language."

Pullen: "Is there any referendum provided for for the territory that would be annexed?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative, please bring your questioning and your remarks to a close.."

Pullen: "This is my last question, Mr. Speaker and I'd like an answer.."

Zito: "...Not to my knowledge..."

Pullen: "What did you say, Sir?"

Zito: "Not to my knowledge."

Pullen: "There's no referendum. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

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

Apparently this is an attempt to force involuntary annexation by the hole in the doughnut method and I think it's, well, something we should be very leery of. In my area the city refused to help and assist an unincorporated area that wanted to come in and then after that area became

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

developed and they had a sufficient and large sales tax collection in the county, now the city feels that they ought to annex to the city. And so this is a case of the city annexing what they want and not annexing what they don't want. And it's a forced annexation at best and I just don't see how we can support it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman respond to a couple of questions? Representative Zito, the current law that we have now has about four or five different definitions or boundaries or examples in it and this simply clarifies and adds that one additional. Is that correct?"

Zito: "Yes, that's absolutely correct, Representative."

Leverenz: "And the Lady from Park Ridge asked a couple of questions with regard to the Maywood Park race track, but isn't it also true that a situation exists in, I think it's either Norridge or Norwood Park, where the annexation problem is the same?"

Zito: "Representative, that's exactly correct and if I can elaborate on that a little bit...Any unincorporated area, whether it's Maywood Park or area Park Ridge or Norwood Park township, could come subject under this. This is not my language. Again, it's language that's already existing in the Illinois State Statute books."

Leverenz: "And isn't it true in Cook County especially up and down the Des Plaines River you will have both state and county roads and forest preserves so that this has to be in there for any municipality through the suburban area that wants to annex and it might even be the village or city of Park Ridge. Would that not be correct?"

Zito: "Absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, I am not deleting any language. The current language says that a municipality has to surround that unincorporated area on

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

four sides. If it's not feasible, then the current ...the language that's existing is not ...is not feasible language.

And what I'm trying to do is bring that within the realm of realization."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican analysis clearly shows that there are five different definitions or boundaries that are layed out in the municipal law in terms of annexation. And I know of two areas adjacent, are in my District, that want to annex areas and there is no population in them and I say to you that if you had a referendum, no one would show up. This clearly lays out that those areas that a municipality desires to annex and especially along the Des Plaines River and especially with the Forest Preserve District in Cook County, this is the only way you would get to those determinations of annexation. I solicit your 'aye' vote for the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti."

conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know what the intent of Greg Zito is on this Bill, but the previous..the last speaker hit the nail right on the head. The corporate boundaries of my municipality ends at the sidewalk...at the property line of the homeowners along the Des Plaines River. I cannot even put sidewalks in for some 500 families that the kids have to walk on the highway on 'Thatcher Avenue' which is a two lane dark highway and they can't even have sidewalks to walk to school on because that property belongs to the county and the forest preserves. The other biggest problem and I'm sorry that Representative Bluthardt's not on the floor, I've got Evans Woods right next to Elmwood Park. There have been rapes. There have been murders. Every summer we have a problem with the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

policing. By the time we get the forest rangers out there, 45 minutes to an hour has elapsed. It's the biggest drug center in the west end of the county. And the Elmwood Park police and the River Grove police have to go in there. We're catching all kinds of hell for not protecting the residents in that particular area and we have absolutely no jurisdiction there. In Representative Bluthardt's area all of you remember the triple murder of those three boys that were murdered in Schiller woods and I think there's been something like eight or ten murders there. But the village of Schiller Park is held responsible because of not being able to police and police it properly because of lack of jurisdiction. Now, we have not only Leyden township in this, but as the previous speaker mentioned, there are several spots in Cook County where we have these existing conditions and the most deplorable one, the most despicable one, is the one where I have to let my school children walk on a two lane street and on a highway where I can't do a thing. I can't even put a sidewalk..I can't spend my taxpayers' dollars to put a sidewalk to walk down the street on it. That's all this Bill does."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Zito to close."

Zito: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say several things in closing. Number one, again, I appreciate the support of ..supportive language. This has been endorsed by the Illinois Municipal League. It also came out of the Executive Committee by a vote of 14 to 3. I would appreciate, again, a favorable Roll Call."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1263 pass?'

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this...On this question there are 132 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

vinson: "Mr. Speaker, would you please inform the Body of what your intentions are for this evening?"

Speaker Peters: "...will follow the will of the Speaker who is elected by the Representatives of eleven million people of the State of Illinois. That will to this point, is to continue on House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate.

While ah..."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Yes Sir."

vinson: "It would seem to me that a number of people have, in this chamber, have been in here for a number of hours today. We've been voting on Bills very quickly, a lot of Bills that we know very little about on this Short Reading...Short Debate Calendar. I don't think Members want to continue doing that, at least without having some ability to comprehend what's going on. I think continuing this kind of a schedule is a mistake, and I would suggest that we either take a break for dinner or do something so that Members can begin to comprehend what's going on and that there's some rationality, if you will, in the process."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair will consider the comments made by the distinguished Gentleman from DeWitt. In the mean time, House Bill 1288, Representative Donovan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1288. A Bill for An Act to amend

Sections of An Act in relation to state police. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Donovan."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1288, the synopsis that you see in your digests very accurately describes the Bill. It is, if you will, a state policeman's 'Bill of Rights'. present law or in addition to the present law, House Bill 1288 extends several basic constitutional rights officers subject to disciplinary hearings. They are: prior to interrogation or examination which may to a filing of charges, the officer shall be advised in writing of the specific and proper or illegal act he alleged to have committed. Secondly, he is... shall be advised in writing of any admissions he makes that used as a basis for charges seeking his suspension, removal or discharge. Third, it shall be advised in writing that he has a right to counsel of his choosing who may present at the hearing. Fourth, he shall be...have a right to receive without delay or cost a complete transcript of the hearing, interrogation or examination. The Bill also expends the Board's review power in cases of suspension to include the reduction and the length of the suspension with Board also a corresponding adjustment. The pav specifically is prohibited from increasing the length of suspension. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is totally agreed to by the Department of Law Enforcement with the exception there was some concern in the area where the Board was prohibited increasing the length of specifically suspension. At this point, we have an agreement between the Department of Law Enforcement and the FOP for an Amendment to be added in the Senate. We...I did converse

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

with certainly Roger McAuliffe over there, his Committee, he has agreed to that, I've agreed to it. If there's any changes to be made in that area, it is agreed by them and it will be put on in the Senate. So, I know of no opposition to this Bill, I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone...Anyone in opposition? Are you in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 1288 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are... Take the record. On this question, there are 149 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1291, Representative McClain. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1291. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1291 amends the Criminal Code. Actually, it amends the deceptive practice Section of the Criminal Code which deals with another means to show that there's insufficient funds and that the person was trying to deceive the retailer in cashing a check without sufficient funds. The retailer now, as long as he presents the check two times within seven days apart and there's not sufficient funds, it would be prima facie evidence that there was intent to deceive and that the person was guilty of deceptive practices. There is no change in the penalties as now exists. It passed out of a very thorough Judiciary Committee fifteen to zero, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative

 Leinenweber."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Leinenweber: "Well, if the analysis is correct, I would certainly be in opposition. Currently, as I understand the law, that if you write a check that's an NSF check, that constitutes prima facie evidence of intent to defraud. However, it's The Bill sought to make a second certainly rebuttable. presentation within three days, then they amended make three presentations over seven days. That means if you get a bad check, you're going to have to run it through the bank about three different times which seems to me to be way out of line now, to be able to bring criminal actions. It seems to me, the law is adequate in this phase, and I didn't hear the Gentleman give any reason why we should go to the trouble to change it. It would seem to me. it would only confuse matters rather than clarify them and without a very good reason to pass this, I would urge that we don't pass it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain to close."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1291 was drafted by the Illinois Retail Merchant's Association. They claim that its very difficult to show an intent to defraud presently under the present Act and that presentment which is a normal course of events is an acknowledged legal practice of showing inability to have a sufficient account to cash Illinois Retail Merchant's And. with the checks. Association's full of this piece endorsement legislation, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, shall House Bill 1291 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1294, Representative Slape. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1294. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape."
- Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1294 is just an attempt to clean up the taxing cycle on property tax in the State of Illinois. It changes the reporting day for tax assessors from June the 1st to April the 15th. It provides where by the Supervisor of Assessment can provide work books in case the Board of Review would meet past January 1. And I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Being no one, question is shall House Bill 1294 pass? : Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 144 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1313, Representative Kosinski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1313. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski."
- Kosinski: "This Bill outlaws the sale and manufacture of the exploding bullet of the type used in the attempted assassination of President Reagan and which still has Jim Brady in the hospital. I ask for your vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Being no one...13... Yes,
 Sir. Representative Leverenz."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Leverenz: "Simply, we just couldn't hear the explanation, Mr.

Speaker. Perhaps he could make it again."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "House Bill 1313 outlaws the sale and manufacture of the explosive bullet, the type used in the attempted assassination of President Reagan and which has Jim Brady still in the hospital."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition?"

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 1313 pass?

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 162 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1314, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to limitations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last year in the 81st General Assembly we passed Public Act 81-1169 which set the statute limitation on construction and repairs on real estate. We put that statute of limitations, it's to be twelve years after the building and within a two year period for the filing fees. What this legislation does is allow those buildings built before 1979 to come under the same provisions that we enacted under Public Act 81-1169, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative
Leinenweber."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman answer a question?

Representative Mautino, this takes the statute repose
prospective application provision way so that it would
apply to incidents which have already occurred. Is that
correct?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, those relatively new buildings. Yes. Built basically since 1969 which would be the twelve year period."

Leinenweber: "But any occurrence that went on or any negligence that happened between 1969 and the effective date of the Act under the current law there would be no statute repose.

Is that correct?"

Mautino: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "So, you're seeking to affect those claims that may be in coy at the particular moment. Is that right?"

Mautino: "On those buildings that were built before 1969, it would fall into that same category. We established that public law from 1979 onward. I believe that we should also do the same for those that were built in the previous Since they have been standing and it also period. addresses the question of addition insurance liability for involved in the original were those people that construction or the additional repair as well. Even though the management and the ownership may have changed during that period of time."

Leinenweber: "Well, very briefly in opposition to the Bill.

While that's true, this would have the affect of taking away somebody's rights where the previous Act, which I did not support, took away only those rights in the future. I think it's an entirely different thing to take away some existing rights. For example, if a slab of marble falls off a building that was constructed prior to 1969, you

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

would not be able to recover from the contractor who improperly put the marble on. I think it's a different matter to say in the future, although I had my doubts whether we should prevent that anyway just because it might not happen till 1983..., 1993. But I don't... (cut off)."

Speaker Peters: "Finish your sentence."

Leinenweber: "I don't think it's a good idea to do this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino, to close."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the last speaker's statement. The legislation was passed by this General Assembly addressing those new buildings that were put up from 1979. I think the same provision should be enacted under the same statute of repose for those that were built before. I think it's only fair since we know that those buildings are in good shape. They we been standing for more than the 12 years, and it would affect those that are not under the current law. I think it's a good piece of legislation. It's fair and basically eliminates all those designs and records, etcetera, that some of the architects in buildings and engineers will have to maintain for a lifetime if, in fact, we don't do this. I think it's a good piece of legislation for the business community and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1314 pass?".

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 131 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay, 5 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1339, Representative... I'm sorry. House Bill 1323, Representative Karpiel."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1323. A Bill for An Act to amend

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Sections of An Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel."

- Karpiel: "House Bill 1323 simply increases the production ceilings for wine manufacturers and wine makers in this State. It also increases the amount of gallons they are allowed to sell at retail if they have a retail license and allows them to make certain classifications of wine makers to make wine from other fruit, other than just grapes. On the analysis, it says the Liquor Commission opposes, that opposition is gone with the Amendment that was put on in Committee. I know of no opposition to this Bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Being none, the question is shall House Bill 1323 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 148 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1339, Representative Hannig. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1339. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Junkyard Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Under the present Junkyard Control Act, there are no
 penalties for violation of the Act. As a result, it is
 often very difficult to enforce this law. This Bill would
 simply provide that violation of this law would be a petty
 offense for the first offense and a Class C misde...Class C
 misdemeanor for subsequent violations. The Bill does not

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

impose any new rules or regulations on junkyard dealers. It simply gives a mechanism to enforce the present law. Junkyard dealers favor this Bill. No one testified against it in Committee and it passed out of Committee by a vote of nine to nothing. I know of no opposition to this Bill and would request your favorable vote.

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1339 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Yeah. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 154 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1359, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1359. A Bill for An Act to amend
 Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was recommended by the Gang Crime Commission...Committee. It amends the Criminal Code to raise the offense of threatening witnesses from testifying freely from a Class 4 felony to a Class 2 felony. It's designed to protect against people who have been the victim of gang crimes, who find themselves...find gang members threatening witnesses from testifying. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1359 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 158 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1360, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1360. A Bill for An Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides that a trial court may modify a sentence within sixty days of appellate proceedings being concluded. It is identical to the Pederal Rule 35 and is supported by the Criminal Law Committee of the Illinois State Bar Association. I would appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1360 be adopted? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 148 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1361, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1361. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This amends the Code of Criminal Procedure relative to Grand Jury proceedings. It provides that a person subpoenaed before a Grand Jury and it gets to him that the State's Attorney is seeking a Bill of Indictment, be so informed before testifying. It also requires the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

State's Attorney to advise the Grand Jury of the elements of the offense for which an indictment is sought and to inform the jurors that if no evidence has been presented at any such element, they should return a no bill and that if evidence has been presented, they should return an indictment. I would again appreciate a favorable vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1361 be adopted? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1370, Representative Greiman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1370. A Bill for An Act providing remedies for lessees in relation to failure of lessors to pay for utility services. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends a 1977 law that we passed to provide a remedy for a situation where the landlord collects the utility or collects the rent and doesn't the utilities and is left in the dark...leaves the tenants in the dark. We found that at that time that many landlords had huge bills with the utility companies. utilities found and agreed at that time that this was the way that the utilities could recover the back monies as well as the current utility charges and have the tenants live there with there lights on, otherwise they'd move out and the buildings would deteriorate further. This makes some relatively technical changes in it. It includes changes that a definition of common area, changes the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

number of units made applicable, allows the receiver to pay certain other bills for maintenance, allows future bills to be in the tenants name if they pay the bills, the utility bills, and extends the notice provision to give the tenant a greater opportunity to lean on the landlord and make sure that the utility bills get paid."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another one of these Bills that looks like it's an innocuous Bill. Could you imagine the cost of administrating this Bill and the confusion? Where a tenant goes in and pays the utility bill and then the utilities have to check to find out whether the landlord is their bill, the duplication of bills. I can't see any necessity for this Bill. I think that the landlord should be held responsible and the tenant should not get involved in paying bills, especially in where you find these big apartment buildings two or three or four or five. six. And, just in one building alone this could thirty units. create a tremendous headache for the utility companies in administering this particular Bill. I'm speaking against the Bill and I'd like to see a lot of 'no' votes on this."

the kind of buildings that the only way that the utilities will be paid and the only way they will remain is if there is something done. They are situations where the landlord has not paid the utilities for in excess of sixty days. The bills are generally quite large, and it's the only way that the buildings...these are 'slumlords'. These are not landlords on nice big buildings. 'Slumlords' do this. They collect the utilities. They collect...They pay the utilities or at least they are suppose to pay the utilities

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman to close."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

as part of the rent and don't. This is an 'anti-slumlord'
Bill, and no reasonable good landlord would care...would
oppose this Bill, but 'slumlords' would oppose it. I'm
not...that's not a reference to my good friend Conti. But,
'slumlords' would indeed oppose this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 1370 pass?

Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
'no'. Peters 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this

question there are 48 voting 'aye', 95 voting 'nay', 5

voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the

Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House

Bill 1373, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1373, a Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1373 provides that we'll have an additional license under the 'Dramshock' Act for a farm winery for the production of less than fifty thousand gallons a year. It would also provide that we can produce this wine and sparkling wines from grapes or other fruits. It has a twenty-five dollar fine winery license. I know of no opposition to this Bill and I ask your affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1373 be adopted?' Those

the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1373 be adopted?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 132 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1407, Representative Getty. Read the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1407. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1407 is an Act that will clarify that in regard to will contests that the service of notice will conform to the service of notice requirements as in other civil cases. It also clears up concerning desperate property which situation is...desperate personal estate that is left with the Clerk of the Circuit Court. It provides that after twenty-one years have elapsed, that any things will be deposited with the County treasurer if they are sold. I know of no opposition to this. It passed out of the Committee unanimously, I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Being none, the question is shall House Bill 1407 be adopted? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 160 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1417, Representative Rhem. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1417. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the
 Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Rhem."

 Rhem: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1417

 amends the Juvenile Court Act to provide for a twenty-five

 dollar fine on parent, guardian or custodian whose

 delinquent or neglected minor, or minor in need of

 supervision violates a dispositional order for condition of

45th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1981
- probation or a third time. I request a favorable vote on this Bill. $\mbox{\tt "}$
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative

 Johnson. Representative Johnson? No, Representative
 Flinn?"
- Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak against the Bill, I want to remind everybody that this is his first Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Question is, shall House Bill 1417 be adopted?

 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 143 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1419, Representative Greiman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1419. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill under the Condominium Act, the developer holds control of the board for two or three years after the development begins. Often, particularly now when financing is difficult, the developer ends up owning several of the units. What happens is that the developer doesn't pay his share of the maintenance on a week to week, month to month basis. That is the monthly assessment is not paid by the developer. Under the Condominium Act, the Board of Managers is the one that imposes the lien for failure to pay your monthly assessment. Obviously where the developer has control of the Board, he does not impose a lien on his units for his unpaid assessments. This would merely allow

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

other unit owners to file the notice of lien against those developer's units, where the developer has failed to pay his monthly assessment. That's what the Bill is about. It's a fair Bill, brings equity into...and equality into the condominium development field."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Conti."

Conti: "I didn't hear you."

Speaker Peters: "Are you in opposition, Sir?"

Conti: "No."

Speaker Peters: "No. The question is, shall House Bill 1419 be adopted? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1420, Representative Greiman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1420. A Bill for An Act in relation to the effect of a judgment of judicial termination of marriage. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1420 equalizes a situation in the Divorce Act. Presently, where one party...where there's a divorce the law presumes that that party meant and intended to revoke his or her will with respect to their former spouse. However, then nothing in the law is created that relates to a lifetime trust that has been created which would be revocable. This Bill treats revocable trusts the same way as it treats...as the law now treats wills and presumes that the divorced spouse is not a beneficiary of the revocable trust. The parties can however, in the

.45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

decree of divorce or in the instrument itself, waive this provision if they so desire. It merely puts the will and the trust on equal levels."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 1420 pass? Those in favor will signify by...

 All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Everybody tune in with the 'plot six' going on here. Has everyone... Have all voted who wish? The Chair rules that this Bill in fact does have something to do with the Grand Jury and therefore... No, take that out. House Bill... This Bill having received the... 151 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Henry's Bill is the one. House Bill 1421, Representative Henry.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1421. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry."
- Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 1421 amends the Criminal Code, making...compelling persons under seventeen years of age to join an organization and making it a Class 2 felony and a second violation a Class 1 felony. I'd appreciate your favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Vinson."

 Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I suggest you look very closely at this Bill. A few days ago, this House rejected the concept of right to work. This Bill puts very clearly the concept of right to work again and even has criminal penalties. What Representative Henry's Bill does, is to make it criminal to require that a person become a member of an organization. That is, a complete assertion of the right to work concept. What you

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

are compelled to do, this Bill would make it criminal for a union to negotiate an agency shop agreement with an employer. It would make it criminal for that to occur. And I would urge that this Bill be defeated and the people look at it closely."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry, to close."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I think my dear friend has been misused, he's worked hard last night, he worked hard today. All I ask is a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, shall House Bill 1421 pass? Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 147 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Catania, House Bill 1470. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1470. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Bill 1470 is a little Bill that ordinarily I would never have enough nerve to introduce by myself. But, it was a very nice lady in the district of requested by Representative Ryan and Representative McBroom who said that she had found what she called sexest language in the Human Rights Act and they said see Susan Catania. So, this Bill simply changes what were deemed to be sexest words They changed salesman to Rights Act. the Human salesperson, where it says he, it says he or she and so That is all that it does and as I said I and so forth. wouldn't have had enough nerve to introduce it myself, but

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

to help my Speaker and Representative McBroom anything, and I ask for your support. Come on hurry up, take the record."

- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? The question is, shall House Bill 1470 pass? Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 44 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1474, Representative Catania. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1474. A Bill for An Act to amend
 Sections of the Charitable Trust Act. Third Reading of the
 Bill."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. All of the criminal penalties which are mentioned in the digest has been taken out as Amendment #1's description states. And all that remains in the Bill now is permission for a civil action allowing ten or more interested parties, including prospective beneficiaries of a trust, to bring an action to compel its proper administration. I ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "No, just let it roll, that's all."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, shall House Bill 1474 pass?

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

Take the record. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

passed. House Bill 1487, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1487. A Bill for An Act to amend an Act providing a probation system. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1487 is a Bill which brings up to date the comprehensive criminal justice reform which this House undertook several years ago. In that legislation, we came down very hard on violent criminals. In that legislation, sometimes referred to as Class X, we also said that we should not crowd our prisons with persons who could be rehabilitated with nonviolent offenders, but we ought to have a meaningful system of rehabilitation, a meaningful system of probation. To date, we have not followed through and made our probation systems in Illinois truly meaningful, truly systems that can provide ah ... community service activities that will make restitution. A situation in every case that will provide rehabilitative services and that will have probation officers that can truly supervise their charges. Currently, in some jurisdictions there's an average case load of a hundred and eighty-two. I suggest to you that this system needs a great improvement. This Bill addresses itself to that. It came out of Committee unanimously. It Committee has the support of the Select Joint Corrections which includes Members of both this House and the Senate as well as some very well-known people appointed by our leadership and the Governor throughout the State. I think this is one of the most positive steps that this House will make in this session. It has the support of, if not all, almost all of your downstate county boards. At this time, I do not know of anyone who opposes it.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

will be, I think, the best legislation this House has addressed in a long time, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Dwight Priedrich."

Friedrich, D.: "Mr. Speaker, not in opposition, but for the record. I would like for the Sponsor to indicate whether or not he considers these funds to be appropriated, to be public funds and whether or not he thinks they should be subject to audit by the Auditor General?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "As regards that, I would say it should be handled in the same manner in which other appropriated funds are handled."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, shall House Bill 1487 pass. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Fawell wants to be voted 'yes'. Is he? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 157 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative O'Connell. O'Connell. I'm sorry, we're going to a different order. House Bill 1489, Representative O'Connell. I wouldn't do that to you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 14..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "...89. A Bill for An Act relating to increases in the issuance levels for various State of Illinois general obligation bonds. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does, it addresses the mandate of fiscal restraint that was given to all of us by the

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

electorate on November 4th. What the Bill seeks to do is general outstanding bonded amount of to cap the indebtedness. It seeks to do it by locking in a ratio of point six one percent of personal income. Presently, our general outstanding indebtedness is at four point one three nine billion dollars. That represents two point six one percent of personal income in the State of Illinois. What I'm trying to do with this Bill is to keep it at that level. If our personal income goes up, then so would sale of general obligation bonds. If our personal income goes down, then I think it's fiscally responsible that the sale of general obligations should go down. In 1975, this ratio was one point five three percent. In a matter of six years, we are up to two point six one percent. In 1971 there was only three hundred and thirty-three million dollars in general obligation bonds outstanding. that figure is four point one three nine billion dollars. Now what this Bill is addressing, is to avoid and eliminate the pay now or buy now and pay later concept. It is very politically comfortable to meet our debts by selling more bonds, but the ones who will feel the pain and the suffering are our children and our grandchildren. Right now, we can meet our debt service because we're selling more bonds than we are retiring. However, I might point out to you that our debt service is three hundred and eight million dollars per year. Now that three hundred and eight million dollars per year comes right off the top. Before we appropriate monies to any of our other agencies, we pay a debt service. If we keep increasing our debt at the rate that we are now, we're going to be economically oppressed. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this very important, fiscally responsible Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

one, the question is shall House Bill 1489 pass? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, is this the Gentleman's first Bill?"

Speaker Peters: "He says, yes."

Mulcahey: "He says, yes. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, shall House Bill 1489 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative Abramson. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 153 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1531, Representative Stanley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1531. A Bill for An Act to prohibit the sale of smoking material and paraphernalia to persons under 18 years of age. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley."

1

This is an attempt to put something on the books regarding headshops and the prohibition of drug paraphernalia that's constitutional. A number of Bills were introduced last year regarding the Model Drug Enforcement Administrations Act that has a number of constitutional problems in other states. What this Bill simply does, is prohibits the sale of drug paraphernalia to minors and it amends the statute that prohibits the sale of tobacco to minors. That's exactly what it does, and it's an attempt to prohibit the glamorization of drug paraphernalia among our youth. And might I add, they have been the greatest patronizers of headshops throughout Illinois, and I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being no one,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the question is shall House Bill 1531 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Peters, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 157 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1553, Representative Wikoff. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1553. A Bill for An Act to authorize the conveyance of certain state real property in the Champaign County Porest Preserve District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 1553 was one that came out of Counties House. and Townships on the Consent Calendar, but through a clerical error did not stay on there. They...basically what it does, transfers some six hundred and seventy acres in Champaign County. It's been managed and operated by the Champaign County Forest Preserve for a number of years. It's transferred to the Department of Conservation through Champaign County Forest Preserve. There is an the Amendment which will go on in the Senate which has a repealer clause in it, which states the neglect or failure of the Champaign County Forest Preserve to use the property so quit claim transferred and conveyed, shall revert back to the State. That will go in the Senate, did not go on in Committee, because it was improperly drafted. This is in agreement with both the Champaign County Forest Preserve and the Department of Conservation."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Being none, the question is shall House Bill 1553 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 161 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1558, Representative McClain. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1558. A Bill for An Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1558, as amended, amends the Revenue Act, which requires that those acreage that designated by the Nature Preserves Commission as being nature preserve acreage in the State of Illinois, would be assessed at one dollar per acre instead of their current thirty-three and a third percent of value. This is....your analysis and your digest is totally accurate. Amendment states that this does not violate State Mandates Act, because no local government will loose one thousand dollars and there will not be a net loss of fifty thousand dollars statewide. It passed out of Committee sixteen to nothing. This Bill passed overwhelmingly in the House last however, it was caught in the switches in the session. Senate and I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1558 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 161 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1578, Representative Flinn.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1578. A Bill for An Act to amend

 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."
- Plinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill came about, because the St. Clair County Board has decided to put on the ballot to eliminate the five man board of assessors and instead of replacing it with an appointed assessor, they want to have it replaced by a elected assessor. I know of no opposition. Both parties in St. Clair County support this and all the press, and I guess that's the only bad thing about the Bill, the press supports it."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1578 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1587, Representative Braun. On that last one, record Mulcahey and Leverenz 'aye'. Representative Braun."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1587. A Bill for An Act in relation to health and safety of certain children. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to a report by the Auditor General, House Bill 1587 seeks to give the Department of Children and Pamily Services the power to seek injunctive relief for protection of children in child care facilities.

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Subsequently, the Bill has been amended..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Piel: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be joined by ten people and take this off Short Debate."
- Speaker Peters: "...Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1578, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill came about because the St. Clair County Board has decided to put on the ballot to eliminate the five man board of assessors, and instead of replacing it with an appointed assessor, they want to have it replaced by an elected assessor. I know of no opposition. Both parties in St. Clair County support this and all the press. I guess that's the only bad thing about the Bill, the press supports it."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is shall House Bill 1578 pass. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1587, Representative Braun. On that last one, record Mulcahey and Leverenz 'aye'. Representative Braun."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act in relation to the health and safety of certain children. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Or, Representative Braun."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to a report by the Auditor General, House...House Bill 1587 seeks to give the Department of Children and Pamily Services the power to seek injunctive relief for protection of children in child care facilities. Subsequently, the Bill has been amended..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Piel: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be joined by ten people and take this off Short Debate."
 - Speaker Peters: "Are there ten people. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven."
 - Braun: "Thank you. Subsequently the Bill has been amended to include provisions of House Bill 489 which authorizes, in a permissive way only, citizen foster care review boards to be appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court. The Bill does not have a fiscal impact and is supported by a number of different organizations. I'll entertain any questions that you may have and call for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Will the Lady yield for some questions, please?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

- Piel: "With the Amendment on, Representative Braun, what is the estimated cost on this now?"
- Braun: "Representative, it's my understanding...it is my understanding that there is no fiscal impact with the Amendment. But I would like to defer to Representative Chapman to respond to these quest...to this question."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts did file a fiscal note as requested by Representative Piel. And if the Bill is implemented, says that the cost would be \$114,000, however, I would like

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

to point out, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this is an optional Bill, a permissive Bill. It is not a mandatory Bill. In no way does it require or direct anybody to do anything. So it does not need to have any fiscal impact at all in the coming year or any other year that the Legislature does not choose to provide the dollars to do this. Only if there is the money, will the court do this, and even then, by the way, the court wouldn't be required to. It is an optional Bill, and so it cannot be opposed, because it costs money, because it does not cost money."

"Thank you. I just asked you what the cost was. I just Piel: happen to have a copy of what Roy Gilley .. Gulley sent to And I'd like to, sort of, tell the body what the last This was sent to in his letter. paragraphs It says, 'please, bear in Representative Chapman. by the way, he gave the figure of \$114,000, it says, please, bear in mind that these figures are based educated approximation of the cost involved. Your request was received by me at six o'clock on Wednesday, May 13th and made the fiscal note to you at your request at ten o'clock on Thursday, May 14th'. He says, 'also bear in mind that these figures would provide for only the pilot Pilot projects as she's talking projects'. *In order to establish these foster care contemplated. much throughout the state, review boards appropriation would be required in subsequent fiscal years from the Legislature. I've also got a letter from the Department of DCFS. 'Cost, as amended on House Bill 1587. A single demonstration citizen review board will cost an estimated \$114,000. The future cost of implementing this system state-wide varies from a very conservative figure of \$650,000 to over \$1,000,000. Based on the study prepared

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

for. the Department of Children and Family Services by the League of Women Voters of four existing citizen review cost review is approximately..for boards, the approximately 11,500 children in the foster care review system in Illinois would be \$800,000 minimum.! Looking at the figures of the four states that the League of voters had in their study, that's South Carolina, Arizona, New Jersey and Maryland. The closest one to Illinois would be New Jersey. There cost was \$524,000 and they only had 8,300 cases. We're talking in Illinois more than 11,000 cases, so we're talking about a cost in Illinois of over \$1.000.000. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're talking about a time in the state's history when we're having to watch each penny that is spent. potential cost to the State of Illinois of well over a million dollars, I would ask for a resounding 'no' vote on House Bill 1587."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Griffin."

Griffin: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a few questions, please? I'd like to ask just a few questions about the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Griffin: "Basically, the idea of allowing people to get injunctive relief sounds like a good one in some ways, but I just am concerned about some safeguards for some of the day care facilities or child care facilities in the state. Pirst, I'd like to ask you about the manner in which charges would be brought. Who would bring any charges against the center and how would they be handled under this Act?"

Braun: "Thank you, the Department of Children and Pamily Services would be authorized to seek injunctive relief regarding

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

child care facilities. And I would point out again that this is consistent with the recommendations of the Auditor General and is also consistent with all authority that is given to the Department in its enabling Act."

- Griffin: "The other..another question I wanted to ask you was the existing opportunities for getting injunctive relief if any. In other words, today if there are abuses in child care facilities, what would be the procedure people would take to get remedies?"
- Braun: "Representative, I'm afraid I cannot specifically answer that question in that while the Department has a process for notice and license revocation and the like, it's my understanding, again I'm not all together certain about this, it's my understanding they cannot go in in a situation where the health and safety of the children is jeopardized and actually move for an immediate injunction against the operation of that facility. It was for that reason that the Auditor General recommended that they have this authority."
- Griffin: "The last thing I wanted to ask about was to get your response to this concern. With other Bills, particularly 525 that has been brought up in past, there have been a lot of people that have been concerned about nonconforming kinds of child care facilities, either Monasory some Christian schools and so on who do not find it easy to meet some of the requirements of child care facilities under the DCFS as it is today. I'd like to Braun, what safeguards..what safeguards Representative there may be for people who do not fit the pattern of all child care facilities under DCPS, in another words, the Monasory (sic) system, the various Christian schools and so on?"

Braun: "Representative, first off, it only applies where there is

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

a threat to the health and safety of the children. It does not go to the actual operations of what you're teaching the children and the like. That's number one. Second, the injunctive power only gives the Department the authority to go into court and seek that kind of relief, so there would be a hearing and the like to raise any questions of..it's not changing the type of facility. The Department just can't do it on its own. It's got to go to court, and that's all that that part of the Bill does."

Griffin: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hannig."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall the previous question be

put. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those

opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Braun to

close."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In so far as the cost question is concerned, I'm inclined to agree with Representative Chapman. This is a pilot project and it is one that need not be implemented. It's not mandatory, need not be implemented unless this Legislature seeks to do so. Second, I would point out with regard to Representative Piel's discussion of the cost that this Amendment went on on Second Reading after fairly extensive discovery..discussion. And I don't recollect any real discussion of the cost at that time. That would have been the appropriate time to raise any untoward, any specific concerns regarding the cost of the foster care review. But in any event, Representative Chapman maintains that it will not have a cost, because it is optional only as a permissive program and that the discretion is still left in this Legislature to actually implement such boards. The boards have the support of the League of Women Voters

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

and any number of groups associated with child care. And I encourage your support."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1587 pass.

 Those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote

 "no". Representative Robbins, would you vote me, please?

 Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber to
 explain his vote."
- Leinenweber: "I'd like to explain my no vote. I'm a little disturbed with the language of the...the original language of the Bill, because it gives the power to the Department to seek conjunctive relief to protect the health and safety from children as defined by the Child Care Act. And I've been looking through...I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question, but I couldn't as to whether ... it sounds awfully Some of these regulations that the Department has for day care centers are pretty ridiculous, and I think they would probably say that every one of them is for the health and safety of children. So I think what we're doing here is we're giving them a great deal of power to go into some of these well run day care centers but don't quite march to the same drummer as the..some of the people in the Department think that they ought to run or march. And they can be...there's.. I think this is a vehicle for harassment. And I'm very concerned about extending this power to them."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell to explain her vote."

Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In explaining my vote I would like to remind some of the other Members of this Assembly that there were one hundred of you that voted for this Amendment. I know in DuPage County we had a small child who was placed with a foster home at the age of 3 and at the age of 7..we couldn't find him. And the DCFS was held in contempt of court until they came up with this child. I think it's a very good idea that there

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

are some kind of a watch dog over these children."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Chapman, I believe it's...one minute, Representative."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this permissive

Bill which only need (sic) to be implemented if the

Legislature provides the funds will help 12,000 children

who today are drifting in foster homes. They need to be

reunited with their own families if possible, but there

needs to be a plan to do this. It needs to be implemented

if reun. being reunited with the natural family is not

possible, children need to be freed up for adoption. Every

child who is placed in his own home will save the state

\$5,000. Not only will this save the state money, but it

will help children have what each one of us knows every

child is entitled to—a home..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "If this receives 89, I'd like to verify it, please."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman asks for a verification. The Chair would just point out that there are a number of people from here that do not appear at least to be in their seats or anywhere near them. The Lady will ask for a..take the record. The Lady asks for a poll of the absentees. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be in order in this case since it's obvious that many of these chairs are empty to dump this Roll Call and take another one and see where we are at that time.."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady..."

Schuneman: "...in order to save time of the House."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady objects. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Bowman. Epton. Garmisa.

Huff. Koehler. Macdonald. Margalus. Redmond. Stearney.

Terzich. White. And Yourell."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Barkhausen. Beatty. Birkinbine. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Carey. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Darrow. Deuchler. Donovan. Ewell. Farley. Fawell. Doyle. John Dunn. Giorgi. Greiman. Virginia Frederick. Getty. Giglio. Hanahan. Henry. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Hallstrom. Keane. Dick Kelly. Klemm. Kornowicz. Kane. Katz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Kustra. Laurino. Lechovicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Madigan. Matijevich. McClain. McCormick. McGrew. McPike. Murphy. Nelson. Oblinger. O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Rea. haag. Rhem. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Slape. Irv Smith. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Turner. Younge. Zito. No Duyne. Vitek. Sam Wolf. Zwick.

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brunner."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Peters: "How is he recorded?"

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

Brunner: "Please vote me 'aye'."

further."

Speaker Peters: "Change him to 'aye'. Proceed with the verification, Representative Piel. You are starting with 90 votes."

Piel: "90..90 'ayes'? Preston. Representative Preston?"

Speaker Peters: "Breslin's in her seat."

Piel: "No, Preston. Preston."

Speaker Peters: "Preston. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Piel: "Pechous."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Macdonald wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.

Representative, Rea and McClain are verified. Proceed."

Piel: "Pechous."

Speaker Peters: "Pechous. The Gentleman here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Slape."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape. Is the Gentleman here?

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll: Greiman verified."

Piel: "Beatty."

Speaker Peters: "Beatty. Is the Gentleman here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Take him from the Roll. McPike, verified."

Piel: "Birkinbine."

Speaker Peters: "He's in his seat."

Piel: "Carey. Or is that Casey? Casey."

Speaker Peters: "Who?"

Piel: "Carey."

Speaker Peters: "Carey. The Gentleman's in his seat."

Piel: "Christensen."

Speaker Peters: "Christensen. Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Cullerton."

Speaker Peters: "Cullerton. He's in the chamber."

Piel: "Darrow."

Speaker Peters: "Darrow. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "DiPrima."

Speaker Peters: "DiPrima. In front."

Piel: "Domico."

Speaker Peters: "Domico. Representative Domico. The Gentleman here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Madigan, verified."

Piel: "Donovan."

Speaker Peters: "Donovan's in his chair."

Piel: "John Dunn."

Speaker Peters: "John Dunn's in the front."

Piel: "Ewell."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewell. The Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Piel: "Plinn."

Speaker Peters: "Take him from the Roll. Flinn. The Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Currie. We're at 82."

Piel: "Flinn."

Speaker Peters: "Flinn. Remove Representative Flinn."

Piel: "Giglio."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giglio. The Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Jaffe."

Speaker Peters: "Jaffe's here."

Piel: "Katz."

Speaker Peters: "Katz is here."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Piel: "Koehler."

Speaker Peters: "Koehler. The Lady in the Chamber? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove her from the Roll."

Piel: "Dick Kelly."

Speaker Peters: "Remove her from the Roll anyway. Representative Kelly. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Kucharski."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kucharski. The Gentleman in the chamber? He's here."

Piel: "Laurino."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Laurino. The Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Leon."

Speaker Peters: "Leon's been verified."

Piel: "Matijevich."

Speaker Peters: "He's in his seat."

Piel: "O'Brien."

Speaker Peters: "O'Brien. The Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Piel: "Stuffle."

Speaker Peters: "Stuffle. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to cut short this agony, I'd like to have it put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Peters: "What's..what's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 78 'ayes', 68 voting 'no'. The Lady

- 45th Legislative Day May 18, 1981
 requests Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1609.
 Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was part of a package proposed by the Local Government Finance Study Commission.

 It amends an Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts to increase all fees, all fees charged by clerks of circuit courts state—wide except for the civil juries in Cook County. I'd ask for a favorable Boll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall House Bill 1609 pass. Those in favor will signify by voting 'no'...by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question there are 126 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1632, Representative Tate. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1632, a Bill for an Act to create the drug paraphernalia control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Tate."

=-:-

- Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill
 1632 is a comprehensive drug paraphernalia Act which
 thirteen other states have already had adopted. It's
 designed to get at head shops. It's a lot...it was amended
 on Second Reading by Representative Cullerton. I encourage
 a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall House Bill 1630...1632 pass. Those in favor will signify by

- Asset

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Peters, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1661, Representative Braun. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1661, a Bill for an Act in relation to prohibiting local governments from enacting laws interfering with free and open access to housing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is on Short Debate for a reason. It implements Section 17 of the State Constitution pertaining to the availability of housing opportunities to all persons. As amended the Bill has the support and the endorsement of the Illinois Association of Realtors, the Leadership Council of Metropolitan Chicago, as well as a number of village and township officials who would be affected by this Bill. I encourage your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any opposition? Representative Kelly."

Kelly, Dick: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the suburbs, suburban communities that I represent, for instance, Hazelcrest, Park Forest, Country Club Hills, several have municipal laws that this would affect with the realtors. This was a realtor's proposal to begin with, but with the Amendments adopted, all the communities I represent now support the Bill. So, I'm proud to vote for Representative Braun's Bill."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1661 pass.

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. To explain his vote, Representative

45th Legislative Day

•

May 18, 1981

Griffin."

- Griffin: "Just wanted to add to what Representative Kelly said that any difficulties that our communities had with the Bill have been ironed out. I think Representative Braun should be complimented for the fine job she did of working out any differences. So I support this enthusiastically."
- Speaker Peters: "Take the record. On..on this Bill there are 147 voting 'aye', Karpiel, 'aye'. McMaster.. Representative McMaster."
- McMaster: "Not in regard to this Bill. As soon as you're through with it, I'd like to be heard in regard to a previous Bill."

Speaker Peters: "To a previous Bill?"

McMaster: "Yes."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallstrom, 'aye'. Winchester, 'aye'. Levin, 'aye'. Stanley, 'aye'. That's it. What's the count? A hundred..on this question there are 152 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McMasters (sic) on a point of order."
- McMaster: "Thank you, Br. Speaker. On House Bill 1632 that was heard just a minute or two ago, I was off the floor and my seatmate inadvertently pushed my button 'no', I believe, and I wanted to be voted 'yes' on that. I have never really asked to change my vote before, but in this case..."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman have leave? There's no objection. House Bill 1674, Representative is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." O'Connell.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act to create the Life Care Facilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the House. What this... This is the Life Care Facilities Act. This Bill is similar to a Bill that was sponsored by Representative Bill Kempiner's, now Director of Michael McClain and John Health and Representative Matijevich two years ago. It passed the House 153 to 1 and got bogged down in the Senate. What it does is it creates certain procedural protections for senior citizens who enter into life care contracts with certain providers of the State of Illinois. Presently, an individual who enters into a contract with a provider deposits a substantial sum of money with a promise that the provider will take care of them for the rest of their life in the sense of nursing care, medical care and living facilities. What this Bill does is it sets up, number one, it sets up escrow requirements so that when you deposit, the individual deposits a substantial sum of money anywhere in the area of 12 to 15,000 dollars that if the project does not succeed the individual depositor's funds will be protected. I have worked on this Bill many hours with the Department of Aging, the Department of Public Health and the Illinois I have their support. We have Association of Aging. Amendments that they have agreed. The Department of Public Health has agreed to take over the regulation of this Act and they have agreed that the Amendment would be placed on in the Senate if it passes. I would like to thank the Department of Public Health, whatever the outcome of this Bill, for all their work and the Department of Aging. I'd ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is, "Shall House Bill 1674 be adop... passed?".

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Roger. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Hr. Clerk. On this

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

question there are 157 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1679, Representative Hoxsey."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1679, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Charitable Solicitation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1679 requires religious organizations that solicit funds from door to door to file their reports as required in the Solicitation Act. This is an attempt to track down the abuses that are presently existing within the State of Illinois in regard to the tax exemption status. Representative Van Duyne amended the Bi11 exempting all the non-for-profit corporations from this reporting requirement, which means your local organizations such as Lions and so forth would be exempt. I would simply ask you to support this effort in order to find out how many abuses we have in regard to the tax exempt status in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to House Bill 1679. This was part of a, I believe, a five Bill package which was directed at religious cults. Four of them went to the Judiciary Committee. After a rather extensive hearing we placed them on interim study. The fifth one for some reason known only to my seatmate went to the Executive Committee and..which voted it out here today. Now this..we understand after hearing much testimony, I understood, you know, what the Sponsor is driving at. She had a number of hearings on religious cults, and they do practice some rather bizarre types of conduct. However, the problem with these Bills is trying to separate out

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

those that practice the bizarre conduct from your more traditional religious organizations such as, for example, the Catholic Church. A few years ago we did adopt a Charitable Solicitation Act which provides for a very, very complete and onerous reporting criteria for charitable organizations who solicit door to door. Now we at that particular time did exempt religious organizations. what House Bill 1679 does is eliminate the..the religious organization exemption, which means that any religious organization whether it be the Catholic Church, Episcopal Church or any other denomination, as well as the Moonies and these others will have to if they do any type to door solicitation, even if it involves door of soliciting among your own parishioners in your own parish. They will have to provide very detailed, complete and onerous..writings with the Attorney General, and it will make it virtually, certainly almost impossible for Churches to conduct many of their regular, ordinary activities. The only problem, we understand what she's trying to get at, but the problem is constitutionally, how to do it. You cannot eliminate the Moonies without eliminating every other religious organization. So it's for that reason, and I think, questionable constitutionality whether we can this anyway, I would call for a 'no' vote on House Bill 1679."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Hoxsey to close."

Hoxsey: "Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately, what will eventually happen, my friends, is a total alienation of any exemption for all organizations, probably at the federal level for the simple reason that we cannot trace down the abuses. Now there's nothing unconstitutional about this at all. We have

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

exempted them in the first place. I don't really think it's all that bad that all the organizations make a reporting for their tax exempt status. I would be more than happy to make a report to the State of Illinois if I could be tax exempt. I would suggest that little by little we need to straighten up the situation that exists within this state and try to get at the problems that we're facing. And believe me, my friends, we have a problem. And I think the regular organizations realize it as much as I have had not one objection from the regular I do. organizations against this Bill, not one piece of correspondence in opposition. I would ask you to support the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "The question is..shall House Bill 1679 pass.

Those in favor...you want to pick yours back up?...Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Here: Have all voted who wish?

This quest...To explain her vote, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: . "Who's vote?"

Speaker Peters: "Your vote."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "That's it?".

Ewing: "No, you said her vote. I'm not going to explain Representative Hoxsey's vote. I am sorry to see the number of red lights up there. I think this Bill has a real purpose, one that would be beneficial to those who would be asked to be reporting. And I'm not normally one who likes to have more governmental..more reports, but there are a few times when it would be beneficial. And I think the Sponsor has pointed those out. I would certainly ask that you reconsider, let this Bill go to the Senate for its consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewell to explain his vote. Take

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

the record. On this question there are 48 voting 'aye', 96 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. I tried, Betty. This Bill having received 48 voting 'aye', 96 voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present', this Bill failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. There are 50 fev that loose, lost..lost..it's lost. L..O..S..T. Lost, lost, lost. It's getting too much rote. Representative.. House Bill 1797, Representative Findley."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Take this out of the record temporarily."

 House..Representative Findley, proceed."
- Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Bill 1797 is a recommendation of the House Department of Administrative Services in the Capital Development Board which codifies all state buildings owned or managed by DAS into one section of the Civil Administrative Code. It additionally provides for leasing of commercial space in the State of Illinois Center and State of Illinois Building. It adds to DAS's perdu the Blgin State Office Building and Computer Center in Springfield. It deletes the income standard from DAS's perdu. I would request your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall House Bill 1797 pass. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Br. Clerk. On this question there are 148 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Vinson,

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

for what purpose do you rise?"

- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I asked a question somewhat earlier in the evening, and apparently I'm not going to receive an answer on that question."
- Speaker Peters: "We're preparing that answer. We'll..."
- Vinson: "...and I have filed subsequently with the Clerk a motion, and I would like to have that motion called."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson, we will..we will..we will call that motion at that proper time. House Bill 1819, Representative Barkhausen. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1819, a Bill for an Act to exempt employees participating in ride-sharing arrangements to the minimum wage law during certain periods. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has the purpose of exempting from the minimum wage requirements, the driver or chauffeur of a commuter van driving such a vehicle in a ride-sharing arrangement. It. is.. I know I mentioned an exemption of the minimum wage, and I'm fearful of scaring all of you who are concerned about organized labors in your flags, but this is not, I insist, this is not proposed by organized labor. Believe me, it wouldn't be on the Short Debate Calendar. It's..it covers a situation where an employee in his offi...his or her office hours is..for his or her own benefit and the benefit of his or her fellow employees is driving the employees to and from work in a vehicle which may or may employer. Ιt received provided bу the be consideration favorable OB our favorable..very Transportation Committee, and I ask for the same favorable consideration by the full House."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Hoffman."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I'm in opposition, but I hope this doesn't affect my personal chauffeur."

Barkhausen: "I'd like to assure the Gentleman that it doesn't.

I'm surprised on your 28,000, Representative, that you can
afford one. If there's no other opposition, Mr. Speaker,
I'd ask for a favorable Roll."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite. Yes, Ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, has this Bill been distributed to

Speaker Peters: "Has the Bill been distributed? Yes, it has. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

the Members? I cannot find one."

Barkhausen: "Indeed, I will."

McPike: "Alright, it's my understanding that the..that the driver in this situation is not actually paid by the employer. Is that correct? There's no pay involved, and you're simply saying that, well, why don't you just answer that. Is this a situation where the employer is paying this employee to drive or the employee is doing it in conjunction with some other employees as part of a voluntary ride—sharing program?"

Barkhausen: "There would be no pay involved in the normal situation that the arrangement may be one that's encouraged and facilitated by the employer. But it's really one that's jointly agreed to by the employees."

McPike: "So it's a situation where the employer is not normally rendered any pay whatsoever. And you're simply saying that minimum wage doesn't really apply since there's no pay in this situation to begin with. Is that correct?"

Barkhausen: "Yes, because it is..."

McPike: "Thank you."

Barkhausen: "...strictly for the benefit of the employees..."

McPike: "Thank you."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Barkhausen: "...and the employer provides the vehicle."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield to two questions?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Barkhausen: "Has this been taken off Short Debate?"

Leverenz: "Well, I would ask that, Mr. Speaker, then if necessary because clearly..."

Speaker Peters: "Yea, it's a lot easier, Representative, just answering the question, cause that'll..that'll...ten people will join him, so just go ahead."

Leverenz: "In your opening remarks, you said the individual may or may not be paid. So clearly the person in some cases is being paid and you would now provide that they would not fall under minimum wage. May or may not leaves doubt, and you just answered Representative McPike that in the normal situations, they would not. What about the abnormal? Therefore..."

Barkhausen: "Representative, I can't profess to be knowledgeable about every ride-sharing arrangement in the State of Illinois. I do know that in some situations the employer pays a certain amount of money to cover gas and perhaps some maintenance of the vehicle. I am told that in addition to that, there have been some situations where the driver may receive a small fee. My understanding is that in the normal as opposed to the, what you refer to as the abnormal situation, there is no pay."

Leverenz: "I would suggest that this might be the nose getting under the tent from the camel. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen to close."

Barkhausen: "I would only say this Bill was supported in our Transportation Committee 11 to 1. I have been assured that organized labor is not opposed to this. It was supported 11 to 1 to 1 in Committee, and I would ask for those of you

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

who are concerned about promoting car pooling and van pooling as a mass transportation alternative, particularly in areas that are not served by fixed mass transportation routes, and who are concerned about conserving energy and having your constituents avoid the ever increasing price of gasoline that this is one innocuous Bill that you can all support. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1819 pass.

 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

 On this question there are 150 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1842, Representative Karpiel. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1842, a Bill for an Act to create local government accounting and auditing law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 1842 implements Article VIII, the House. Section 4 of the Illinois Constitution. This is the one provision of the Constitution that has not yet been implemented. Before I tell you what House Bill 1842 let me tell you what 1842 is not. House Bill 1842 is not House Bill 78. It is not House Bill 1841. It is not the Bill that you have been getting mail and opposition to. is not even House Bill 1842 anymore. With Amendment #3 that was adopted the other evening, the provisions of House It now embodies all the Bill 1612 were put on 1842. recommendations of the Local Government Finance Commission and also puts back the publication notices which was a problem with that Bill. And I ask for a favorable vote."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry of the Chair, please. Does this Bill pre-empt home rule units, require 107 votes?"

Speaker Peters: "We'll be happy to look into that."

McClain: "The last ruling was made before he saw the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "It comes from experience. Representative
DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek the attention of the
Chair? Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've just sent up to you..up to the parliamentarian. In the verbal transcript of the verbatim transcript of the 1970 Constitution on pages 191, I believe, and 192, it specifically states that the provisions set forth in this Article providing for uniform accounting systems and auditing and reporting systems shall pre-empt home rule and shall not be extraordinarily..have to be adopted at..by extraordinary vote."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady has stated the argument excellently.

It takes 89 votes."

Karpiel: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 18.. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Getty just told me it was a specious argument, and you were right, so I withdraw it."

Speaker Peters: "The question is shall House Bill 1842 pass.

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 89. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schneider to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this proposal, I think you ought to all be pretty much aware of the essential: nature of the auditing procedure that, I think, can be beneficial. The most recent standard in poor

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981.

newsletter called 'Perspectives' made a very strong case for municipal bonds and those bonds being circulated in the public market that there are reductions and benefits to be had by appropriate reporting and auditing and financial statements. I think they compared Maryland, the State of Maryland to another state in which Maryland's auditing procedures were so much more superior that they saved themselves a penalty that was worth somewhere in the vicinity of a quarter of a million dollars. So when you look at this decision, be aware of the fact that although you cannot by law in all probability establish the best kinds of circumstances for bonding in the private market which so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle celebrate, that we are noticing that bond houses are more and more looking at proper financial reportings. So I think you do your municipality a good service by arguing for this kind of a proposal in the amending, amended form that Representative Karpiel has placed it. So I would encourage you just in terms of sound financial planning as well as getting a better deal on your bonds that you support this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel to explain her vote."

Karpiel: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it isn't so much to explain my vote,

I don't think I was given the opportunity to close. I did

want to say that the Keane Amendment which was in House

Bill 1612 is what is the Bill now. I have worked with

various people to get a Bill together that relieved the

opposition from so many groups. I've worked with the Local

Government Finance Commission, the Municipal League, the

Northwest Municipal Conference, the IPA, MFOA, and the

Civic Federation and the Illinois Press Association. I

can't see that I can't get one more green vote up there,

especially since I see some people who told me they would

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

support the Bill who are now not voting for the Bill. I would appreciate..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane to explain his vote."

Reane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo the remarks of
Representative Schneider and the Sponsor of the Bill. This
Bill, the Bill as amended, reflects the recommendation of
the Local Government Finance Study Committee, and it does
address a very serious need of local government accounting
and auditing practices. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman to explain his Bill...his vote. No, Representative Brunmer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I'm not sure that everyone has considered this in relationship to the very small units of local government.

Currently they are not required to have a CPA audit. Some of those units of local government, the small fire protection districts and small park districts operate on some budgets of sometimes as two or three thousand dollars a year. Obviously, it seems to me at least ridiculous to require a CPA audit with regard to those small local units of government. I think this is an undue burden on local government. If you care about local government with all due respect to the Sponsor, I think you would vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no', 7 voting 'president'...'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

House Bill 1880, Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 18..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "..80, a Bill for an Act relating to the coordination council for North American affairs of the Republic of China. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bradley."

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

Bradley: "Nr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 1880 provides that every official or employee of the
Coordination Council for the Republic of China, Taiwan,
located in Illinois, shall have the same rights, privilege,
and immunities as they had prior to January 1st, 1979. It
also provides that such officials or employees may apply
for and display special Illinois license plates. That's
really what the Bill's all about. It came out of the
Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, and I ask for your
consideration."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Isn't this getting the State of Illinois involved in foreign policy which I think under the Federal Constitution is reserved to the Federal Government?"

Bradley: "Well, what we're doing with...is making sure that the license plates that they are able to apply for and receive now that in case there are objections by Red China that they will be able to receive some kind of a special license plate. That's what we're doing, and I think that's within the purview of the State of Illinois. We're asking that the Secretary of State provide those license plates."

Kane: "Yea, but aren't you also saying something about the status of the Consular Office?"

Bradley: "We're recognizing that, however, the..the Congress passed the Taiwan Relation Act in April 10th of 1979 that already provided them with the immunities that they had prior to the date that I mentioned in my opening remarks.

Let's see, prior to January 1st of 1979. So we're really doing nothing that we can't be doing as the State of Illinois."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

ought to leave foreign policy to the Federal Government. We have enough problems of our own to take care of, and I would urge a *no* vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "If we're in Short Debate, I'll just explain my vote if it's necessary."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock. Representative Huff.

 The question is shall House Bill 1880..pass. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'.

 Voting is open. Representative Wolf to explain his vote."
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when Alan Dixon was Secretary of State, I did have some discussion with him on this very subject matter. The law presently provided for license plates for foreign governments made no distinction. He did issue consular corps plates. I believe this is just an effort to clarify that and make certain that that will continue. I see we have enough votes so I'll be quiet. Is that it?"
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Stewart to explain your vote, I'm sorry."
- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Perhaps most of us are too busy with state and local affairs to bother to pay attention to what's going on in the rest of the world. After all, foreign policy is the province of the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, it was your..it was the party represented by the other side of the aisle that pioneered the whole strategy of bringing US relations..the US relationship with the Peoples Republic of China into the 20th Century. I would suggest that these 113 votes represent a sad ignorance of what's going on in the world today, and I would also suggest that we are attempting to put a Chinese wall around our OWn

45th Legislative Day

May 18, 1981

intelligence. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Pierce to explain his.."
- Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I agree as foreign policy as well, however,

 I might have gone for it had we recognized the Czarist
 Regime of Russia which is the last legitimate government in
 Russia and the pre-war Polish government of Paderewski when
 Poland had a great, free Republic. So I think until we
 extend the same rights to the few czarists of us that are
 left, Representative Jaffe and myself, and to the pre-war
 government of Poland and Paderewski, we shouldn't vote for
 this. And I vote 'present'."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all...Representative Bullock, no? On this question..do we take the record? On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay', 8 voting 'present'.

 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise?"
- AcMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the provisions of Rule 35g be suspended until midnight, May 20, 1981, with respect to final action on nonappropriation Bills originating in the House. And that the House do now stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. Tuesday, May 19, 1981."
- Speaker Peters: "You have heard the Gentleman's motion. He has leave for the Attendance Roll Call. Is leave granted? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed, the 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned."
- Clerk Leone: "For the Members of the House, we're adjourned til 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."
- Davis: "Mr. Speaker, this is Davis, Chairman of the State
 Government Organization Committee. There will be a
 committee meeting of the State Government Organization on
 Executive Order I, Executive Order I tomorrow morning at
 nine o'clock in room 114."

MAY 18, 1981.

HB-0113	3RD	READING .	PAGE	90
		READING		91
HB-0128	3RD		PAGE	
HB-0155	3RD	RBADING	PAGE	72
HB-0181	.3RD	READING	PAGE	93
HB-0186	3RD	READING	PAGE	82
	3RD			95
HB-0239		READING	PAGE	
HB-0249	3RD	READING	PAGE .	100
HB-0463	3RD	READING	PAGE	4
HB-0473		READING	PAGE	7
HB-0477	3RD	READING	PAGE	9
HB-0490	3RD	READING	PAGE .	10
	MOT1	CONS	PAGE	27
HB-0519		READING	PAGE	27
				27
HB-0531	.3RD	READING	PAGE	
HB0533	3RD	READING	PAGE	33 -
HB-0535	3RD	READING	PAGE	101
HB-0542	3RD	READING	PAGE	88
HB0568	3RD	READING	PAGE	102
HB-0576	3RD	READING	PAGE	106
HB-0577	3RD	READING	PAGE	107
HB-0582	3RD	READING	PAGE	107
HB-0594	3RD	READING	PAGE	118
HB-0597	3RD	READING	PAGE	127
HB-0625	NOT	IONS	PAGE	148
HB-0645	3RD	READING	PAGE	128
		-		
HB-0646	3RD	READING	PAGE	129
HB-0659	3RD	READING	PAGE	130 -
HB-0674	3RD	READING	PAGE	132
			PAGE	133
HB-0725	3RD	READING		
HB-0734	3RD	READING	PAGE	134
HB-0765	3RD	READING	PAGE	136
HB0772	3RD	READING	PAGE	137
HB-0782	3RD	READING	PAGE	138
HB-0794	3RD	READING	PAGE	139
HB-0803	3RD	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0808	3RD	READING	PAGE	141
HB-0819	3RD	READING .	PAGE	142
HB-0823	3RD	READING	PAGE	145
HB-0829	3RD	READING	PAGE	36
	MOT	IONS	PAGE	62
HB0847	38D	READING.	PAGE	146
HB-0857	3RD	READING	PAGE	147
HB-0882	3RD	READING	PAGE	147
HB-0913	3RD	READING	PAGE	148
•	3RD	READING	PAGE	153
HB-0927				
HB-0940	3RD	READING	PAGE	153
HB-0942	3RD	READING	PAGE	154
HB-0947	3RD	READING	PAGE	155
		READING	PAGE	155
HB-0959	3RD			
HB-0961	3RD	READING	PAGE	156
HB-0972	3RD	READING	PAGE	157
HB-0974	3RD	READING	PAGE	17 7
нв-0978	3RD	READING	PAGE	177
HB-0979	3RD	READING	PAGE	178
нв-0980	3RD	READING	PAGE	179
HB-0983	3RD	READING	PAGE	180
HB-0999	3RD	READING	PAGE	182
HB-1005	3RD	READING	PAGE	183
HB-1012	3RD	READING	PAGE	186
HB-1016	3RD	READING	PAGE	191.
яв- 1020	3RD	READING	PAGE	193
HB-1020				194
BB- 1043	3RD	READING	PAGE	
нв-1052	3BD	READING	PAGE	195
HB-1073	3RD	READING	PAGE	196
нв-1097	3RD	READING	PAGE	197
40 1031	-40			

PAGE

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 18, 1981

HB-1136	3RD	READING	PAGE	198
HB-1139	3RD	READING	PAGE	198
HB-1144	3RD	READING	PAGE	199
HB-1145	3RD	READING	PAGE	200
HB-1146	3RD	READING	PAGE	200
нв-1150	3RD	READING	PAGE	201
HB-1160		READING		203
HB-1161	3RD	READING	PAGE	203
HB-1168	3RD	READING	PAGE	206
HB-1179	3RD	READING	PAGE	207
HB-1181	3RD	READING	PAGE	208
HB-1189	3RD	READING	PAGE	209
нв-1209	3RD	READING	PAGE	210
HB-1234	3RD	READING	PAGE	211
HB-1253	3RD	READING	PAGE	212
HB-1257	3RD	READING	PAGE	216
8B-1263	3RD	READING	PAGE	217
	-3RD	READING	PAGE	62
HB-1288	3RD	READING	PAGE	224
HB-1200	3RD	READING	PAGE	226
HB-1294	3RD	READING	PAGE	228
HB-13.13		READING	PAGE	228
BB-1314.		READING	PAGE	229
HB-1323	-			231
HB-1339	3RD	READING	PAGE	232
HB-1359	3RD	READING READING	PAGE	232
			PAGE	
HB-1360	3RD	READING	PAGE	234 234
нв-1361 нв-1370	.3RD	READING READING	PAGE	235
HB-1370	3RD 3RD		PAGE PAGE	237
HB-1407	3RD	READING READING		237
	_		PAGE	237
HB-1417.		READING	PAGE	239
HB-1419. HB-1420	3RD	READING	PAGE	240
	- 3RD	READING	PAGE	
HB-1421	3RD	READING	PAGE	241
HB-1470	3RD	READING	PAGE	242
HB-1474	.3RD	READING	PAGE	243
HB-1487	3RD	READING	PAGE	244
HB-1489	3RD	READING	PAGE	245
HB-1531	3RD	READING	PAGE	247
HB-1553	3RD	READING	PAGE	248
HB- 1558	3RD	READING	PAGE	249
нв- 1578	3RD	READING	PAGE	249
RB-1587	3RD	READING	PAGE	250
HB-1609	3RD	READING	PAGE	263
HB-1632	3BD	READING	PAGE	263
HB-1661	3RD	READING	PAGE	264
нв- 1674	3RD	READING	PAGE	265
HB- 1679	3RD	READING	PAGE	267
HB-1797	3RD	READING	PAGE	270
HB-1819	3RD	READING	PAGE	271
HB-1842	3RD	READING	PAGE	274
нв- 1880	3BD	READING	PAGE	277

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER PAYNIC	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
HR 313 - ADOPTION	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	27
SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	174
SWEARING IN OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT BARR	PAGE	175

MAY 18, 1981.

SUBJECT MATTER

REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGB	176
SUSPENSION OF RULE 35 (G)	PAGE	280
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	280

PAGE 3