62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will come to order and the Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Father John Spreen of the Church of the Little Plower. Father."
- Father Spreen: "Saint Anthony of Padua died in the year 1231.

 One of the prayers attributed to him could be our prayer today. O light of the world, infinite Father of eternity, stretch forth Your hand and touch our mouth. Fashion it like a sharp sword that we may eloquently proclaim Thy words. O Lord, make our tongue like a chosen shaft indelibly to impress Your wonders. Send, Lord, Your spirit into our heart. That we may receive it into our minds, that we may retain it into our conscience that we may meditate upon it. Lovingly, faithfully and gently breath Your mercy into us. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Father. Chairman Kulas will lead us in the Pledge."
- Kulas: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic, for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for attendance. After a brief conference with Chairman Kulas, we've decided that the House probably will adjourn somewhere between two and three o'clock this afternoon. We'll return sometime Monday, fairly early and for those of you that come down and want to be prepared with clean clothes, bring enough for next weekend because it's a good possibility."
- DiPrima: "Bob Mitchler will you bring the kids down?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 168 answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. Colonel DiPrima in the Chair."
- Speaker DiPrima: "Bowers, where you at? Get over here. Bowers,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

where you at? Get in here. Now, Representative Bowers is a former Member of the Boys' State. He participated in the Boys' State Program run by the American Legion, and at the time, he was made Superintendent of Public Instruction and that was 1966 and that was at a time when my very dear friend Ray Page was Superintendent of Public Instructions. And what a better man to have to introduce all these young kids that were brought here by former Senator, Bob Mitchler, who now is affiliated with the Department of Veterans' Affairs and is doing a terrific job. Bowers, will you take over here?"

Bowers: "Certainly. Thank you Colonel DiPrima. It's certainly an honor to introduce the elected state officials from Boys' State which is one of the finest programs conducted throughout the nation to help young people become familiar with government, and something that's very significant in Illinois, is that the first Boys' State, which every State in the nation has, was founded here in Illinois by the American Legion of Illinois. I'd like to introduce the Governor of Boys' State, Warren Austin, and he's The Lieutenant Governor, Scott Ward, Waukegan. Shoreward. The Secretary of State, Kurt 'Reeburg', The Attorney General, Todd Spencer, from Ashkum. The State Treasurer, Jeff 'Aills', from Pekin. The Justices of the Supreme Court, James 'Uke' from Washinghurn, Scott Eisenhower of Danville, Mark Stevenson of Rantoul, and Dan 'Tingwall' of Peoria. I'm sorry we left one out. The Comptroller, Bruce 'Louie' of Pana, right here. I present to you the Governor of Boys' State." Warren Austin: "On behalf of over 1,000 young men of Boys' State, I wish to wish you all luck with solving all the problems that you have, and we know you have a lot of and...but I came to tell you that you if you all work

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

together for the betterment of Illinois and not for your own selfishness, that we could all pull together and make our great State of Illinois, the greatest State in the Union. Thank you."

Speaker DiPrima: "I'd like to have Bob Mitchler to give you a little run down on Boys' State and what it's all about.

Bob."

Bob Mitchler: "Thank you, Representative DiPrima. As you know, the America Legion, since its susception in 1919 has always stressed one of its major goals as to educate the youth of our country and our State and the Boys! State program originated in the State of Illinois in 1934. Tt was originated by Legionaires that lived in the State of Illinois where Members of the American Legion Posts in the State of Illinois, and since 1934 all 50 States have adopted Boys' State, but because Illinois was the first State to have Boys' State, it is known as Premiere Boys' State. So, you see the logo on the students that are you today, they have Premiere Boys' State. before 52,000 plus students have gone through their high school, Junior students have gone through this one week intensive training. We used to have it out at the State Fair Grounds but seven years ago because of the dilapidated condition of the 4-H facilities, we moved it over to Eastern Illinois University for three years, then had one year at Western Illinois University and we're then back and completing the third year again at Eastern Illinois University. The facilities over there are just terrific, and they're doing fine job. We had several of the Legislators come over and speak from the House of Representatives. Clarence Darrow, Babe Woodyard, Clarence Neff, Ben Polk, and I don't if the helicopter got off taking Jim over there today or not. But it's pretty bad weather out

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

there. How many Members of the House of Representatives were members of Boys' State? Could we see you stand and hold your hand high so these fellows could see? Ben Polk, I know 34 years ago, was a boy stater. I want to thank you all for your cooperation and Speaker Ryan...where's Speaker Ryan? Speaker Ryan, we have the Governor's of Boy State, who wants to present you with one of these official T-shirts, which makes you an honorary member of Premiere Boys' State."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you very much. No, this one is big enough.

Thanks very much, Gentlemen. Good luck to you."

Speaker DiPrima: "Alright, boys, we're all behind you 100%. We want to wish you all the luck in the world. Hope you have a nice stay down there at Eastern Illinois. Enjoy yourselves and come back again as Members of this....First Bill is my Bill. Let's all vote 'aye'. While I'm up here I want to make this presentation to the Speaker. This was given to us by the Veterans' of Foreign Wars for the sale of poppys. They've never done this before, but they...It says, 'presented to Speaker George Ryan and Members of the House of Representatives, Buddy Poppy Sales Day for meritorious and distinguished service and furthering the aims and ideals of their Veterans' of Foreign Wars of the United States.'"

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, on behalf of myself and the Members of the House, for this lovely plaque, and it says exactly what Colonel DiPrima said it says. On the Calendar on page 6, under the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 17, Representative Deuster, out of the record. Senate Bill 61, Representative Braun, out of the record. Alright, you want to go with that Bill, Representative? It's Senate Bill 61. You want the Bill called? Out of the record. House (sic) Bill 62, Representative Stewart. You

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

want your Bill called? Out of the record. House (sic) Bill 88, Representative Beatty, out of the record. House (sic) Bill 89, Representative Kornovicz-Zito. Are you going to handle that, Eddie? Read the Bill, Mr....The Amendment hasn't been printed yet, Representative. Out of the record. House (sic) Bill 115, Representative Greiman. Senate Bill 115, out of the record. Senate Bill 147, Representative Barkhausen, Representative Barkhausen, Senate Bill 147, on the Order of Second Reading. Do you want the Bill read? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 147, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take that Bill out of the record."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record on Senate Bill 147.

Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, can you hear me? There's 85 Bills on that 'Call that you're on and the first ten Bills...no one has called their Bills. Why don't you ask for volunteers in that Order of Call, rather than going through 85 Bills? It doesn't make much sense. You've got 85 on the Call, 10 Bills you've called, no one has called the Bill. It's nonsense to go to 85 Bills."

Speaker Ryan: "We appreciate all the advice you give us,
Representative Giorgi. Maybe some day you'll have the
opportunity to be up here, then you can run this place the
way you want to."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Giorgi: "I've had the opportunity."
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright. Alright, let's go back to Bill....Senate

 Bill 61, Representative Braun is ready to go. Read the

 Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 61, a Bill for an Act to assure the children of arrested persons are cared for, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Braun, amends Senate Bill 61..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Braun on Amendment #1 to Senate
 Bill 61."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 was suggested by the Department of Children and Family Services. It resolves a concern that was raised in Committee by Representative Bower and Representative Bowman. It is an agreed Amendment, and I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 61. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 168, Representative

 Deuster. Representative Deuster, do you want to go back to

 Senate Bill 17? 17, Representative? You want to hear

 Senate Bill 17? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 17, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

جي " " _{آخ}

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Deuster: "I'm sorry, would you take this Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 168,

Representative Deuster. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed with respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment being drafted. I was wondering, at this time, if it might be possible to ask Mr. Schuneman, is that who's handling the Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "No, Representative Deuster is handling the Bill. You may make the request to Representative Deuster, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Deuster, I have an Amendment that is not up yet from the Reference Bureau on 168. And I'm wondering if you would be agreeable to hold this Bill on Second Reading until Monday, when I may be able to present that Amendment as soon as it gets here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Representative Mautino, the Bill has already been moved to Third Reading. Of course, in view of the subject matter, I would think all of us would want to be reasonable about it. And I think at such time as you may have an Amendment, why we can discuss it and perhaps, bring the Bill back from Third Reading. I would just as soon leave it on Third, right now."

Mautino: "But you are agreeable to discussions of coming back?"

Deuster: "Sure, we can talk."

Mautino: "Thank you."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think you're starting out this morning in Now, my light was on and I was, also, a very poor way. visually seeking recognition, physically recognition before you said, Third Reading. I think it's in very poor taste for you start out by trying to ram I think you could have recognized the things through. Membership when their lights are on, and they're seeking your recognition. I think right now, in the sense of fairness, that I know that you personally have, the Bill should be moved back to Second Reading, so that the request of Representative Mautino and other Members on this side of the aisle can be answered properly."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, what is your request, Representative Getty?"
- Getty: "That you would have recognized me before you moved it to
 Third Reading. I'm suggesting to you, respectfully, Sir,
 that in the interest of fairness, you should now put it
 back where it was, on Second Reading, and then let the
 Membership entertain any questions that they have before
 moving it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino has made a request to Representative Deuster. That request has been honored. I understand the two Gentlemen are in accord to leave the Bill where it is now. Do you have a further request? If so, would you like to ask Representative Deuster?"
- Getty: "My request is that the Bill be held on Second Reading."

 Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster? The Gentleman has requested to hold the Bill on Second Reading. What is your pleasure, Sir?"
- Deuster: "Well, the...really, his request ought to be, to return it from Third to Second. The Bill is on Third, now. I indicated to Representative Mautino, who said he an

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendment conceived and being drafted, that at such time he has the Amendment, why we can look at and talk and always try to be reasonable. At that future time, consider bringing the Bill to Third. It's on Third now, let's leave it there. And that is my desire as Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Representative Deuster, my point is that I had sought recognition of the Chair, prior to the time that the Chair very hastily moved it to Third Reading. point is that that recognition should have been granted before it was moved. Had that recognition been granted, the record would indicate that I had one of my staff on the way up, with a fiscal note request on this Bill, because I think it's called for. And I think in fairness, especially, at the very early Session today, we should not be starting out in a rancorous manner. I think that the accommodate everybody, and Chair could Representative Deuster, you, whom I have always known to be fair, would accommodate us in this."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, yes, I always try to be fair and the problem is, at the time this Bill was moved by the Speaker, and I'm not the Speaker, but at the time the Bill was moved from Second to Third Reading, the Clerk did not have a fiscal note. The Clerk didn't have any Amendments, and we were just following the rules of the House, and I'm sorry that some staff person was on the way, unknown to me. But this matter is untimely at this point and I, simply as Sponsor, I have a Bill on Third Reading. At this time, I don't have any desire to put it somewhere else. So, let's leave it on Third Reading and we all know this is an important subject and reasonable people have to get together about it and I'm certainly going to be reasonable and fair. And I'm sorry,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

you know, that something was happening that I didn't know about or the Chair didn't know about. But it's on Third, so let's leave it there and get on to the business of the House."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think everybody has escaped the point. The point is that there is no way that this Bill should been moved to Third Reading while the have Membership is seeking recognition. That Member was seeking recognition on that Bill, on Second Reading. Member had received the recognition that he deserved and had a right under the rules, there's no way that this Bill would have moved to Third Reading because while seeking recognition, he was asking that a fiscal note be filed. think that if there is a fiscal impact, that we should determine that fiscal impact but the point that has escaped you, Representative Deuster, is that a Member was seeking recognition. This isn't the first time that a Member has sought recognition and the Chair has gone over that recognition. It is deserved under the rules. It is a right under the rules, and if that had been observed, there's no way that this Bill would be on Third Reading. And I think that's the point that has been escaped and I think that Representative Getty has made that point, and in spite of that, this Bill sits on Third Reading. This has happened before, and as a Member on this side of the aisle, I object to it again. We've dissented it at the past actions like this. We object again."

Speaker Daniels: : "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, I rise to...for a point of order, and the point of order is simply this. That I think that his point of order was untimely. I think you moved it, in fact, I know you did, you moved the Bill to Third Reading. It should remain

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

there. The Sponsor of this Bill has indicated that he's willing to discuss this on Monday with the proposer of the Amendment. As far as filing a fiscal note request, I think that's a little bit ludicrous, in terms of, we know what the fiscal impact is. We've discussed this matter many times on the floor of the House, as we've debated the issue over the weeks in the past. I think that could be very well addressed on Third Reading when the debate is in order. So, I think you should move on to the next Bill, Mr. Speaker, and proceed."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make the additional point that this was the Bill that was objected to by the Minority side when we tried to have a hearing on the Bill on a week ago, Wednesday. The Minority Party certainly knows that this Bill is in the House. They've had adequate time to present their Amendments. Nothing illegal or improper has been done here, and I think the Bill is on Third Reading, where it belongs. We should proceed with the order of the House, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty. The Bill is on Third Reading. Representative Mautino has asked and requested of Representative Deuster to discuss an Amendment that he has in the Reference Bureau, being prepared. The fiscal note that was filed, was not timely. There were no motions filed to Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, and there were no Amendments filed. This Bill is on Third Reading, Sir. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, I'd like to inquire if my light is working, then,
Mr. Speaker, because...."

Speaker Daniels: "It is now, Sir."

Getty: "Are you telling me that it wasn't working earlier this morning, Sir?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Sir, I did not see your light at the time you said it was on. But the Bill is on Third Reading and that's where it will stay. Representative Mautino's request of Representative Deuster has been honored and it will be taken up that time. So, we're going to move on, Sir. Senate Bill 170. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Domico. Okay, Senate Bill 170. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 170, a Bill for an Act in relationship to martial arts training centers and martial arts matches and exhibitions, Second Reading of the Bil. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Domico. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 172, Representative Breslin. Representative Oblinger. Representative Robbins, are you handling this Bill for Representative Oblinger, Senate Bill 172? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 172, a Bill for an Act relating to location of sanitary landfill and hazardous waste disposal sites, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Breslin, amends Senate Bill 172 by deleting line 35 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Breslin, Amendment #3."

Breslin: "I'd like this Bill taken out of the record, please."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins, Representative Breslin,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

who is the Chief Sponsor of the Bill, has requested it be taken out of the record. So, we're going to take it out of the record. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 209, Representative Piel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 209, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in regard to judgements, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Piel, amends Senate Bill 209, on page one, line one and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel, on Amendment #1."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I brought this Bill up before the Committee there was...the question was brought that there was...that I forgot to change all parts of the Act. I've submitted the Amendment. I brought it up to the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and Representative Getty and the Minority Spokesman on the Committee, and it conforms to what they needed changed in Committee, and that's all it does."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that Amendment, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, Representative Piel, in your Amendment, I notice you're raising the rate from 6% to 10% for the redemption of a property on which a lien has been foreclosed. In other words, you went into the Act to be sure that the 6% figure in all the Acts were raised to 10%, so that you can be sure you can foreclose on somebody's property, is that what you do with your Amendment?"

Piel: "No, I don't."

Giorgi: "Well, what do you do?"

Piel: "Basically, the Bill changed the different areas of the Act, and it was brought up in the Committee that there was

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- two areas. If you'll notice the Amendment just changed two areas. And what this Amendment did, was change two areas that were forgot to be changed in the original Act."
- Giorgi: "But you had to go into the interest for the redemption of the property, right? You're going from 6% to 10%, which you feel is a reasonable figure, do you not?"
- Piel: "The original Bill or the original Bill when it was first made out was 10%."
- Giorgi: "What is it now, up to 12?"
- Piel: "No, it's down to 6, right now. There's about 6 different areas that have been changed by the Bill and this Amendment...the question was brought up in Committee.

 Passed out of Committee, I think, ten to one with the agreement that I would change those two areas on the floor."
- Giorgi: "In other words, in some areas you went higher than 10%, you're up to 14% in some areas?"
- Piel: "No, no, not at all."
- Giorgi: "Well, explain what you did, would you?"
- Piel: "All I'm doing is conforming the Bill with the complete Act. The problem is, the Bill forgot to cover two areas of the Act, Zeke. And the two areas of the Act, you might be against the Bill, but this is the...all this does, is the Amendment covers two areas of the Act that they overlooked when they drafted the initial Bill."
- Giorgi: "What percentages are you talking about in the Amendment?

 What percentages do you affect?"
- Piel: "10%. It was the same figure in the Bill. I'm saying is there was about eight different areas that it had to change. The Bill changed about six of them and it was brought up in Committee that there was about two more."
- Giorgi: "Okay, you went from 6 to 10, in 10 parts of the Act.

 You didn't go to 12, 14 or 20 yet? You didn't go to 12,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

14, or 20 yet, you know the prime rate? You didn't fluctuate it up, so that the poor guy that got foreclosed would have more trouble coming up with the money? You didn't get up that high, yet, did you?"

Piel: "Do you really know what you're talking about?"

Giorgi: "I'm pretty sure, how about you?"

Piel: "Very well."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion on Amendment #1?

Representative Piel has moved for the adoption of Amendment
#1? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed
'no'? The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendment is
adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 224, Representative Peters. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 224, a Bill for an Act amending and repealing Sections of and adding Sections to the Child Care Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion, 'I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate
Bill 224', Representative Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "I have no objection."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman has moved to table
Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',
opposed 'no'. 'Ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is tabled. Any
further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 224 on page three, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is virtually identical to Amendment #1

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

which we just tabled. The only difference being, it makes a technical change. It indicates where certain language is to be inserted into the Bill. That specificity was omitted when Amendment #1 was drafted and this simply corrects the technical error. So, otherwise, this is the same as Amendment #1, adopted in Committee. I move its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "I concur."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 224 on page..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Floor Amendment #3."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Amendment #4...Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 224..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #4."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4, this simply requires that in those cases of child care centers which are going to be unlicensed as a result of this legislation, that when parents of the kids leave their children there, that they should leave their names and an emergency phone number where they can be reached and then the center just keep track...should also keep track of the kids and how many hours that they are there. I think it's a Bill...an Amendment that I have checked with the Senate Sponsor, with the Department of Children and Family Services, with the Staff on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber. It meets

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

with the agreement of all parties. I know of no opposition and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "I concur."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 227, Representative Greiman. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 227, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 236, Representative Stuffle. Representative Woodyard, do you wish to proceed with Senate Bill 236, Sir? Out of the record. Senate Bill 256, Representative Davis. The Clerk will read the Bill. Senate Bill 256, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 256, a Bill for an Act in relationship to certain transportation agencies, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Ted Meyer-et al, amends Senate
Bill 256."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, Amendment #1."

Meyer: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has withdrawn Amendment #1. Any further Amendments? Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, has Amendment #2 been printed and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2 has been printed and distributed.

Any further questions, Sir?"

Madigan: "No."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Amendment #2, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Madigan-Levin-McClain, amends

Senate Bill 256 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu
hereof..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is Amendment #6 printed and distributed?"
Speaker Daniels: "Well, we're not there yet, Sir. We're on
Amendment #2."

- Madigan: "But the question is pertinent, Mr. Speaker, because the Amendment has been filed. If we read 6 and it's not printed and distributed, then we'll be required to either sit and wait for it to be printed and distributed or move to some other Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Or table it or be subject to motion, so we're going to work up to #6 and then whatever motion or desire you have, Sir. But right now we're on Amendment #2. What is your pleasure, Sir? Representative Madigan. Amendment #2, Sir? Representative McClain, Amendment #2."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 256 increases the Series A Bond Authorization for highways by \$400,000,000. If you'll recall, that is the sum total that the Governor wished to increase bond authorization this year in his comprehensive mass transit highway program. So, this would increase the Series A Bond Authorization by \$400,000,000. We allocate the bond authorization for the State of Illinois. \$150,000,000 will be allocated to the District 1 or the six county area, Northeastern Illinois and 250,000,000 of the 400,000,000 will be allocated then for

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the bottom 96 counties. What this will do, is equalize the unobligated Series A Bond Authorization throughout the State of Illinois. If you recall, the last few years we have allocated Series A Bonds, more to the Northeast than to the rest of the State. So, this would just equalize So, all this does, is the amount of money. that \$400,000,000 wanted. Wе allocated the Governor \$150,000,000 for the six county area and 250,000,000 for the remaining 96 counties. This is part of the Democratic Task Force recommendations. I'd urge an adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that Amendment, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Amendment's You will recall, that this intentions are laudable. the Democratic Transportation Task Force of Program, the base Amendment of their program was defeated some two or three weeks ago on the House Floor. understand what Representative McClain is trying to do by amending the Bond Authorization Act to distribute bonds funds in Series A transportation monies upstate And that's all well and good except for one small problem. There is really nothing to talk about with Series A, \$400,000,000 in bonds. Simply because, there's no revenue source currently pending before this Legislature that would fund and equitably retire those bonds as we So, I think this is simply a smoke screen to along. confuse the issue on Senate Bill 256, that they know I, seriously, would question this Amendment. Ιt probably is not germane, but I urge you just to defeat the Amendment, based on the fact that it is certainly without substance, at this point in time, since the final funding source for any road program and certainly not in place and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the road fund could not substantiate \$400,000,000 in additional bonding in Series A, at this point. So, I would urge a 'no' vôte."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good Amendment. We think that fairness is important.

Fairness to the six county area and fairness to downstate and this is the fairness to downstate, as far as bringing more road money to downstate. It's my understanding that come September..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Levin, excuse me.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, can we please have your attention? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may we please have your attention? This is Senate Bill 256, the Regional Transportation Authority. Very important piece of legislation. May we please have your attention? Give the Gentleman the courtesy of listening to his explanation.

Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We recognize that the only way that we're going to come up with a viable solution to the mass transportation problem in Northern Illinois is to build a coalition. A coalition which includes not only Legislators from the city of Chicago and from the suburbs, but from downstate, that deals with the needs of downstate That's what Amendment #2 does. as well as of Chicago. Amendment #2 recognizes that the road program is going to run out of money very shortly. That come September, the Governor is not going to have the money for all the contracts he's already signed. It also recognizes that there has been a little bit of a mail distribution the six county area and roads and downstate, and it's an attempt to balance those equities. The only way that see that we can deal with mass transportation is also to

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

deal with roads to increase the amount of money available.

That's what this Amendment does. I urge everybody from the
six county area, as well as downstate to support it."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Vinson: Representative Levin's remarks were telling, and I House. think people should have paused and considered there What Representative Levin is saying, is that he wants to stick the taxpayers twice. He wants to gouge them first for mass transit, and then he wants to gouge them again for roads. And that's what this particular Amendment This is the Amendment that would gouge them for does. roads. Now, what we have adopted so far, in this House, in this Session, is the principle that mass transit and roads should be dealt with separately. We've adopted that principle because the taxpayers will be protected by principle. If we deal with them separately, then we're not going to have a steamroller going, which gouges the taxpayers as deeply possible on both counts. We can have a moderate mass transportation program, and we can have a moderate road program. I believe that Members from the six county area will remember and will recall with great detail what has happened in the past when mass transportation has been linked with roads. I don't think you've been dealt with fairly, there, whether you come from the suburban area, from the collar counties or from the city. As a matter of fact, the people who have been the biggest critics, at the last time mass transportation and roads were linked, are those people from the city, who don't believe the Mayor made a very good deal. I would suggest you, that you not fall into that trap by doing what Representative Levin and McClain say they want to

time and link mass transportation and roads. We should

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

separate these issues and the most decisive vote you can cast today, will be to separate these issues and to vote 'no' on this particular Amendment."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment and in direct opposition to the comments of the The last speaker has been designated by last speaker. Speaker Ryan as a spokesman for the Republican side of the aisle on the issue of mass transit, and I would presume, that in light of that designation, that that Gentleman would be concerned with the viability of mass transit throughout the State of Illinois. If he is sincere in a desire to maintain a good mass transit system throughout the State, then he realizes that in the long term, the question of mass transit and the question of highway construction and maintenance cannot be separated and they are separated, not only will it be the death nell for State support for mass transit but, as been stated publicly and to him privately, it will be the death nell for the near future for any highway program for the State of Illinois, which is very much needed and which has been attested by the Governor of this State and several business leaders. So, that I suggest that the Gentleman's comments are very ill-founded, short-sighted, and that he should reconsider his position as enunciated on this floor and contemplate a repeal of this statement."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, do you want to do that?

 Okay. Any further discussion? The Gentleman, Mr. McClain,

 from Adams to close."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're dealing with, solely on this Amendment, is dealing

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

with bond authorization for highway construction in the State of Illinois. For those of you that downstate Illinois, like the Gentleman from DeWitt, what this does is, it equalizes the unobligated Series A Bond, statewide. For the last few years, the Governor has agree to slip more Series A Bonds into the Chicago Metropolitan Area than for downstate. All this does, is equalizes downstate with District 1, which is the six county area in Series A Bonds. So, I think the Gentleman from DeWitt, in actuality, is harming downstate in trying to get some decent Series A Bonds. It would be the same selling of the bonds, as the Governor proposes, which is \$100,000,000 each year for four years. All it does, is authorize 250 for downstate, 150 for the six county area. It's part of a comprehensive program, yes, but also it does give us, in downstate Illinois and the Chicago area, some sort of road program, and I'd ask for the adoption."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 68 voting 'aye', 83 'no', 5 'present' and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Ebbesen, amends Senate Bill 256 and so forth."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen, Amendment \$3. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative Davis, what is your pleasure, Sir?"
- Davis: "Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the rules provide if the the Sponsor is not on the floor that the Amendment be withdrawn, and I suppose that's the best course of action."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #3.

 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #3 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #4, Ted Meyer-et al, amends Senate
 Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #4, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Ebbesen, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen, Amendment #5.

Representative Davis moves to table Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #5 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Madigan-Levin-McClain, amends

Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #6, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, #6, in Amendment great part, is Governor Thompson's program, as presented to this General Assembly a few short months ago. It would provide for the adoption of a 5% gross receipts tax on the oil companies operating within the State of Illinois. The money to be derived from this tax would be used to support mass transit statewide and road construction and maintenance statewide. The Bill (sic, Amendment) further provides that in terms of the structural rearrangements of the RTA, that the Governor's concept of a budget review agency labeled the TFA would adopted bу this Amendment. That agency would be responsible for the dispersement of the subsidy money from the five percent gross receipts tax to the various mass

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

transit carriers operating in northeastern Illinois. This particular agency would be under mandate of Statute to withhold the subsidy money from any carrier which, judgment, during any budget quarter was operating at a deficit budget. So that an individual carrier which for one reason or another had not raised fares sufficient to meet expenses, or had not negotiated a contract which would provide for a balanced budget, would be denied the subsidy money from the state tax before those..before those errors had been corrected. So that, for those who are concerned with local transit carriers which operate deficit budgets, because they either refuse to raise fares or because they negotiate a poor labor contract, or because they refuse to reduce the level of service, if you are concerned with those carriers, then this Amendment would provide that by operation of law those carriers would be denied their state subsidy until they had corrected those budget errors. Amendment, as I said, adopts in great part the ideas that Governor Thompson has propagated for several months. It offers certain refinements which, in my judgment, the judgment of many Members of this House, improve the Governor's plan, especially in terms of the structural rearrangements of the RTA, and I would sincerely recommend to you that this is the best solution to the current mass transit crisis in northeastern Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, on Amendment #6."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative Madigan, did you indicate that this
 imposes a gross receipts tax?"

Madigan: "This Amendment adopts the Thompson gross receipts tax

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

on oil companies to finance road construction and mass ${\tt transit."}$

Vinson: "At what particular rate?"

Madigan: "This adopts the five percent rate proposed by Governor Thompson."

Vinson: "Does this Amendment exempt from the gross receipts tax farmers and farm used fuel?"

Madigan: "This Amendment adopts the Thompson proposal to include farm products in the tax."

Vinson: "So, if the Amendment were adopted, off-road fuel used by farmers would still be subject to the gross receipts tax."

Madigan: "This Amendment would adopt, as Governor Thompson did, a tax that would apply to all products. It would not provide for discrimination as to the products to be taxed, as proposed by Governor Thompson."

Vinson: "Does the Amendment exempt home heating fuel?"

Madigan: "This Amendment, as proposed by Governor Thompson, provides no exemptions."

Vinson: "Is there a bridge loan contemplated by this Amendment?"

Madigan: "As proposed by Governor Thompson, there is a bridge loan."

Vinson: "Now, what is the amount of the bridge loan?"

Madigan: "Two hundred million dollars, as proposed by Governor Thompson."

Vinson: "For what period of time would that bridge loan carry mass transit in the six county area?"

Madigan: "As proposed by Governor Thompson, three years."

Vinson: "For how long?"

Madigan: "Three years."

Vinson: "So you would not anticipate under your Amendment collecting any of the gross receipts tax for three years?"

Madigan: "Yes, we would contemplate collecting the tax."

Vinson: "When would you contemplate first collecting the tax

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

under the Amendment?"

Madigan: "January 1 of 1982."

Vinson: "Now, would the collections of the tax be the security for the bridge loan?"

Madigan: "As proposed by Governor Thompson, the assets of the newly created TFA would constitute the collateral for the loan."

Vinson: "And would not those assets include the collections under the tax?"

Madigan: "As proposed by Governor Thompson, yes."

Vinson: "Now, would you anticipate that the tax would be subject to judicial challenge?"

Madigan: "Governor Thompson stated that he expected this to be subject to judicial review."

Vinson: "Now, would you anticipate that the banks would loan against those collections prior to judicial determination of the issues revolving around the tax?"

Madigan: "It was Governor Thompson's statement that there would be bank loans, yes."

Vinson: "Prior to the collection of the tax?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Vinson: "And you think that the assets in place now in mass transportation would be sufficient to justify a \$200 million loan prior to judicial determination of the issues on the tax?"

Madigan: "Governor Thompson has told me and told you and told the world that that would be sufficient."

Vinson: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I might?"

Speaker Daniels: "To the Bill, Sir."

Vinson: "Mayor Byrne also has made certain statements regarding gross receipts taxes. And I believe that the essence of Mayor Byrne's statements and the essence of her proposals recognize the fact that there would be serious judicial

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

review of the issues revolving around a gross receipts tax. Mayor Byrne, I believe, anticipates a \$400 million bridge loan would be necessary and that under that \$400 million, one of the reasons for it would be the length of time involved in adjudication of the gross receipts tax. It's the indication of the financial community that there would not be a willingness to loan until the tax was adjudicated as a Constitutional tax. The further indication, I believe as also stated by Mayor Byrne, that there can be no loan on that basis until the writ 'assecurare' is denied by the United States Supreme Court. And that's why she would anticipate some 18 months of litigation. That's why she would anticipate substantial further lending and another tax would have to be raised to pledge against that loan. Now, beyond that, I would just ask the Membership to recognize the Amendment that they're voting on and the fact that it is a gross receipts tax Amendment and Membership ought vote its pleasure on the subject."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn. Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Dunn: "How much revenue will this ..this proposal raise if adopted and if it becomes law, on an annual basis?"

Madigan: "On an annual basis, 850 million as proposed by Governor Thompson."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he'll yield."

Conti: "On page 115, line 33, we've heard so much about Governor Thompson's package. Did he say that the city of the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Chicago and the Mayor, with the advice of the City Council of the City of Chicago shall appoint four members of the Board for initial terms expiring September 1st of the year of 1946, '50, '51 and '52 respectively? Did Mayor Thompson...Governor Thompson suggest that?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Governor Thompson proposed in his five percent gross receipts tax plan that the Mayor make all seven appointments to the CTA. The Democratic Task Force felt that there should be input both from the Governor and the Mayor concerning the operation of the CTA and therefore, the Democratic Task Force provided that the Governor would continue to make three appointments to the CTA. But Governor Thompson had proposed when he spoke before this Body that the Mayor take over all seven appointments to the CTA."

Conti: "No further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes. I have some questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "The new authority is to have a seven member directorship. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

-- * -- ***** -- **-**

Leinenweber: "Now, the..three of them come from the city of Chicago. How are they selected?"

Madigan: "They're appointed by the Mayor of Chicago."

Leinenweber: "That is..You've been saying that as the Governor proposed...as Governor Thompson proposed. That is not in accordance with the proposal of Governor Thompson. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That is a refinement to the Governor's proposal."

Leinenweber: "The Governor's proposal was what?"

Madigan: "My recollection, Mr. Leinenweber, was that not only

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

would the Governor appoint all members to the Fiscal Oversight Committee, but he further provided that in the event that the Governor and the Mayor of Chicago were of the same political party, that then the Chairman of the authority would be appointed by the highest ranking Republican official in the state and that further, because of the way that the language was drafted creating the Fiscal Oversight Agency, the TFA, that the Chairman would, effect, be a Czar over mass transit in northeastern Illinois, and let me also point out, that concerning the which required that the Chairman Czar be appointed either by a Republican Governor or a Republican state official. when the Governor visited with the editorial boards at the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Sun-Times he failed to mention that. He failed to point out that this was a Governor Thompson Republican power grab similar to the appointment of Mr. Fayner as Attorney General and Mr. Edgar, Secretary of State..."

- Leinenweber: "Let me ask you .. I'm not particularly interested..."
- Madigan: "....Attempt to engineer the election of Senator Shapiro as the President of the Senate..."
- Leinenweber: "Well, you were ...you were a Member of 'Con-Con' that extended the Governor those powers to make those appointments. But, how are the three directors, the other three directors, to be appointed? The three the Mayor appoints..."
- Madigan: "Other three would be appointed by the Governor from recommendations submitted to the Governor by the Council of Mayors, which is an established organization in suburbia which meets on a regular basis to consider transportation problems and which has already established a structure that could be utilized for the review process."

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- Leinenweber: "Is there any limit to how many names can be submitted to the Governor?"
- Madigan: "The presumption is that there would be a workable arrangement developed by the Council of Mayors."
- Leinenweber: "Is that your presumption or is that a presumption of somebody else?"
- Madigan: "I think it would be a reasonable presumption by a reasonable man."
- Leinenweber: "All right. Then this...Does this include county board chairmen?"
- Madigan: "We specifically excluded participation by county board chairmen, because the testimony adduced at the Committee of the Whole hearing scheduled by Speaker Ryan over a weekend three months ago clearly indicated that the Mayors of the region have a much stronger interest in the provision of mass transit than do county board members and county board chairmen..."
- Leinenweber: "But the chairmen..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Gentlemen. Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in order to conserve time of the House, too, I would like to make a point of order."
- Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."
- Deuster: "The point of order is that Amendment #6 as I read it is out of order because it reads, '..amends Senate Bill 256 as amended..' and Senate Bill 256 has not been amended. And so I make the point of order that Amendment #6 is out of order."
- Speaker Daniels: "Can we see the Amendment, Mr. Clerk? And the Bill? Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if it would be helpful to the process, I would move to amend the Amendment on its face to correct an error, if, in your judgment, there is an error."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Hold on everybody now. Wait a second. The Gentleman's point is well taken and is in order. The Amendment is out of order because it refers to the Bill, '...as amended..'. Therefore, Amendment #6 is out of order. Representative Madigan has moved to correct the Amendment on its face by deleting the words on line 17, '..as amended..'. Is that correct, Sir? Is that your Motion, Sir?"

Madigan: "Would you restate that?"

Speaker Daniels: "All right. You have requested and moved to correct the Amendment on its face by deleting the two words, '..as amended..'. Is that correct, Sir?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. That requires unanimous leave of the House, Sir. Are there any objections? There are objections raised, Sir. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "There is no ruling, Sir. It requires, by the rules..."

Madigan: "No. You have ruled the Amendment out of order. And I appeal that ruling of the Chair. Now, if you wish to follow in the footsteps of your Speaker and deny me the opportunity to appeal the ruling of the Chair, be my quest."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would just call upon your good judgment to reconsider your ruling."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty.."

Getty: "The..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, one second now. Let me make sure that everybody understands what has occurred here. Amendment #6 was filed using the terms, '..as amended..'. The Bill, House..Senate Bill 256 has not been

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

amended. That Amendment is, in fact, out of order. Representative Madigan has moved that the words '..as amended..' be deleted. That requires by our rules unanimous leave of the House. There were objections raised by Representative Pullen and Representative Conti and several others to that leave. It is on that request that the Chair has said that his request is out of order. Now, Representative Getty."

"Mr. Chairman..Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that Getty: your original ruling in response to Representative Deuster's inquiry is not correct. I suggest to you that the mere usage of the words '..as amended..' is pure surplusage. I suggest to you that that does not put it out of order. We have consistently held that it is pure surplusage. It does not put an Amendment out of order because that surplusage is in there. I suggest to you that in a reasonable manner, reconsider that ruling and rule that this is indeed in order."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, it is long standing and recognized by this House that the terminology ...as amended..'is..does in fact make this Amendment out of order...."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Daniels: "...Request of the Membership to amend that and that request has been denied."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

Getty: "The question always has been whether or not an Amendment fits regardless of the issue as to whether or not the words 'as amended' were or were not in it. It's a question as to whether it fits into the Bill as it is before you. You take the Bill in one hand and look at it. You take the Amendment in the other hand and look at it. And if it

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

fits, it is in order, regardless of those words. I suggest to you that you should reconsider your ruling and if you do not, I appeal that ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in reflecting on this, I know that this is a big Amendment and a lot of work has gone into it. And I have never been one who likes to deprive the House of an on a matter. I do believe that opportunity to vote I suppose it is Amendments should be in order. impossible.. I would be happy to withdraw my point of order, although I've gotten the Chair in a difficult position..." Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster, you have graciously consented to withdraw. However, Sir, there is an error in the Amendment. Representative Madigan has moved to correct it on its face to delete the two words, '..as amended..' which appear on line 17. Representative Deuster has withdrawn his objection. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the fair way to handle this would be for all of us to vote in favor of Mr. Madigan's Amendment (sic, Motion) which will amend the Bill on its face so we can get on to a vote on the substance of this Amendment. And so, I..so we can get on to vote on it. I'm not saying that we have to vote for it, but we will vote it up or down, and so I would suggest that the proper way, since we have a Motion before us, is, in my own case, I'm going to vote for that Motion...for that Motion so that this Bill can be amended...so the Amendment can be amended and so we can consider it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, as you properly noted, this requires unanimous consent, not a Motion. And as you properly noted, I had objected to unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, I really do desire the opportunity to vote against this

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendment so I will withdraw my objection."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Mr. Deuster, has raised a point of order. That point of order has been raised. The Gentleman, Mr. Madigan, has moved to correct the Amendment on its face to delete the terms, '..as amended..', in line 17. The Gentleman has requested unanimous leave. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Amendment is corrected on its face. And Representative Kane."

"Mr. Speaker, I think that you and the rest of the House Kane: leaving all of us in an impossible situation. other Bill that anybody files an Amendment, say, Amendment or Amendment #5, does one file the Amendment to House Bill such and such, 'as amended'? Or does one have to file two Amendments, one saying, 'as amended', and one saying to...and leaving out the words, 'as amended', or does one put into his or her Amendment, Amendment to House Bill 653 possibly amended'? Because, with the ruling that you have given, anybody can raise any objection and we are at the whim of another Member of whether or not an Amendment can be heard, depending on whether Amendments 1,2 and 3 previously were adopted or not adopted, and no one knows that in advance. And I think that you, by your ruling, are leaving the House in an impossible situation to deal with any further Amendments on any other Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane, this ruling is consistent with the practices of the House, even under the former Speaker. It has always been the case. We will present each and every Amendment as it presents itself. The problem has been resolved. There is nothing pending before the House now and on the Amendment, Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan, the Amendment has been corrected on its face. Is there further discussion on the Amendment? Representative Leinenweber was in the course of discussion

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

during the interruption. Representative Leinenweber."

- Leinenweber: "Yes. The Chairman of the authority is to be appointed in which way, Sir?"
- Madigan: "The Chairman would be appointed by the Governor with the Mayor of Chicago having a veto authority over the appointment."
- Leinenweber: "The exact language...is it prior approval of the Mayor of Chicago? And if so, that's not....That's different than a veto authority, isn't it?"
- Madigan: "In the case of the Chairman, it would be an appointment by the Governor subject to the prior approval of the Mayor of Chicago ..."

Leinenweber: "Which is different than ... "

Madigan: "...Mind you, is a veto ability."

- Leinenweber: "That's different than saying the Mayor has a veto power. Isn't that true?"
- Madigan: "It certainly would operate much smoother if the veto authority were couched in terms of prior approval so that we wouldn't have names bouncing back and forth between one and the other."
- Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Amendment has time and again came up with a line that 'as proposed by Governor Thompson' to indicate that this type of proposal somehow has the support of the Governor. Well, I would suggest to you that the Governor's proposal is far different than this one. And that is, that although he was willing to give some money to this authority, that perhaps some of us feel is excessive, nevertheless, he was establishing a body that would have some kind of statewide responsibility as opposed to being totally under the thumb of the Mayor of the city of Chicago. And I would suggest to you that what we would see happening if we passed this type of Amendment is, first of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

all, you'll have three clones of the Mayor sitting for the three seats appointed by her. The three by the Governor would probably be responsible to no one because they would be submitted from a laundry list of people submitted by the various Mayors, who would probably all come up with somebody from their own community. And the Governor would But the worst part is the tie make these appointments. breaker, the Chairman of this outfit, will be .. has to..before the Governor can even propose him, has to go hat hand to the Mayor and say, Look at who you will accept. And then he can only appoint from a list that the Governor will...the Mayor will give him. Now this is different from saying a veto. I only have to point out to you that a few years ago when the RTA was first adopted, because of the fact that the Chairman was to be selected by the evenly divided Body between the collar counties, suburban Cook and the city, that under strict instructions of the Mayor of the city of Chicago, the RTA Board refused to act other than to accept the appointment of Facarski'. And this was the charge that many of the opponents made that this RTA 'Milton was to be run bу Pacarski' and the proponents said, 'No, it can't be because of the way the structure is set up it would have to be agreeable to the collar counties, suburban Cook. And just want to remind many of you of the awesome pressure that the press, that the business community in the city of Chicago, that the city of Chicago, itself, brought to bear the suburban commissioners..the suburban RTA Board members until they finally got one. I guess they had some people suggest that they offered in some kind ο£ But they finally got one of them to yield. Now, just remember, they were ready to let the thing..the whole transit system go down in order to get

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

their will by getting 'Milton Facarski' appointed and they got their wishes. Now, if you want to structure a board so that it's exactly the same as the existing one, that's ground this transportation system into the ground, that has starving (sic) the collar county and suburban Cook transportation systems in order to keep the city of Chicago system running in direct, clear violation of the law, then go ahead and vote for this Amendment. But if you want to have some kind of a Body that's responsive to the people of the State of Illinois and to the people of the six county region, then vote 'no' on Amendment #6."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Levin."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in Levin: support of Amendment #6. The emergency we have been talking about for some months, that it was going to coming, that we were going to have a problem if we didn't do something, that emergency is here right now. Part of the system has closed down. Part of the system is closing The rest has very little time. It's not Chicago. It's not just the inner suburbs. It's the entire county area. And what I am hearing from m y constituents is that they're tired of what they see political games. They're tired of one side or the other refusing to compromise. They're tired of the antics which they perceive coming on from this General Assembly. what they are saying is, 'Do something. Get this crisis resolved and get it resolved now. This General Assembly right now has a very bad image with the public. look at the polls "

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Levin.."

Levin: "...it's not just the Governor..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin? Excuse me. For what

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

purpose does the Gentleman, Representative Mulcahey, arise?
Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Mulcahey: ".. If the Gentleman wants to have a press conference,
he ought to go down to the second floor to do so. This is
no place to do it. I wish he would address the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin, proceed."

"Polls suggest that people perceive it is not just the Governor: it is not just the Mayor, but it is the General Assembly that they feel has not gotten down to business in solving this problem. This Amendment is a good solution. Again, this Amendment is open. If there are points need to be discussed, negotiated, changed, we're certainly willing to do that. But, this is an Amendment that will resolve the crisis, will get the commuter rails running again, get the suburban buses running again, keep the CTA The problem is not only one in the city of running. Bach suburban district has between eight and ten Chicago. thousand residents who take the commuter rails, who are not able to get to work, who are concerned about solving the The problem is also one not just of mass transportation, but is a problem downstate as far as roads. And that's what this proposal deals with. It provides a..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Levin.

Representative Meyer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ted Meyer: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point."

Ted Meyer: "Would the Gentleman...if the Gentleman would direct his remarks towards the Chair, not towards the T.V. cameras."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. Your point is well taken.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Representative Levin, will you refine (sic, confine) your remarks to the Bill, please, or the Amendment, Sir? Please and bring it to a close."

Levin: "I thought we were talking about the Amendment. This not only benefits Chicago: it not only benefits the eight to thousand people in each suburban district who take the buses and the commuter rails each day to work and won't able to at the present time, but it helps downstate. Ιt helps them deal with their road problem. And we want help downstate because we feel that's the only way we're going to be able to help ourselves. What this does there's been no questions about it because they're awfully good provisions, this provides that after monies formula are set aside for mass transportation, seventy-five percent of the balance of the proceeds go into a highway construction account fund, one that cannot be used for administration by the Department of Transportation, but one that must be used for construction of roads. And as far as the balance of the money, it provides that only thirty percent of that balance can go for state road fund. remaining seventy percent would go to local government road So this is an approach which helps Chicago, helps the suburbs and benefits greatly downstate. suggest that the .. You know, we need to do something right now about this problem. People throughout the state are getting fed up with our lack of action. And this proposal, this Amendment, has been endorsed by not only the Chicago Tribune a couple of months ago, but in this morning's paper the Chicago Sun-Times endorses this proposal. describe it as a fair and affordable way to resolve the RTA turmoil. I urge your support of this measure. This is the most important crisis we have before us. It's time we resolved it."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kociolko."

Kociolko: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen the House. I think from the constant invoking of the name of the Governor that we've heard here this morning it should be clear what the pattern for the future will be if we were to adopt Amendment #6. A new and very burdensome tax will be placed on all the people of the State of Illinois. And the prime purpose of that tax will pour more millions of tax dollars into the CTA to support the CTA in its waste and in its inefficiency profligacy. Now, no doubt the Chicago media that we've heard so much from over recent weeks and that we've heard mentioned by the previous speaker, would applaude us for our great statesmanship if we were indeed to adopt this But it's equally clear that the onus for that Amendment. tax increase would then be mounted around the neck of Governor of this state and of the political party which he leads. Now the Governor's original proposal has refined, as the Minority Leader puts it in this Amendment, in such a way to guarantee that the Chicago political Leadership will retain control over regional transportation that they, and their instruments, will be able to continue riding roughshod over the people of the suburbs and of the collar counties as they have for so long. Now. certainly from the point of view of those who have introduced this Amendment, it's a wonderful system. They get the tax dollars they desire. The media can applaude the statesmanship, and the burden for that tax increase will fall on the Governor and on our party. Well, this to be. unfortunately, a very poor system. that reason, I most respectfully encourage the Members of this Body to vote 'no' on this terrible Amendment."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis." Davis: "Pretty hard act to follow, Representative Rociolko. Lord, oh Lord, how time worn and weary that we become, and I counted the number of times the distinguished Minority Leader mentioned Governor Thompson's name. Nineteen times during his presentation, did he mention the name. And yet, this House, only a brief eight weeks ago, the House Republicans joined by downstate Democrats rejected the notion of a five percent gross receipts tax, rejected that notion to the point where the Bill was never even called and responsibly tabled by the Speaker of this House. only tell you now, Mr. Minority Leader, that you have brought this Amendment back to and this is the third time the Amendment has come back, and the President of the Senate has done the same thing, so that the minions of the city of Chicago know one thing, Ladies and Gentlemen. know they have less than three weeks to put a gross tax in place around the necks of downstate suburban collar their own citizens in the city of Chicago to throw hundreds of millions of dollars at a wasteful and inefficient system that exists in the RTA and the CTA, and yes, oh hallow, oh how hallow the Minority Leader's words ring on this Amendment and on the last Amendment when we discussed bonding when he said on television two nights ago, 'It'll be a cold day when downstate gets any Chicago votes for their roads in the future, if the Mayor has to take over the CTA'. Well let me tell you something, the Republicans in the collar counties, in suburban Cook and downstate will furnish roads for downstate. And they'll wote for increases for downstate. All we've been trying to do all this time is to give the RTA, CTA an enema to force the elimination of waste in the system and bring cost

containment to the system. Now that's what this is all

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

about. So you'd better vote 'no' on this Amendment, and let's get on with the business of saving the system."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Representative Madigan, are you closing?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All those opposed,
'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the main question is put.

Madigan: "There was a demand for a Roll Call on that question."

Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish floor debate, Sir?"

Madigan: "There was a demand for a Roll Call on the question."

Speaker Daniels: "Would you like to speak further on the Amendment, Sir?"

Madigan: "I want a Roll Call on the question."

Speaker Daniels: "On the question, the previous..."

Madigan: "The rules specifically provide ..."

Speaker Daniels: "All right.."

Madigan: "...That if there's a demand for a Roll Call, it shall be granted."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen has...Yes, Sir?"

Ebbesen: "I withdraw the Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. It's withdrawn. Representative Madigan, you've already spoken on it. Are you closing, Sir? Is there further debate?"

Madigan: "I was not seeking recognition.."

Speaker Daniels: "Oh, I'm sorry.."

Madigan: ".. Except to ask for a Roll Call..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Sir. We're on the Madigan-Thompson transportation program. Now, Representative McClain from Adams, you wish to speak to the Amendment, Sir?"

McClain: "I do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the House, I stand in support of this Amendment. Speaking of an enema, I think that we're all playing somewhat of pseudo-power brokers here. If the Gentleman, Mr. Davis, really believes that they are offering a program for roads for downstate, I'd like to see their proposal. There are no proposals. You've got three weeks before the end of After July 1st, you'd need 107 votes, and I see no proposal coming from that side of the aisle to take care of roads. The Comptroller's Office says that we have million dollars in the Treasury on a daily basis for roads. see no proposal from Republicans to try to protect the If you look at this proposal, and if you study it, you will see that Chicago will put in 22% of the total tax dollars: Cook County will put in 22%; the remaining five counties will put in 22%. They get back 60% of the total amount. So, in essence, the six-county area is going to be taxed 66% and get back 60%. Downstate gets the remainder. you look at, also, the RTA, as Al Manning pointed out today, is the only mass transit system in the entire State I'd like to of Illinois that receives no State subsidy. can qo back to Peoria and Quincy Champaign-Urbana and Springfield and say that that's fair. All this Amendment does is provide for the same kind formula for all mass transits throughout the State of Illinois, one-third of operating costs plus 10% growth a Also, it provides for a nondiversionary highway year. construction account, plus it changes the Motor Fuel Tax Fund and gets local governments more money than they normally get under the present Motor Fuel Tax Fund. you're really concerned about the economic stability and economic growth of downstate Illinois, then you ought to be voting for it, this Amendment. If not, and you say that you're a pseudo-power broker, then offer another program.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

You voted against the bonding. You're going to vote against this Amendment and you keep coming up with ideas that you're going to have another program, and you don't have a program. You want the RTA to go down because you get your money in Peoria and Quincy and Champaign- Urbana and Springfield and Rockford, but you don't give a damn about 60% of the people, and I think that's wrong. you say that you want money for roads and you won't ask for...offer a program for roads. You just want deterioration of the entire State of Illinois because you can go back home and run against people and run against the program or run against Thompson. All you've got to do learn how to package yourself and promote yourself and look for the economic stability and growth of downstate Illinois and to the six-county area. I think it's time for us to quit playing like we're pseudo-power brokers and start voting for our areas."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Would you hold that, Sir? The Gentleman, Mr.

Jones, from Cook."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. I heard the previous speakers on the other side of the aisle talk about the wasteful system of mass transit in the Chicagoland area. But I don't..I don't think his constituency feels that way because the hundreds of thousands that commute to the city of Chicago to work do not consider that system a wasteful system. It's the system that serves the people of the State of Illinois. The Governor did propose a five percent tax on the gross receipts of the oil companies. Now that is your Governor. Now if you think your Governor

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

is not looking out for the best interests of the people, you should tell him. But I feel, for one time in all the years that he has served, that he has come up with a proposal. But if he cannot lead his other Members on the side of the aisle, then something is wrong. other Something is wrong on the second floor. Something is wrong with the Membership on the other side of the aisle. transit in the Chicagoland area serves all the people. Wе cannot separate mass transit from the road We, in Chicago, who represent that area, are prepared to vote for roads downstate. We are prepared to help our colleagues who need help. We cannot continue to fight as upstate, downstate, suburban versus city of Chicago. If the system goes down, it's going to affect each and every Legislative District in the entire State of Illinois. So quit. Let's stop playing games with mass transportation. Let's stop playing games with the road program. Why don't you stand up and be for real? Stand up and support your Governor. Support this Amendment for the people of the State of Illinois and you can go home and tell the people that for one time you were a statesman, that you did what you felt was right for a change and not vote according to political amibitions of each and every individual on the other side of the aisle. I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in closing the debate, let me reiterate some of my earlier points. This Amendment proposes the adoption of the Thompson gross receipts tax on oil companies. After much prodding at the beginning of this Session, Governor Thompson through force of circumstance, was finally

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

compelled to appear before a Joint Session of this Assembly and to offer his plan to finance mass transit and construction and maintenance in Illinois. The keystone of that plan was the adoption of a five percent gross receipts tax on oil companies operating in Illinois. Since that day on one occasion Governor Thompson has said at the mansion, 'I gave you a plan, now it is your responsibility to pass that plan or to change that plan. But when I gave you the discharged my responsibility in the area of transportation. I don't feel that the drafting of a plan which costs the taxpayers of this state \$70,000 in legal fees is sufficient to discharge the responsibility and the duty of Governor Thompson to the mass transit riders of northeastern Illinois and to the well being of the road downstate. I feel that there is a greater program responsibility placed upon the Governor of this state, not only to draft a plan, to present a plan, but to work on behalf of that plan. To this point in time, not one Member of this House, not one Member o£ this House Representatives has said to me that Governor Thompson has ever asked him to vote for the Thompson plan for transit and roads. There has been no work by the Governor ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Madigan.

Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise,

Sir?"

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Schuneman: "I don't think we're here to discuss the record of the Governor of this state. We're here to discuss this Amendment. Please ask the Gentlemen to confine his remarks to the Amendment, make his political speeches somewhere else."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's point is well taken.

Representative Madigan, please confine your remarks to the

Amendment, Sir. Proceed."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this part of the legislative process. Amendment is The legislative process involves not only those who sit on this floor and those who sit on the floor of the Senate, but it, definition ο£ the Constitution, requires participation by the Governor of this state because if this Amendment is adopted and passed by both the House and the Senate, before it becomes final, the effect of it, it will require the approval of the Governor. So that the Governor, by definition of the Constitution, is an active participant in the legislative process. On items of major concern and items of major importance, we need, we require, the people need, the people require the participation, the active participation of the Governor of this state in the legislative process. I stated earlier, there has been no work by the Governor. There has been no work by the Governor throughout this Session except on one occasion.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan, we have objections again. Would you please confine your remarks to the Amendment so we can bring this debate to a close, Sir?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "I have adequately defined my notions of the legislative process. If certain Members on this floor wish to stand in the defense of another public official, let them do it.

But let them offer facts as to why their defense..."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir.."

Madigan: "...Is well founded.."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir. Are you done?"

Madigan: "No, I am not finished.."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "All right.."

Madigan: "I'm attempting to address the Amendment.."

Speaker Daniels: "All right..."

Madigan: "And I would appreciate the ability to proceed uninterrupted."

Speaker Daniels: "I would like to do that, too, Sir. But I'd like you to limit your comments to the Amendment. Would you proceed, Sir?"

Madigan: "Uninterrupted. For this Amendment, or for any similar Amendment, that proposes the adoption of a statewide tax, which proposes the adoption of a new funding mechanism for mass transit and roads will require the active and strong support of the Governor of this state. If we do not have his support, the problem will not be solved in the fashion that it should be solved. I have called upon the Governor.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan, we have continuing objections. Would you please limit your remarks to the Amendment, Sir? Representative Ebbeson."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. He continues to go back into the Constitution and the government, the Governor and giving us a lecture on the Governor as how he proceeds and how he fits into this picture. He's not talking about the Amendment. He should confine his remarks to the substance of that Amendment and nothing more."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I'm rising on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Deuster: "My point is that most of my constituents have been communicating to me about how ashamed they are of the Illinois General Assembly, that political people down here are making speeches and accusations. And I think that, out of respect for this chamber, it does not contribute to the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

respect for the Legislature and for the serious concern we have over this transportation crisis if we continue and persist in making partisan political attacks. The Governor is not here. I, too, would like to join in asking the distinguished Minority Leader, who has worked so hard on this Amendment and who feels so strongly about the merits and importance of it, that if he would continue, to confine his remarks to this and not do what my constituents have been complaining about and that is converting transportation problem and an economic problem into a partisan political wrangle. The people are fed up and sick and tired of these kinds of speeches, and I think that the folks back home will cool down and calm down and maybe some of us could support some solutions, if we just didn't have so many of these political shots back and forth across the aisle."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Point of order.."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Kane: "The point of order is that that's not a personal privilege speech. His name was not mentioned in debate. There was no personal privilege there. And he's engaging in the kind of rhetoric that he is slamming on the part of other people. I think that if the Chair is going to rule on things, the Chair should rule even-handedly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Deuster, Mr. Deuster,

I, too, am concerned with the respect and dignity of this
chamber. And if you share my concern, I ask you to join me
in asking Speaker Ryan never again to permit the type of
demonstration that was permitted on the floor of this House
by former Representative Griesheimer and other Members of
this House. Let me point out that a previous speaker who

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

alluded to the responsibility of Speaker Ryan was one of the participants in that disgraceful performance, which has severely demeaned the reputation of this Body and the reputation of each individual Member of this Body. It was uncalled for. It should never happen again."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryan. Speaker Ryan on a point of personal privilege."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Ryan: I'm somewhat dismayed at the action that's taking place here in the last few minutes. Representative Madigan knows full well that we've all tried, including himself, Senator Rock and the Republican Senate, myself and the Governor's Office, have all worked or at least tried to work together to solve the, what I consider the immediate problem and crisis in the State of Illinois and that's the transportation problem. I said last week that we could point the finger and blame one another for what's been done in the past and what's happened in the past, but that's not going to solve the problem for the future. Judge McMillon today, after refusal by Lou Hill to pay the Milwaukee \$750,000, has ordered the closure of Railroad some the...the closing of the Milwaukee Railroad at 2:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. I'm going to meet with Representative Madigan, hopefully, Senator Rock and Representatives from the Republican Senate in the Governor's Office as soon as this debate finishes to see what we can do to come up with the needed cash to keep that railroad running. I think that if we can work that out then the northwestern railroad will continue to run. I just think that it's time to stop all the political nonsense and to get serious about solving one of the state's problems. And I think that we've got to look forward instead of backward on this, and I would encourage Representative Madigan to join me with that kind

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

of an attitude to see if we can't get serious about solving this problem."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to Speaker Ryan. Mr. Speaker, if you are serious about your concern for responsible work on this problem, why don't you request that the Sponsor of this Bill take the Bill out of the record?"

Ryan: "And then what?"

Madigan: "And then adjourn to the Governor's Office which is where the meeting has been scheduled. I am on the floor because I must take care of...."

Ryan: "...Absolutely, Representative. I'll do that. And when we come back we will proceed with this Bill. I would recommend to the Chair that the House stand in recess until after the meeting ...the Leadership meeting with the Governor..."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker?"

Ryan: "..And then when we come back after recess, that we take up at this point."

Speaker Daniels: "House will be in recess. Call of the Chair.

Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I want the record very clear. I did not call for a recess of the whole House...."

Speaker Daniels: "The House is in recess.."

Madigan: "...I called for the Leaders to go to the Governor's

Office. There's no need to discontinue consideration of
the other Bills on the Calendar."

Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Madigan, I know that it's been five or six months now since you've had the total say about how this House is operated, but I'm going to give you that opportunity once more today. If you'll tell me what you

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

want, we'll try and accommodate you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan, for what he wants."

Madigan: "My suggestion....Do I have an opportunity to consult with Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan. Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, my suggestion was simply that if this Bill were taken from the record, then I would feel free to leave the floor and to attend a meeting in the Governor's Office with Speaker Ryan, President Rock and Senator Weaver. I do not wish to be the one suggesting that the entire House stand in recess. I think that the entire House can continue to work on the other Bills on the Calendar."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryan. Speaker Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, I think the Gentleman's point is well taken, Mr. Speaker. And I would be more than willing to do that.

Just so everybody in the House understands that it's my intent to finish this Bill today. If it's midnight tonight, so be it. I think the House can continue to do its work and when we come back from the conference that we get back to that Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come back into order from recess. The House is called back to order. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are going to temporarily remove from the record Senate Bill 256. Upon the return of the Speaker, on the advice of the Speaker, we will return to the Order of Senate Bill 256, Amendment #6. Is that correct, Representative Madigan? Is that your understanding, Sir?"

Madigan: "Would you restate that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "All right. We are going to temporarily remove from the record Senate Bill 256. When you and Speaker Ryan return, when Speaker Ryan requests, we will return to this order of business, Amendment #6. Is that your

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

understanding, Sir?"

- Madigan: "Yes, it is."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right. Senate Bill 256 will be temporarily taken out of the record. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, only for those who are interested in the count, the count right now is Governor Thompson at 25.

 So when we come back we're at 25."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you have heard the Speaker. We will remain in Session until Senate Bill 256 is completed. So whatever plans you have to make I suggest you make now. Senate Bill 257, Representative Oblinger. Mr...Out of the record. Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, if I might follow up? I wanted to wait until we dispensed with 256. If I might follow up on a point that Representative Kane called to your attention earlier in the debate regarding Senate Bills 'as amended' or Amendments 'as amended'. And I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I think you've made a grievous mistake..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley, I'm going to ask you to come up and speak to the Parliamentarian as has Representative Kane..."
- Bradley: "No, Sir. I am speaking to you because it's a very important issue. If you're going to allow ... If you're going to stick with your ruling, I..."
- Speaker Daniels: "..That will be covered...That will be covered at the time the Amendments present themselves if you desire to speak with the Parliamentarian. We're going to move on, Sir. Senate Bill 263, Representative Pierce. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 263, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendments."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 270.

Representative Ebbesen? Representative Ebbesen on the floor? Senate Bill 270. Do you wish to proceed, Sir? Representative Ebbesen? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, read the Bill. I don't even know which one it is."

Speaker Daniels: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 270, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to state finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative...Senate Bill 294, Representative Vinson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 300, Representative Watson. Representative Watson? Senate Bill 300? Out of the record. Senate Bill 352, Representative O'Brien. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 355, Representative Topinka. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 355, a Bill for an Act to give small business equal access to justice. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted previously."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions regarding Amendment #2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 376, Representative Nelson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 390, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill"

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- Speaker Daniels: "There's a Floor Amendment just turned in,
 Representative Getty. We'll have to hold that Bill.
 Representative Getty?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think I'm entitled to have that Bill read a second time now."
- Speaker Daniels: "There are three Amendments filed, #1 by
 Representative Leinenweber; it's been printed and
 distributed; #2 by Representative Bowman; #3 by
 Representative Jaffe and they have not been distributed,
 Sir. Is it your pleasure to go ahead?"
- Getty: "I would ask you to read that Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Read the Bill a second time, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 390, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill 390 as follows."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Jaffe: "No, I would just merely request of the Sponsor that the
 Bill, having been read a second time, that it be left on
 Second Reading for a while so we can hear the other
 Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, your pleasure, Sir?"
- Getty: "I'll be happy to accommodate the Gentleman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Representative Peters in the Chair."
- Speaker Peters: "With leave of the House, for the purposes of an introduction, the Chair recognizes Representatives Reed and Macdonald and Swanstrom."
- Reed: "Mr. Chairman (sic) and Members of the House, it's a particular pleasure to me, as Chairman of the Water

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Resources Commission, and to Representatives Macdonald and Swanstrom, as Members of the Commission, to introduce to you a man that we're very pleased to have with us today. This is Mr. Rod Searle who is Chairman Designate of the Upper Mississippi River Basin. He is the first appointee of the Reagan Administration, and that we're particularly proud of. But even more appropriately, he's come to visit us today as the former Speaker of the Minnesota House, where he tells me they have 134 Members. He's not dismayed at our actions, our fights, anything that goes on here. We'd like Rod to speak to you for just a few minutes."

Rod Searle: "Thank you very much. I must compliment you're working on Fridays. We never did that in Minnesota. always seemed to go home and see what the constituents wanted from us. I didn't mean to raise any hackles, of It's indeed an honor for me to be able to say a course. few words to this august Body. I share kinship with you as I did preside in the House in Minnesota. But my new role is one of facilitating and trying to coordinate states like yours and those that are affected by the water policies of the Mississippi, Upper Mississippi River Basin problems inherent to them, such as environment, navigation, siltation, erosion and the things that are needed in the tributaries such as your great Illinois River and it Mississippi. meets the And it's going to be шy responsibility to work with the fine Commissioner such as *Frank Aderna* and Kay Whitlock and those people that you send to us to work with those from the other states. Wisconsin, Missouri and Iowa to put together a master plan which must go to Congress the first of January next honor. I'm delighted to meet with some of your people that are working on the water problems. looking forward to a very fruitful day. Thank you very

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

much."

Swanstrom: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 404, Representative Rea? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 405, Representative Ralph Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 405, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None,"

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 407, Representative Terzich? Is the Gentleman on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 455, Representative Daniels? Out of the record. Senate Bill 457, Representative Sam Wolf. Your pleasure, Representative Wolf? Senate Bill 457? Oh, I'm sorry. Schraeder. Your pleasure, Representative Schraeder? Pardon? We have an Amendment that's not printed, Representative. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going on. And if there's an attempt to hold this Bill, then it's obvious how it's being done. This Bill was called yesterday and an Amendment wasn't printed. It's now 24 hours later and the Amendment isn't printed. And I would move to table the Amendment. All right. Just move it then, Mr. Speaker, to Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "We are speaking of additional Amendments that have been filed. Now, Representative and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think if we end up making the precedent now that Amendments filed and not printed and distributed when the Bill is called are, in a sense, tabled, then I think we may end up getting ourselves somewhat into a problem down the line. And we all know we get ourselves in a problem down the line. I would end up

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

suggesting, Representative Schraeder, that at this point we take your Bill out of the record until the Parliamentarian and the Leadership on both sides can end up resolving this problem so that we can have the same rule apply to all of the Bills. Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk? Representative Getty, for what purpose, Sir?"

- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I just think that we ought to make note in the record at this point. I have absolutely no objections to what has just been done, that two or three persons on this side of the aisle have been happy to accommodate that sort of request. I just hope that it works both ways."
- Speaker Peters: "This Chairman would endeavor to ensure that that happens. Senate Bill...Representative Getty."
- Getty: "I'm sure you would, Mr. Speaker. You're very fair."
- Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 404? Representative Rea. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 404, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of
 the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no Amendments from the floor."
- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. On page two of the Calendar,
 Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. Senate Bill
 267, Representative Greiman. Is the Gentleman in the
 chamber? Out of the record. I would want to stay there,
 Representative, except if we get into a
 problem...Representative Greiman, do you wish that Bill to
 be called, Sir? Short Debate. Representative?"
- Greiman: "Yes, I'm ready. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.."
- Speaker Peters: "Hold on. Senate Bill 267. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 267, a Bill for an Act to amend the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When the Marriage and Dissolution Act was revised in 1977, there were some areas that were changed which changed the customary practice in the preparation of divorce agreements. And one of the things was to not allow parties to agree to future maintenance after the death of them. This would be a matter of ..strictly by agreement. And this Bill merely gives the parties that flexibility to let them continue after ..after the death of one or either of the parties if, in fact, they agree to that in writing and it becomes part of the decree and that's all this Bill does."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman? Any discussion? Ιf not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 267 pass?'. 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? wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 127 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 377, Representative Greiman? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 377, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill addresses a somewhat important issue. There was a question, you know, in the Marriage and Dissolution Act. There was a provision for a bifurcation of the issues of property and the issues of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

grounds. And the question happened, 'What happens if they do not have the appropriate bifurcation?' There was apparently a case...that indicated that the divorce might well be in question. And so this Bill provides that judgements for dissolution, where they reserve the questions and enter the decree, are valid as of the date of the entry of that decree. And that's what ..That's the significant part of this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 377 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 136 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 414, Representative Fawell. Is the Lady...Out of the record. Senate Bill 476, Representative Younge. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 476, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Promotion Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 476 amends the Illinois Promotion Act to permit the Department of Commerce to assist municipalities in the development of new tourist attractions. Right now, under the Statute, they can only promote existing tourist attractions. There is no opposition to this Bill. It is supported by the Hotel and Motel Association and there will no request for appropriation. I move that you pass this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Does anyone stand in opposition? Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 476 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

opposed by voting 'nay". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 528, Representative Ropp? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 528, a Bill for an Act in relationship to sheep and wool production, development and marketing programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 528 actually provides the machinery through which a sheep and wool development marketing program can be enacted. It does provide for a referendum. Should it pass by a majority vote, it would go into effect. Should it fail, there would be a two year period before they could call for it again. There are provisions in the Bill which would permit refunds should those who are a part of the program chose to do it. The check-off would begin at the first point of sale, either through the sale of wool or the sale of wool and/or mutton. I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone in opposition? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 528 pass?'.

All those in favor will say 'baa', all those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bopp to explain his vote."

Ropp: "I want to thank you very much for passing the 'buck'."

Speaker Peters: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question
there are 152 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 2 voting
'present'. And this Bill, having received the

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- Bill 738, Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. I'm sorry. 783. Senate Bill 783, Representative Hoffman."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 783, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after having that last Bill 'rammed' down our throats...It looked to me like that was a 'ewe' turn, but..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Tuerk: "Well, I think after that comment, he ought to be sheered."
- Hoffman: "Just so I don't get 'shorned' ... "
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "I'd like permission to return Senate Bill 783 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 738 (sic, 783) for purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Objection? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 783, Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 783 on page two, line three and so forth."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We had some discussion on 783 two days ago I believe, and Representative Satterthwaite pointed out there was a technical error in the Bill and Amendment #3 corrects that technicality. Decimal points were put in wrong in a wrong sequence. I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Has this been distributed?"
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk? Yes, Sir. Any discussion on the Amendment? If not, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Senate Bill 783 be adopted? •. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Third Reading, Short Debate.

Senate Bill 898, Representative Deuster? Out of the record. Senate Bill 899, Representative Wikoff. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 899, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to natural resources, research, data collection and environmental studies of the Illinois Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was discussed last night and was taken out of the record with what was some possible..er..potential problem with some Members on the other side of the aisle. I think this has been worked out шy understanding there is no there is...it's disagreement on it now. Basically it authorizes the of Natural Resources and Conservation to consider and decide matters pertaining to the natural history, water and water resources. There was one technical Amendment on it as it came out of the House..er..the Senate. And there was a rather major Amendment which was agreed, bipartisan agreed, by both sides which establishes the Illinois Coal Research Board, which the purpose of that is to support and coordinate Illinois coal research. is..came out of the Senate as an agreed Bill. I know of no opposition. And would ask your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion. Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 899 pass?'.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

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. Polk, you're on. 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. Representative Deuster? Do you wish us to go back and pick up 898?"

Deuster: "No, Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Peters: "All right.."

Deuster: "There's an Amendment that hasn't been distributed.."

Speaker Peters: "Okay.."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 902, Representative Robbins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 904, Representative Miller? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 904, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Bovine Brucellosis and bull leasing.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Miller."

Hiller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 904 extends the brucellosis testing period from thirty days to sixty days on instances when bulls are leased. It also clarifies the interstate movement of cattle from brucellosis—free states into Illinois and provides for intrastate movement of bison within Illinois. It requires veterinarians to notify the State Department of Agriculture when brucellosis vaccines have been administered. This Bill passed out of the Agricultural Committee 12 to nothing. And I would ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Any discussion?

Representative Collins."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Collins: "Just a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Collins: "I was wondering if anything in this Bill was relative to bull jiving."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 904 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 155 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1073, Representative Birkinbine? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1073, a Bill for an Act to amend in the Insurance Code the Non-Profit Health Care and Service Plan Act, Medical Service Plan Act and Voluntary Health Service Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1073 is a clean-up Bill offered by the Department of Insurance with a number of technical Amendments, included in which are Amendments such establishing late fines of \$100.00 per day for late filings of registration statements, fine of \$100.00 a day for late or false annual statements saying that companies adding clauses of authority are subject to capital and surplus requirements. It moves the audits of domestic companies! cash and securities from June first to April first. eliminates need of fraternal benefits cited from filing its Constitution and bylaws with its annual statement. of no opposition to the Bill. I don't think there's been a vote against it in either the Senate or the Committees or on the Senate floor."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

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

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure my standing here is in opposition, but it is really to raise a concern about one of the provisions. Most of the provisions I've got no problem with. One of the provisions, unless it was amended out, allows a company to maintain its principle office outside the State of Illinois. And, my concern is that this will cut down on the quality ο£ service policyholders in the State of Illinois. Let me give you an example. There's an insurance company that serves many senior citizens, Colonial Pen. And there have been serious problems with that insurance company as far as subscribers being able to get their questions answered, being able to get to people when they have problems and so on. That company is not in Illinois. And there's like one phone number you can call in Illinois, and it's frequently not manned. Would the provision allowing a company to move its principle headquarters out of Illinois have the effect of reducing service to the residents of Illinois who are policyholders? Mr. Speaker, could we take this...Could I have nine other people to take this Bill off of Short Debate?"

Speaker Peters: "One, two, three, four...ten people. The Bill is now on Regular Debate. Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Levin's concern, while it's nice, is not well founded. That the....This would permit principle office in place of business for domestic stock and mutual companies to be located outside of Illinois, only upon the Director's approval. Now, you can think of any number of different insurance companies that you or I or people in this room might have insurance policies with whose principle offices are indeed outside the State of Illinois. If you're looking for a dangerous

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Bill, I don't think you've found one here."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "I said, you know, I have no strong opposition ...strong objection to the Bill. I am concerned. There is no criteria in the standards that the Director would look at. In fact, there are no standards of..in the Bill as to how he would make that determination. I would be, you know, a little less concerned if there were some provision in the Bill concerning, you know, the continued availability of services. But, you know, if there is a commitment that this is, in fact, one of the things that the Director will look at, that is my major concern."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Speaker, to save time, why don't we take this out of the record right now? There's a request from our side of the aisle from someone who's concerned about something..."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record.."

Birkinbine: "...And on that basis, I'll take it out."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. For what purpose do you arise, Sir? Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, of course, with the understanding that this
Bill now is on the regular debate Calendar."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Back to the top of the Order, Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate, to pick up those that we had missed. Senate Bill 414...Representative Epton, do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No. Much to my surprise, I can see of no reason why the Bill was taken out of the record.

I certainly respect the Sponsor's wish. I was going to speak on it. This Bill is certainly an excellent Bill and in response to the inquiries raised, the Director has in the past very strongly insisted that any company doing business with the principle office outside of Illinois must

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

maintain records sufficient so that they can be properly supervised by the Department of Insurance. I certainly respect Representative Birkinbine's decision to take it out of the record, but it's a shame that a simple Bill now will have to be debated at full length at a later date."

- Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 414, Representative Fawell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 414, a Bill for an Act to repeal

 Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the

 Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell."
- Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very simple Bill. It merely gets rid of some very bad law that was passed a few years ago. This law was originally...allowed the Park Districts to aid one another. The Park District Association has asked me to Sponsor this Bill. It passed out of the Senate 57 to nothing. I know of no opposition to this Bill and I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "Not in opposition, again. I need a question answered by the Sponsor. Generally, Representative Fawell, you deal with very provincial interests and issues. Which Park Districts are we talking about?"
- Fawell: "There is no particular Park District in DuPage County,
 Sir, that this is concerned with. This is just..."
- Schneider: "Well, Naperville.."
- Fawell: "This is just something the Park District Association wants done."
- Schneider: "Yes, but that doesn't give it necessarily our blessing, I don't think. My question really is related to the instances where there are programs like special

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

education that are shared by Park Districts. I think Naperville, as a community that you're familiar with, sometimes has overlapping concerns in that area with Districts. I don't think, again, that we ought to look so generously upon the Park Districts' role, because we've had Bills where they've been in opposition as well as That doesn't...I don't think that shapes my support. opinion necessarily. I think these decisions to have a municipality included in two Park Districts often works to the advantage of the city or the municipality, and although there's been no opposition, I don't think there's enough information in front of us to make a reasonable decision. So, although I won't oppose you, I would suggest that the Members throughout the state who live in a community where there are, in cases like this, overlapping Districts, be aware that sometimes special ed programs and other programs do service that community. So I'm going to vote 'present' on that because of the lack of clarity in explanation by the Sponsor."

Fawell: "Sir? If I may answer, all I am talking about is the disconnection of land. The Park Districts have a tendency to try and raid another Park District's land, especially if there happens to be a rather large shopping center that both of them are interested in. There still is a way to de-annex from another Park District, if a group of citizens so wishes to join the second Park District."

Schneider: "Well, if you're saying it's an effort that sometimes results in the loss of assessed valuation to a District, then the combining originally had to relate to that as well. So you're not only now raising another question that I hadn't given much thought to, because first of all, I was talking about services that can be offered by a Park District to a municipality. Now, you're raising the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

question about the equalized..rather the assessed valuation of a District that needs tax base. So if you are jeopardizing in some cases the tax base, you're in total then jeopardizing the park program. So, on that explanation, I oppose the Bill."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative, this is Short Debate. But,
 Representative Brummer. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, I was going to refer to a quote that Representative Ropp often makes. I've heard him make it in Committee. 'If it ain't broke, it don't need fixing'. Something like that. And, what I'm getting at is the Sponsor of this Bill has not shown...All she has said is the present law is bad. But she has not given us any indication that there's a particular problem because of the present law that this Bill is referring to to correct the inequity in the present law. And until I hear of that inequity, I can't vote for the Bill. I don't have a particular problem with it and Representative Brummer, who is an attorney for Park Districts, is by my desk now and we'll discuss it with him.."
- Fawell: "May I take this out of the record and go over and explain to them?"
- Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Representative Deuster, 898.

 Out of the record."
- Deuster: "If the Amendment had not been distributed, I wanted to take that back to Second Reading. If it has been, I would..."
- Speaker Peters: "Has the Amendment been distributed, Mr. Clerk?

 No? All right. Out of the record."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills,
Third Reading, Senate Bill 116. Representative Breslin."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 116, a Bill for an Act to amend the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Retail Installment Sales Act and Motor Vehicle Retail
Installment Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to move this Bill back from Third to Second for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady asks leave to move the Bill back to
Second Reading for purposes of Amendments. Does she have
leave? Leave is granted. Second Reading. Proceed,
Ma'am."

Breslin: "Okay. Just..."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$2, Breslin, amends Senate Bill 116 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in Committee we put on Amendment #1 which was satisfactory to the Committee. After the Committee adjourned, we started to try to fit in Amendment #1 with the Bill and looking at it a little more closely and we found it to be very confusing. As a consequence, we went to the Reference Bureau, had them strike everything after the enacting clause and start over again. Amendment #2 is the Bill as it was intended to be passed out of the Judiciary I Committee. The Association for Modern Banking in Illinois has approved of the Amendment. The household finance groups have withdrawn their opposition. The Illinois Retail Merchants Association has withdrawn their Amendment. This is technical in nature, and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion on the Amendment? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 116 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Any further

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendments? Third Reading ... "

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading,
Short Debate Calendar, page five. Senate Bill 98,
Representative Giglio? Is the Gentleman in the chamber?
Out of the record. Senate Bill 118, Representative
Bullock? 118. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 118, a Bill for an Act to amend the Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 128, Representative Sandquist? Out of the record. Senate Bill 186, Representative Telcser? Out of the record. Senate Bill 253, Representative McGrew? Does that mean 'yes' or 'no'? Out of the record. Senate Bill 255, Representative Kustra? Out of the record. Senate Bill 295, Representative Reed? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 295, a Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act an Act in relationship to state finance. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 527, Representative Leinenweber. Representative Leinenweber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 546, Representative Schuneman? Out of the record. Senate Bill 568, Representative Terzich? Out of the record. Senate Bill 575, Representative Hallstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 575, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Land Surveyors Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendments 1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 579, Representative Hallstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 579, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Business Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 596, Representative Ewing? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 596, a Bill for an Act to permit railroads to dispose of property not needed for performance of duties to the public. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments." .

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, let's back up to Senate Bill 255. Representative Kustra. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 255, a Bill for an Act relating to the postage stamp vending machines. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 633, Representative Ewing? Out of the record. Senate Bill 791, Representative Terzich? Out of the record. Senate Bill 903,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

*

- Representative Levin? Out of the record. Senate Bill 920, Representative Bullock? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 920, a Bill for an Act to amend the Baccalaureate Assistant Law for registered nursing. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "None."
- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1119, Representative Sandquist? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1145, Representative Kulas? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1145, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the adoption of persons. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "None. Ploor Amendment #1, Kulas, amends Senate

 Bill 1145 on..in the House on page six and so forth."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1145 is a technical Amendment. It moves a comma from behind the word, 'or', to before the word, 'or'. And I would urge passage of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1145 pass?'. Those in
 favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the
 opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is
 adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading, Short Debate. Senate Bill 1218,
 Representative Ronan? Out of the record. Senate Bill
 1227, Representative Telcser? Out of the record.
 Representative Kulas, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
 Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to check on Senate Bill

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

1145 that we just adopted the Amendment. Is that left on Third Reading? I mean, did that go to Third Reading..."

Speaker Peters: ".. Third Reading.. Yes."

Kulas: "Short Debate?"

Speaker Peters: "Short Debate."

Kulas: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "For what purpose does the Lady arise?"

Oblinger: "When Bill 172 at the bottom of page six was called, I
was in the Governor's Office and so we passed the Bill and
I wondered if it could be called."

Speaker Peters: "We're going to make...Representative Breslin took it out of the record at the time. Unless there's objection, I'll be pleased to accommodate you. Representative Breslin. Page...Page six. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 172. Representative Breslin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 172. It's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendments 1 and 2?" Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Breslin, amends Senate Bill 172 by deleting line 35 and..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen,
Amendment #3 is a technical Amendment. It has clarifying
language so that the Act is absolutely clear. The only
substantive change is that we exempt the Metropolitan
Sanitary District from the Act. I believe it has no
opposition."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 172 pass?'. Those

4

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #4, Collins, amends Senate Bill 172 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #4? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Peters: "The Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. It would now be the intent of the Chair to continue with Senate Bills on Second Reading, picking up those Bills at this point that do not have Amendments with the understanding that when we do return to this Order of Business, the agreements made between the Speaker and Minority Leader still pertain. Okay? On page seven of the Calendar, Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 263. Representative Pierce. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of 263?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 263 has been passed..passed Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "Two seven ...Senate Bill 270, Representative Ebbesen. 270 is on Third Reading. Senate Bill 352, Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 355, Representative Topinka. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Topinka? Senate Bill 355? Out of the record? Go with it. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 355 has been read a second time previously. No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 376, Representative Nelson. Representative Nelson on 376? We are on page seven of the Calendar, Senate Bills, Second Reading. Do you wish that moved? Representative Nelson."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Nelson: "Mr. Speaker, I have had requests from two colleagues to have Amendments added to that Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record..."

Nelson: "And I would like to hold it one more day."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 438.

Representative Kornowicz? Do you wish that moved? Out of the record? Senate Bill 455, Representative Daniels. Read the Bill, Mr., Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. There's what? Third Reading.

Senate Bill 475, Representative McCormick? We are now on

the top of page eight. Hold it? Representative Younge.

Senate Bills, Second Reading, page eight. 475. Read the

Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 475, a Bill for an Act to establish the Illinois Community Development Finance Corporation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 490, Representative Katz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 547, Representative White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 559, Telcser. Out of the record. 584, Sandquist. Out of the record. Senate Bill 585, Flinn. Representative Flinn. Out of the record. Senate Bill 611, Representative Pierce. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative...There is an indication there are Amendments that have been filed. We're taking those

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

that have no Amendments at this point. 611. Senate Bill 611. Representative Pierce."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 611, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 614? Telcser? Out of the record. Senate Bill 639, Robbins. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 639, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the filing of leases and standardize objections and purposes for which appropriations are made. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 642, Kustra?

Representative Kustra? Out of the record. Senate Bill

674, Representative Macdonald? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 674, a Bill for an Act to create the
Elder Abuse Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Macdonald?"

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suspend the appropriate rule to have this Bill put over to the Spring Calendar. There...It is with the agreement of the Senate Sponsor where they are waiting for a report from Sangamon University and it was with the agreement that this Bill would be held over that it was passed out of Committee."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman....The Lady asks that the appropriate rule be suspended so that Senate Bill 674 may

62nd Legislative Day

June 12. 1981

appear on the Consent (sic, Spring) Calendar and the Lady asks...on the Spring Calendar, the Spring Calendar, and the Lady asks that the attendance Roll Call be used. On that question, Representative Schneider?"

Schneider: "I don't ever recall being told we had a Spring

Calendar. I know of Interim Study. But is the Spring

Calendar a reality?"

Speaker Peters: "I don't..."

Schneider: "I think it should go on Spring. I'd rather have it there than Interim. But I didn't realize there was..."

Speaker Peters: "There are Bills on the Spring Calendar."

Schneider: "Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Does the Lady have leave? Any objection? There being no objections, Senate Bill 674 will appear on the Spring Calendar. 694, Telcser? Out of the record. Senate Bill 714, Representative Bullock. Out of the Senate Bill 717, Representative Bullock. Out of the record. Senate Bill 777, Yourell? Representative Bill Yourell? Out of the record. Senate 794, Representative Terzich? Out of the record. Yes, For what purpose do you arise, Representative O'Connell. Sir?"
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm listed as a Cosponsor. Is this appropriate for the Bill to be passed on to Third Reading with my presence on the floor? 794."
- Speaker Peters: "The...I have no objection, and it seems to me reasonable, except I would rather not want to get into a hassle later on when one Sponsor moves it and the principle Sponsor doesn't.."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Terzich asked me before he left this morning."
- Speaker Peters: "We will...Fine. Let the record indicate that

 Representative O'Connell indicates that Representative

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Terzich has requested him to handle this and the Chair will honor that. Senate Bill 794."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 794, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to campaign financial disclosure. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 827, Representative McGrew? Is the Gentleman on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 836, Representative Findley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 911, Representative Hastert? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 911, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Uniform Hazardous Substances Act of Illinois. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 922, Representative Bullock? Out of the record. Senate Bill 925, Representative Bullock. Out of the record. Senate Bill 953, Representative Swanstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 953, a Bill for an Act in relationship to lease (sic, release) of tax...State Tax liens. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 957, Representative Daniels? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 957..."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on a second. Representative Daniels? 957?

Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 957, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 989, Representative

Stewart? Is the Lady in the chamber? Representative

Stewart? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 989, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the manner of proposing Amendments to the Constitution and submitting the same to the electors of the state. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 992, Representative Miller? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1007, Representative Piel. Out of the record. Representative Bullock, do you want to go back and pick your Bills up? Happy to accommodate you, Sir. At the bottom of page nine, Senate Bill 922. Representative Bullock."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 922, a Bill for an Act to create a statewide Nursing Education Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 925,

Representative Bullock. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 925, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Service Education grants. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1049, Representative Ebbesen. Out of the record. Representative Bullock?

Bullock: "714 and 717."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 714, page nine of the Calendar.

Representative Bullock."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 714, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 717, Representative
Bullock."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 717..."

Speaker Peters: "Read the Bill..."

Clerk Leone: "... Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Wage

Payment and Collection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Page ten of the Calendar, Senate
Bill 1060. Representative Ted Meyer. Representative
Meyer, 1060? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1060, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1081, Representative Schuneman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1086, Representative Hannig? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1086, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1103, Representative Ewing. 1103, Representative Ewing? Page ten of the Calendar, Sir. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act in relationship
 to the Water Company Investment Capital Tax. Second
 Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
 Committee."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor? Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion, I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill
 1103. Representative Ewing."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to...Representative Ewing.

 The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill

 1103. Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall
 ...'..Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Was that Representative Ewing'sThat was your Amendment in....in Committee. Is that correct?"
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing? The question is, was that a Committee Amendment?"

Ewing: "Yes."

Getty: "And what is the reason for tabling it?"

Ewing: "It's...It was a Committee Amendment prepared by our staff. They thought it was necessary, that wording had been left out that this money be put into the Personal Property Replacement Tax Fund. The wording is superfluous. It's not needed. The Amendment's not needed. We didn't need it and we're just trying to clean it back up and take it off."

Getty: "Okay."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the Gentleman's Motion

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1103 prevail?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? The 'ayes' have it and the Motion ...the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1110, Representative Findley? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1110, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Hazardous Materials Transportation Act. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1143.

Representative Bower? 1143. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Regulatory Agency Sunset Act and Sanitary and Registration
Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Braun? Back to page eight to pick up Senate Bill 614. Representative Braun. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 614, a Bill for an Act to award income tax credits to businesses which contribute money or resources to community groups. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Kustra, 642?

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 642, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. The Chair will now continue with
 Senate Amendments...Senate Bills, Second Reading to which
 Amendments have been filed and printed. With leave of the
 House, the Chair would like to first call Senate Bill 1109,
 Representative Epton handling that for Representative
 Sandquist. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed to Amendment #1. Ploor Amendment #2, Greiman, amends Senate Bill 1109 on page 23 and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 takes out an expression, '...a facially valid order..'. That's not a term of art that we use in Illinois law and has no real meaning here. The notion is that if an agency has the power to subpoena or if the agency has the power to get a search warrant, then they'll get them. But that something that would be merely a facially valid, whatever that might mean —and I suspect it has no meaning in Illinois law— that that would be removed so there would be no ambiguities in the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1109 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Greiman, amends Senate Bill

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

1109 on page 27 and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, the next Amendment removes some language. It was thought that...there was an effort at least to make this the exclusive remedy and to cut out any other remedies that one might have for violation of the Act. This merely takes that out. It does provide a remedy for people injured in the Act, but it says, too, that once this Amendment is adopted any other remedies that might be available are still available. That's all. We don't cut out any remedies."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bradley."
Bradley: "Mr. Speaker. A point of order, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "I believe this Amendment is out of order because it does not say, '...as amended...', and we've already adopted Amendments #1 and 2, and so Amendment #3- and we had this discussion earlier, Sir, when you were not in the Chairand I was trying to make a point at that time and..."

Speaker Peters: "You might get a different ruling.."

Bradley: "Well, I would hope you would be consistent with those who have sat in the Chair, and I know you have been and you've been fair. I just bring this point up. I think it was a poor ruling before, but if we're going to live with that ruling, then this Amendment would be out of order because it's not...does not say, '..as amended..'. And I think we ought to clarify that, and I hate to bring it up on Mr. Greiman's Amendment, but I think we ought to have a clarification on how we're going to operate this House with..in regards to Amendments. Might be a different Speaker, but the same Parliamentarian."

Speaker Peters: "It is the ruling of the Chair that the Amendment is in order, in that, Representative Bradley, it does not

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

amend any of the previous Amendments. Yes, Sir? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I don't object to your ruling. I can live with the ruling. I think you're absolutely correct. think though that the ruling that I will ask the next time (is if) we have an Amendment that says, "..as amended..." when there hasn't been amended...an Amendment adopted, I'd like...I'm going to ask for a ruling on that at that time because the ruling by the previous Gentleman who sat in that Chair ruled that that time that the Amendment was out And I think, with you in the Chair, Sir, we've got to have clarification, but we've got to be consistent and I only bring that up because if we're going to file Amendments, we don't know whether to file them ...under the other ruling, whether we file them, ... as amended..., or , "...not as amended...". We've never had that problem before. And I just bring this up for clarification. And I'll bring it up with the next Amendment that says, "...as amended...", when no Amendment has been adopted and I'm sure we'll probably get a different ruling at that time. And then we will...And then we, as Members out here, will try to with that ruling, but we'll be guessing all the time."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair understands the quandary that the Gentleman is in. The Chair finds itself in that quandary. In regard to the previous ruling, there, in fact, was objection made and there, in a sense, was no real ruling on that particular question technically. Objection was removed. In regard to the Amendment that you indicate, the opinion of the Chair is in keeping with the advice and opinion and work attitude, so to speak, of the Reference Bureau. And that is, that if an Amendment does not amend a preceding Amendment, you do not need the words, '..as amended..'. Proceed, Sir."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, we are, I think, on Amendment #3 at this point. Amendment #2 has been adopted, I think.."

Speaker Peters: "Yes."

- Greiman: "Yes. Amendment #3, I have..What I've said before was merely that this takes out the exclusivity provisions so that whatever cause of action exists in the law now would remain. And that's all that that does."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1109 be adopted?'.

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

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Greiman, amends Senate Bill 1109 on page 27 and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment..The Bill, as originally drafted, exculpated or provided for immunity from.. in actions of defamation, invasion of privacy or negligence and we pointed out to the Sponsors that it would be unfair to exculpate investigators for their own negligence and there would be no public policy reason to allow them to go free of their own negligence. So we have taken the word, 'negligence', out and that's what Amendment #4 does."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'...Somebody.. At least one person must say 'aye'. Those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair...In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 1109 on page 23..."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #5."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 amends the provisions giving the insurance companies authorization to release personal information in people's files to police authorities in such a way that they may offer the information to police authorities, if they believe that there is fraud being committed and in order to get an investigation to...underway. But it removes from the language ... and by the way, from the existing Statute too, language which authorizes the insurance company to give information to police authorities at their request, without I think if the police authorities and other subpoena. governmental agencies want information, they have recourse to the courts to obtain warrants and subpoenas and that should be the only way in which they get it, at their own And I offer Amendment #5 to protect the citizen request. from unwarranted intrusion into their files."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment \$5 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 1109 on page 26 and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill, in its present form, provides a cause of action to individuals who are injured by improper disclosures under this Act. The Section which I'm amending limits the damages in such cases to actual damages. I believe that that's an appropriate limitation simply because the monetary damage arising from improper disclosure is very, very difficult to measure. In fact, in some cases it's quite impossible to measure. What we're

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

talking about here is sharing personal information with people who don't...who have no cause to have it, and if that is done, then it seems to me that the court ought to have the flexibility to award whatever damages it sees fit and not limit it to something which is impossible to measure. I move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Has this Amendment been distributed? We don't have it over here."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk?"

Bowman: "I believe it has."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, it has."

Daniels: "We have it now."

Bowman: "Better late than never."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, O'Brien, amends Senate Bill 1109 on page 27 and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Brien. Representative Bowman?"

Bowman: "If Representative Epton would permit, I would like to

handle this for Representative O'Brien. He's back in

Chicago right now."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Epton?"

Epton: "Of course we'll certainly be happy to extend the same courtesy to you as you've shown us."

Bowman: "Thank you. Amendment..on Amendment \$7, then, Mr. Speaker, the Bill, in its present form, provides a bar to cause of action arising from ..on the basis, rather, of invasion of privacy and so forth. However, it says that the..this bar shall not apply if the person has released

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

information, false information, with malice and intent to Well, it seems to me. Mr. Speaker, that a person should have a cause of action if an individual working for an insurance company shares true information as well as false information with malice. It seems to me that the main concern is whether there is malice in sharing that information, for example, if a person works for insurance company and seeks to blackmail another individual. Presumably they're blackmailing individual with true information, not with and consequently, I think, so that we do information. provide a cause of action in those cases where a person trying to blackmail another individual, that we need to delete the word 'false' from the Bill. And that's all this Amendment seeks to do. I urge its adoption."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'. Those in favor will
 signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? That was close.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the
 Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Levin, amends Senate Bill..."

 Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. How many of these are we going to go through? I thought this was...Representative Levin, Amendment #8. Representative Levin, you have to get to your seat. That is in absolute violation of the rules to speak from there. And I know that you uphold the rules all the time. You have ten minutes to explain the Amendment. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Amendment has not been distributed,
 but I did discuss it with Representative ...with the
 Sponsor. I can explain the Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "The Amendment has not been printed and distributed. The Gentleman moves...what?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Levin: "I think Representative Epton has indicated he'd like to move the Bill to Third, but had indicated he would bring it back to Second.."

Epton: "We'll waive the...We'll waive it, Mr. Speaker. Unanimous consent, leave. It's printed. It's distributed. We accept the Amendment..."

Speaker Peters: "Obviously it ain't going anywhere eventually,

Representative Levin. I hope you get the point."

Levin: "Okay."

Epton: "Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Any further Amendments? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? That's a 'no'. The Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Obviously there were more 'nos'.

Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose?"

Leinenweber: "Just to clarify for my own welfare. We just defeated a nonexistent, nonwritten and nondistributed Amendment?"

Speaker Peters: "Correct."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "It's known as the 'evolutionary process'. With leave of the House, the Chair would like to now go to those Bills on Second Reading, the same Order we're on, but those Bills that the Chair has been informed that the Amendments have been distributed. Is there leave? Is there anyone objecting? None objection? No objection? The Chair is granted that courtesy by the House. On page nine of the Calendar, Senate Bill 806. Representative Swanstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 806, a Bill for an Act in regard to judgments. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Swanstrom, amends Senate Bill 806 on page two and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 647,
Representative Stuffle? John, do you want your called?
Page eight, Senate Bill 512, Representative Beatty. The
Chair will endeavor to pick up one Member from each side of
the aisle so as not to show any bias. Representative
Beatty."

Clerk Leone: "Senate.."

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

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 512, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Beatty, amends Senate Bill 512 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Amendment #1 is an Amendment that aids the Chicago policeman, and it puts the Chicago police duty disability provision in the same condition as now enjoyed by the Chicago firemen. In other words, it allows the disability rate in the case of duty disability to be paid at the time the disability is allowed. I have the Illinois Public Employees Pension Laws Commission impact statement, Minor Cost Impact. I think policemen are entitled to the same kind of benefit as firemen in Chicago, and any cost here will be assumed by the Chicago Police Department Pension Code. As I explained, this has to do with a man who was shot in the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

course of duty some years earlier and now getting....He's disabled at this later date and under the existing law, he would be paid disability based on what (sic, when) he was shot, when the wages were a lot lower. And he should really benefit from the inflationary wages and be paid at the current wage level. I ask a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Just a brief question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Wolf: "Representative Beatty? Did you say that the cost would be borne by the police pension? Is it under \$50,000?"

Beatty: "Well, it says, 'minor cost impact', in the statement.

If whatever..."

Wolf: "If it's under \$50,000, you're absolutely correct. It would be borne. If it's over, then it becomes the burden of the state under the State's Mandates Act and I just wondered if you had a dollar figure."

Beatty: "I..They didn't give me one. But whatever has to be done
to see that the Pension Fund pays for it personally, I will
see that that is done here and take it out of the State
Mandates Act."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "This would only cover those, for example, shot, wounded, hurt in the line of duty. Is that correct?"

Beatty: "That's correct."

Leverenz: "That doesn't really happen all that many times."

Beatty: "That's true. It would apply to a few individuals who were hurt at a much earlier time."

Leverenz: "Very good. I would...To the Amendment, certainly I believe the Amendment would be sound in keeping with the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

inflationary problems that we have and only have an impact for a handful of people. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 512 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Doyle, amends Senate Bill 512 on page one, line one and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Doyle."

Mr. Speaker. This is just an Amendment Doyle: "Thank you, that ... for Chicago Park District employees only. It's entering the service the Chicago Park District at age 60 or over, the option of membership in the Pension Fund and the option of contributing for all services rendered prior to Also provides for refunds to present entering the fund. members of the fund who entered after the age of 60 and will not be able to earn the minimum four years service required because of a compulsory retirement under the new quidelines at the age of 70 years old. It clarifies the language for optional contribution by employees to include interest at the applicable interest rate. This here proposal has been approved by the Illinois Public Employees Pension Commission, by the Chicago Park District Board and also by the attorney for the Chicago Park District. I would just ask for approval."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 512 be adopted?'.

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed?

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative McAuliffe?

Representative Doyle, for what purpose, Sir?"

Doyle: "There was a third Amendment and it's been distributed and this is just to clarify some language... I got mine. It was delivered to the floor here."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Doyle, there is..."

Doyle: "Pardon?"

Speaker Peters: "There is no record of that Amendment being here."

Doyle: "All right. Then we'd move it to Third and if necessary move it back."

Speaker Peters: "Very fine. Third Reading."

Doyle: "Thank you very kindly."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McAuliffe, on Senate Bill 587?

Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 587, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Henry, amends Senate Bill 587 on page six and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry? Representative McAuliffe?"

McAuliffe: "Could you temporarily take this out of the record while I confer with Representative Henry? I didn't know this Amendment was going to be offered."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Is Representative Bower on the floor? Representative Stuffle on 469? Out of the record. Representative Pullen, 499? Out of the record. Stuffle on 647? No? Representative Currie, do you want to take Senate Bill 584 as a Cosponsor with Representative Sandquist? Has he requested you to do that? He has. The record will so indicate. Senate Bill 584, Representative

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 584, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the enforcement of water well construction codes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Is

Representative....Representative Schraeder? For what

purpose, Sir?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Amendments on 457 are distributed."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 457, Representative Schraeder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. It's at the top of page eight."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 457, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Mautino, amends Senate Bill 457..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is the agreed Amendment that appeared in the Committee, and it was agreed that it would be offered on the House floor. The Bill, as originally presented, allowed for any qualified person to draw blood under the implied consent provision. What this Amendment does is eliminate that language that says, '...any qualified person..', and says, '...only a licensed physician or registered nurse...', may withdraw blood. I think it's a good Amendment. It addresses the question of who should take blood under implied consent, and I move for the adoption. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Schraeder?"
- Schraeder: "He's absolutely correct. It's an agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
 Bill 457 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by
 saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair
 the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Barkhausen, amends Senate Bill 457 on page thirteen and so forth."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen. What does that mean?"

 Representative Barkhausen?"
- Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, I have asked that Amendments 3...2, 3 and 4, I'm attempting to revise them to refine them, and I'm in the process...Legislative Reference Bureau is in the process of putting that together. I would ask, if the Sponsor were willing, that this remain on Second Reading for the time being."
- Speaker Peters: "What's your pleasure, Representative? It's up to you this time, Representative Schraeder."
- Barkhausen: "Just until Monday."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks...leave to take this out of the record. Representative McAuliffe on 587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 587, Representative McAuliffe."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 587, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Henry, amends Senate Bill 587..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry."
- Henry: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In keeping with cooperation on both sides of the aisle, I do not want to cause any

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

problem with this fine piece of legislation. I'd like to move that Amendment #1 be tabled."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 591, Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 591, a Bill for an Act relating to the leasing of oil and gas when the owners cannot be located.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Robbins, amends Senate Bill 591 on page one, line two and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "This Amendment has to do with the control of salt
water. The Senate Sponsor has agreed to accept the
Amendment and the House Sponsor has also agreed to accept
the Amendment. This is needed very much in our area."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, it's very edifying to know that the Sponsors both agree to it, but I think the record ought to reflect when you have a three page Amendment a little bit about what the Amendment is going to do to the people of the State of Illinois or for the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins, a little bit about the Amendment."

Robbins: "This Amendment has to do with the control of salt water and brine. It sets up a disposal method so that ...handled by the Department of Mines and Minerals and this has been agreed to with the Environmental Protection Agency so that the salt water will be disposed of properly, properly hauled and properly injected into the ground."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brummer?"

62nd Legislative Day June 12, 1981

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Does the Illinois Oil and Gas Association have a position on this Amendment, Clyde?"

Robbins: "The Oil and Gas Association are in approval of this Amendment, yes."

Brunner: "They support the Amendment?"

Robbins: "They support the Amendment. Charlie Pardie was in Springfield to testify in favor of it."

Brummer: "This would require each of those individuals to obtain a separate permit?"

Robbins: "Yes. They would be permitted similar to the permits that are placed and bonded as are placed on oil field locations."

Brummer: "Would this be the...Would this be incorporated in the same permit that they obtain when they drill a well?"

Robbins: "No. This will be separate...This would be a permit as

far as the proper handling of the salt water from the
lease."

Brummer: "They're aware that there's a \$100.00 permit fee in this in additional bonding costs?"

Robbins: "Yes."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, if I might very briefly....To the Amendment, salt water dumping in the streams and ditches in the oil producing area, particularly southeastern Illinois, has been a major problem. There have been various attempts made to address this very serious problem requiring the haulers of the salt brine ..would...requiring the haulers of the salt brine to have a permit would seem to address that problem in a feasible manner. I guess I'm a little bit surprised the Oil and Gas Association is in support of this because it's additional regulation and additional cost to them. I guess I commend them in recognizing the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

seriousness of the problem and their willingness to work with the people of the State of Illinois concerned about the dumping of salt water in the streams and would urge an 'aye' vote with regard to the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Getty, this is an Amendment that does something for the people of Illinois rather than to the people of Illinois. Representative Brummer was absolutely correct. The illegal dumping of salt water from oil well operations is a serious problem in our area and all of our area has oil in it. The people that are doing the dumping are not the legitimate oil and gas operators of our area. This is the same as the Bill Representative Robbins has introduced that got caught in the switches and is on the Spring Calendar. It's something that's a serious problem I think we ought to address immediately. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 591 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Page eight of the Calendar,

Senate Bill 585, Representative Flinn. Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Bistate Development District and Bistate Development Agency Visitation Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 477, Representative Vinson? Representative Vinson? 477? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 477, a Bill for an Act relating to certain investment credits. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477 on page four and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "It's a bad Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Whose Amendment is this?"

Clerk Leone: "McPike."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, on Amendment #1."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 477 is nearly identical, I believe, to House. a House Bill 900 that was debated earlier, so I will try to keep my remarks as brief as possible. The corporate personal property tax that went into effect two years ago is used exclusively for local units of government, local School Districts, Park Districts, cities, etcetera. first distribution of that money occurred in January of 1980. During 1980, we distributed thirteen months of collections in twelve months. Had we distributed twelve months of collections in twelve months, the replacement tax would have been three percent above the old corporate replacement tax revenues. And similarly, in 1981, we will distribute fourteen months of collections in a twelve-month period. If we had distributed twelve months of collections in a twelve-month period, the corporate replacement tax revenues would be three percent below what the revenues would have been under the old corporate replacement tax. The purpose of this Bill is to provide an investment tax

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

corporate credit against the replacement tax. Ιn Committee, the Sponsor of the Billsaid that..that estimated amount of that credit would be \$42,000,000.00 the first year that it is in effect. Amendment #1 opposed...Amendment #1 changes that credit. Instead of having it as a credit to the corporate replacement tax, it makes it as a credit to the state income tax. can be no denying of the fact that federal revenues that were passed along to local units of government declined and that state revenues for education have declined and the only source then left for units of local government, including School Districts, are property taxes and the corporate replacement tax. As I indicated earlier, the corporate replacement tax has generated on a month month basis nearly an identical amount of revenues that would have been generated under the old corporate personal property tax. The effect of this Bill them is to destroy that tax base for local units of government. Amendment would shift that from local units to the State Government. If the Sponsor of the Bill believes that an investment works, which I doubt, and which most economists in the United States doubt, but if the Sponsor of the believes that this is simply not another give away to big business, this is not simply not another gift for the rich at the expense of the school children in Illinois, if he truly believes that then he should take a risk and that to state income...to the state income tax and not against local revenues. Because, at least at the state we are able to shift priorities, shift revenues according to those priorities, where, at the local they really do not have the capability of doing that. Amendment #1 properly applies the credit where it belongs. against the state income tax, and I would ask for a

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "On the Amendment, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment. It will do purpose of the Bill is to generate growth. that. We have revised downward the cost of the Bill substantially since when we last voted on it. There is enormous imposition on any unit of government in this. Ιt will revitalize the Illinois economy. It will get state moving ahead again. It is a Session where, I think all of us know, there may be no new incentives for business. There may be no new incentives for growth unless pass this Bill and I would urge rejection of the Gentleman's Amendment. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, to close. Representative Bowman. I'm sorry."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. But, this seems to me that one thing is worth ...worth saying. You know, if you come from an area like I do, like say Evanston, or Oak Park, or some downstate communities that are already pretty well built up within their corporate limits, you'll be hurt by this .. by the Bill without the Amendment. You'll be hurt because even if development does take place, as and Representative Vinson hopes again, 1 share Representative McPike's skepticism, but let's say the development takes place. It's not going to take place in community...within the corporate limits of your communities and yet, your citizens will be paying somebody else's development, because they will not be getting the tax receipts that they deserve and need their own local services. So if you come from places like Evanston and Oak Park and Skokie and Schiller Park and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

places ...communities downstate that are already pretty well built up within their corporate limits, you should vote 'no' on this Amendment because your constituents ...I mean, you should vote 'yes' for the Amendment so that the state then will wind up picking up part of the tab. I support the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "The question is,....Representative McPike? The question is,...Do you want to close? Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Yes, this is probably the most important Bill that we've debated this year, at least one of the top five most important, because it affects local revenues to the tune of \$40,000,000.00 or \$50,000,000.00 so I think I should probably close on this. It's been debated thoroughly about two months ago..er..a month ago in this everything that Representative Bowman iust But beyond that, I'm not sure how many absolutely true. more incentives or so-called incentives After a while you have to stop calling them incentives. You have to simply just start calling them gifts to big business. I'm sure how many more we can give away to business. When we took off the sales tax on business equipment, grown from \$60,000,000.00 the first year to an estimated \$420,000,000.00 by Fiscal '83 and by Fiscal '84, if that's not repealed, the amount of tax relief that we're going to give to business under just that one tax gift will exceed the total state income tax that corporations pay. It's getting to the point in the state where the only people that are going to be paying taxes are individual homeowners through property taxes and individual Corporations, if the trend continues, will be paying no taxes by the year 1990. Now, this is simply a give away to business. And if you want to give it to them,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

for God's sakes, don't take it away from the school kids at the local level. At least take it away from some of the programs of State Government which are not necessary."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House (sic, Senate) Bill 477 be adopted?'. Representative McPike? Roll Call? The Gentleman requests a Roll Call and he's joined by four Members. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 477 be adopted?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Currie to explain her vote for one minute."

"A vote .. a vote 'no' on this Amendment is a vote to Currie: increase the property taxes each and every one of your constituents are going to have to pay. This proposal. Representative McPike's Amendment, would, instead, take the against the income tax. The effect of credit investment tax credit would then have no impact at all your local homeowners, your local property taxpayers. Ιf you vote against the Amendment, you are consigning your homeowners back in your districts to pay increased taxes at the local level. We've heard a lot on this House floor, particularly from those on the other side of the aisle, about the need to reduce local property taxes. your opportunity to do that, precisely that. Vote 'yes' on this Amendment and see to it that your local property taxpayers, your homeowners are protected."

Speaker Peters: "Representative John Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have to agree with the last speaker. But I think we have to carry the reasoning one step farther and that is to remember that the same Governor is sitting on the second floor as was there last year, and he indicated he would veto an investment tax credit Bill if it all comes out of the state

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

income tax. So what you're voting for here, if you're voting green, is voting to kill this piece of legislation. Unpleasant as it might be, if you really believe in investment tax credit ought to be adopted, you should vote 'red' in hope that there can be some equitable allocation between the local governments and the State of Illinois. But if this Amendment is adopted, the Bill will be killed, I feel certain. So I urge a 'red' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 92 voting 'nay'. This Bill (sic, Amendment), having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. This Amendment ... Amendment #1. having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477 on page four by deleting lines fifteen and sixteen and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Obviously, obviously, from the remarks of one of the previous speakers, the Governor of the State of Illinois really doesn't believe in an investment tax credit. You know, he did veto an investment tax credit last year. He vetoed it because some of the monies came out of state revenues. There are very few people in the state that would...that actually believe that investment tax credit works. What you're really saying here is that, 'We don't believe it works. The Governor doesn't believe it works. But business wants it, so we're going to take it out of local revenues because it doesn't affect us.' Well, that's a real gutsy thing to do to sit in Springfield and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

take revenues away from the local mayor, away from the local Park District, away from the local school kids. That's a real brave thing to do. But it's really not the proper thing to do, and I think everyone here recognizes that. At least Amendment #2 cuts in half the amount of money that you're going to rob from local schools of government. It applies the credit equally. One-half the credit is applied to the state income tax and one-half the credit is applied to the corporate replacement tax. least if this Amendment is adopted, you're going to force the state to share half of the responsibility of this risky, if not senseless, plan. If you really want to give money away to big business, then at least have the courage to get up and put the State of Illinois at least halfway behind the program. Don't sit on the House floor and say, 'We know this is not going to work. The Governor knows it's not going to work. But we're going to do it, because we're supported bу the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers Association, and it doesn't cost us one penny to take it out of local revenues. At least have the courage to split the cost, split the responsibility so that the state is at least sharing in some of the burden of this program. Vote 'yes' on Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Bowman?

Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Amendment. The problem with the investment tax credit, as Representative McPike very ably pointed out in his closing remarks on the last Amendment, is simply that we've probably gone too far already with respect to providing tax breaks for corporations. I hope everyone here is aware of how the manufacturers of sales tax exemptions has gotten out of hand. Now, for those of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

you who perhaps weren't on the floor, weren't in the Assembly at the time when the initial Bill was passed, weren't treated to the debate that we had that where the proponents of that measure indicated that it really wouldn't cost verv much. Ιt would cost maybe \$20,000,000.00, maybe \$30,000,000.00. What was the highest figure anyone remembers here? \$40,000,000.00, something like that? Certainly, certainly, no one ever suggested that it would cost 200, 300, 400 million dollars and this very year, unless we fail to..unless we do something to freeze the rate or something like that, it's going to cost us \$256,000,000.00 for the budget year. Now that got out of hand real fast. The problem is with these tax gimmicks is that you can't really figure out how much it's going to cost. Representative Vinson, I'm sure, has done the best job he can of making a projection, but so did the Sponsors a couple of years ago when that manufacturers sales tax exemption gave it their best shot. These things have a way of getting out of hand, and when they get out of hand, they become disasters. And, right now, we're faced with a budget that needs to be balanced. We need to make \$200,000,000.00 worth of cuts. And, we're having..we're struggling with that and yet we seem to be incapable of doing anything with the manufacturers sales tax exemption to save some money there. So at least if we're going to get into this thing, if we're going to jump in with both feet and say, 'Okay, one more tax break for business', at least let's share the burden SO that the local municipalities and the Park Districts, the Drainage Districts, you know, every....the Mosquito Districts in far southern Illinois, that they don't have to share the ...take the whole burden themselves if something goes wrong with this. This is the insurance policy.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

particular Amendment provides a state insurance policy, so to speak, to the local governments so the burden will not impact entirely upon them if something goes very seriously wrong with this as I suspect it will. It certainly has, with respect to our other adventures in the tax relief area, and I have no reason to believe that this will be any different. So I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Vinson."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the As I indicated before, the Bill is a Bill to provide for economic growth and vitality. The Amendment is a bad Amendment. One of the problems with the Gentleman's exposition of his Amendment is he suggests that we're robbing something from somebody. I would suggest to you that when we talk about the subject of tax revenues, if we're robbing something from anybody it's from the And this attempts to return the money to the taxpayer in a highly focused way to stimulate growth, investment and savings for this economy. And I would you to reject the Gentleman's thesis, to vote 'no' OΠ Amendment, to cast a 'red' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative John Dunn." Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this is a good Amendment, a practical Amendment. It may not be anyone's druthers, but it will divide the burden of this tax between the State of Illinois and local governments. Local governments are bearing the brunt of all of the tax cuts at the federal and the state level. Here, in Illinois, if you look at the tax cuts that our Governor has proposed, particularly the most recent round of \$200,000,000.00 worth of tax cuts, you will that the great proportion of those tax cuts are cuts in grants to local governments. Local qovernments are

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

strapped already. They're going to have a very difficult time, and if we're going to all tighten our belts, then it's time to do that. And this is a way to do that and that is to spread the burden equitably between the State of Illinois and the local governments. I doubt if the Governor will veto a Bill in this form in spite of what the people on the other side of the aisle are saying. It's too harsh a Bill to put the entire burden on local governments. Let's adopt this Amendment. Let's send this Bill to the Governor and see what he does with it and find out if he really is for investment tax credits or not."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
would just say that individuals who ..who perforce are
constrained to be domiciled in vitreous structures of
patent frangibility, should on no account and I repeat, on
should no account employ petrous formations as projectiles.
And I support the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike to close."

I didn't understand the last speech. McPike: "Well, Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor of the Bill spoke against the Amendment. And maybe the last speaker did. I wasn't sure. What ... The Sponsor of the Bill spoke against the Amendment saying that I had in fact, I had stated that we are robbing money from local units of government and from school children. And he says, we really aren't, that this money doesn't belong to them. It belongs to the taxpayer, and we are simply giving it back to the taxpayer. Well, I would agree. We are giving it back to a taxpayer. And everyone else on this floor should agree that there's no such thing as a free lunch and that someone has to pay for So what we are doing is giving it back to the services.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

corporate taxpayer and asking the homeowner and the individual wage earner to pay what the corporations chose not to pay or what the corporations will not have to pay because of our extreme generosity in removing them slowly of any burden they may possibly have for paying taxes in this state. That's what we are doing. We are removing the burden from corporations, and we're returning it to the tax...to the local taxpayer. All I'm asking in Amendment is, if you've made up your mind in deciding to relieve business of any tax obligations they may have, least have enough courage to allow the State of Illinois to share equally in the loss of revenues that you're going to give away. Don't make local governments sacrifice entirely and allow the state to escape scot-free. Put the burden equally on both the local government and on the State Government."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall'..Roll Representative? You desire a Roll Call? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 477 be adopted?'. in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Robbins to explain his vote? No? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there no. are 82 voting 71 voting 'aye'. This Amendment...Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, it's probably close enough to poll the absentees.

I would request you do that."

Speaker Peters: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Bartulis. Capparelli. Deuster...."

Speaker Peters: "Bartulis, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Donovan. Epton. Farley. Garmisa. Huff.

Jackson. Dick Kelly. Kucharski. Margalus. Martire.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

McCormick. O'Connell..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McCormick, 'no'."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Redmond. Richmond. Ronan. Stearney. Telcser.

 Terzich. White. And, Yourell."
- Speaker Peters: "There are 71 voting 'aye', 84 voting 'no'. This

 Amendment, having failed to receive sufficient votes, is

 declared lost. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477 on page four, line 23 by deleting 'B' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'by'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, on Amendment #3."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I pointed out to the Sponsor in Committee that there were three or four technical errors in this Bill and that I requested that he introduce Amendments to correct the technical errors. In light of the fact that he did not, I took it upon myself to introduce the Amendments to correct technical errors, and that's all this is. On line 27 it says, '...additional credit shall...'..I'm sorry. On line 23 it says, '...preceding year as determined: B: the insured wages...'. And it should read, '...the preceding year as determined by the insured wages...'. So I would ask for the adoption of this technical Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's obvious what the Gentleman wants to do. He wants to send the Bill back to the Senate to try to get as many cracks as he can at it. Now he's had several cracks at this Bill. He's lost every crack. The Amendment is not a significant Amendment. The Bill stands good as it is. If he's really concerned and sincere and legitimate about his interest in this particular Amendment, he can come in with another Bill which I would Cosponsor with him

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

to solve the problem. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment so that we don't lose it back and forth in the Senate playing ping pong."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike to close. Roll Call, Sir?"

McPike: "No. I was surprised at any Member on the House floor rejects an Amendment that is prepared in good faith to correct technical errors. I did not stand up and claim that this Amendment was proposed by the Reference Bureau. I simply said that our staff found that there were technical errors, and I think they should be corrected. If we want to pass legislation that's not technically correct, and the Sponsor insists on passing Bills that are obviously defective, that's up to him. It's our responsibility to correct any technical errors we find. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to House (sic, Senate) Bill 477 be adopted?'. 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. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 83 voting 'nay'. This Amendment, having failed to receive sufficient votes, is hereby declared lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, McPike..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "... Amends Senate Bill 477..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barr, for what purpose do you arise, Sir? Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe as this Bill was originally introduced it included a manufacturing and mining. In the Senate it was amended to include retailing.

Therefore, on page ...on page six, on line 19 the word

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

'retailing' should be added after the words, 'manufacturing and mining'. It should read, 'manufacturing, mining and retailing Capital equipment'. Without this Amendment, it's a possibility that when the Bill under this portion...This portion of the Bill calls for a study at a later date. It does not refer at all to retailing. So that if the Bill is going to be shown to work, the word 'retailing' should be included. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson on Amendment #4."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman is again trying to play ping pong politics with the Senate. I would urge defeat of the Bill. It's not a problem. Again, if he wants to, we will mandate that there be a study of the employment increase in retailing in a subsequent Bill. I would urge defeat of the Amendment because what he's trying to do is to defeat the whole concept of the Bill. Please yote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike to close. The question is...."

McPike: "No, this is the ... "

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

McPike: "This is an unusual for a Sponsor of a Bill to get up and oppose this. I will admit that Bills often go from the House to the Senate for concurrence on various Amendments, but very seldom on the floor will you see the Sponsor of the Bill refuse to accept Amendments that clean up the Bill, that are technical in nature and that add words or phrases or correct changes in the Bill that should be corrected. It's unfortunate that the Sponsor of the Bill could not have corrected these himself. He could have corrected them in the House Committee or on the House floor or it could have been properly handled in the Senate. Unfortunately, it was not and this is a Legislative Body

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

that should not be putting Bills through here that are not in correct form. This Amendment corrects the Bill. And I'm really surprised, despite the fact that I will admit that I'm against the Bill and despite the fact that I would admit that I would like to see it go back to the Senate, I really am surprised that the Sponsor of the Bill stands up and refuses to accept technical Amendments. It's not my fault that the Bill is in error. It's his fault. And it should be corrected."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 477 be adopted?'. Those in favor will vote 'aye'; those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 89 voting 'nay'. This Amendment, having failed to receive sufficient votes, is hereby declared lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, Amendment #5."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is not technical as the two previous ones were. When we removed the sales tax on machinery, as Representative Bowman pointed out earlier, the estimates of the cost of that to state revenues were grossly underestimated. I believe that the highest estimate I heard that year was \$30,000,000.00. It is now up to #275,000,000.00 in the coming Fiscal year and climbing rapidly. I asked the Sponsor of the Bill Committee what his estimate of the cost of this was and he answered \$42,000,000.00. If that is the legitimate estimate of the cost of this Bill, and I think he should accept this Amendment as a cap. This caps the amount for any calendar year at \$42,000,000.00. Now, if he wants to change that at some later date to make the gift to

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

business larger and larger, that can be handled in 1984 or thereafter. But, for the first year that this is in effect, if we're saying that we're only going to rob \$42,000,000.00 from the school children in Illinois, then let's cap it at \$42,000,000.00. Because that is exactly what did not happen when we removed the sales tax on manufacturing equipment. We said it was going to cost \$30,000,000.00 and now it's up to \$275,000,000.00. Sponsor is honest and sincere in what he believes is the cost of this investment tax credit. I take him at his word that it's \$42,000,000.00 and ask him to accept that as a cap for the first...for any calendar year in any aggregate. Forty-two million dollars is a lot of money to give away to biq business. Let's insure that it's not going to be 142 or 242 million dollars. Let's cap it at what the Sponsor says it's going to cost."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, the Gentleman has stumbled into a cul-de-sac in his own logic. The cul-de-sac that he stumbled into, he suggests that there should be a permanent cap on this. reason we don't want a permanent cap on this is that the whole purpose of an investment tax credit is to stimulate growth. As there is growth and as we create the incentive for new capital investment in this state, of course, more and more people are going to take advantage of that to create jobs and to create growth. And because of that, we want no cap on this. We want to permit unlimited growth that's the problem with Representative McPike's Amendment. What his logic really leads himself to something on the order of a snake eating its tail. It's consuming itself as we raise taxes. What we're trying to do is to cut taxes and to stimulate growth, and I would

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the only one doing the

62nd Legislative Day

who wish?

June 12, 1981

urge you to vote against Nr. McPike's snake eating its

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike to close."

eating in this Bill are large corporations. They're eating up all the revenues that go to school children in the And I would ask that if we're going to give them state. \$42,000,000.00 Most people estimate the cost of as much higher than \$42,000,000.00, but if the Sponsor says that we're only going to give them \$42,000,000.00, if the snakes in this state want to eat \$42,000,000.00's worth of revenues going to the children of Illinois for their school education, then let's cap it at \$42,000,000.00. we don't believe that, if, in effect, we think this is going to cost \$200,000,000.00, then vote against this. you know who's going to pay for any excess above \$42,000,000.00 cap. It's going to be the local property taxpayers in your districts. When they start screaming about property taxes to you and the cost of property taxes, tell them it wasn't your fault. It wasn't your fault at all that you decided to give away a11 αf revenue...all of their corporate tax replacement revenues to big business. It wasn't your fault that you refused to put a cap on this. You had nothing to do with it. your way out of it, and say it's someone else's fault, In reality, the question is how much are we going yours. to give to big business. I say, \$42,000,000.00 is enough." Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 477 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed... Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye': those opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Clerk. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- there are 62 voting 'aye', 81 voting 'no'. And Amendment #5 is lost. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477..."
- Speaker Peters: "Amendment #6, Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Amendment #6 is another technical Amendment. If the Sponsor opposes it, I would accept a voice Roll Call. If he doesn't want his Bill in order, that's up to him."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson?"
- Vinson: "I oppose the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. It's another ping pong Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'nos' have it. In the opinion of the Chair, the Amendment #6 is lost. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment *7, McPike, amends Senate Bill 477..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, Amendment #7."
- McPike: "Amendment #7....I believe that when the Sponsors in the Senate changed the Bill they added retailers to the Bill and then they changed the investment tax credit from one percent to one-half percent. They neglected at the same time to correct the amount of employment growth necessary to achieve the extra one-half percent -excuse me- the extra one-half percent investment tax credit beginning in 1985. Under their Bill, various levels of employment growth, anywhere from 0.5% growth up to 1% growth, would result in the same investment tax credit. This corrects that and makes it clear that in order to double your investment tax your employment by credit, you need only to increase one-half of one percent. I would ask for an 'aye' vote." "Did you desire a Roll Call, Sir?" Speaker Peters:

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

McPike: "Please."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. The objection is not well founded. I would recommend that we, again, reject ping pong diplomacy on this Bill and that you vote 'red'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, to close."

McPike: "The Sponsor can't even... The Sponsor of the Bill can't even give a rationale reason for opposing this Amendment. He knows...He knows it should be adopted. He recognizes that it was an oversight. I asked him the question Committee, 'What employment growth would be necessary to increase your credit from 0.5% to 1%? . And he answered, 'It would unnecessary to have a 1% increase in employment growth. I told him he hadn't read the Bill properly and suggested that he reread his own Bill and correct it. has no answer to this Amendment. He knows it should adopted and it flies in the face of all rationale legislative activity to allow these Bills to pass in this kind of shape. It's really surprising that the Sponsor would not accept this Amendment. I'd ask for vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 70 voting 'aye', 88 voting 'no'. Amendment #7 has failed to receive sufficient votes and is hereby declared lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Katz, Senate Bill 490, Sir? Out of the record. Representative Kornowicz?

On page six...Is Representative Cullerton here? On page ten, page eleven, excuse me. Senate Bill 1198, Representative Bullock."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1198, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Bullock-Catania-Margaret Smith, amends Senate Bill 1198 on page one..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1198 is an Amendment House. that was arrived at as a result of the Committee Members' concern over the protection given to residents of public housing who would voluntarily sign consent forms to portions of their rent allowance paid directly to the Housing Authority. The Amendment, in fact, says, #1; if a person consents to the assignment of a portion...of a financial portion for rent, that that amount, his or her amount, is in no way a requirement for rental. Secondly, the Amendment says that it may not be used as a method to coerce a person to signing a lease. 1 know of no opposition to the Amendment. It was recommended by recipients, and I would Public Aid represent who respectfully urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1198 be adopted?'.

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed?

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1147. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1147, a Bill for an Act relating to health and accident insurance provided by (sic, to) employees by their employers. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Brummer-Kulas, amends Senate
Bill 1147 on page one, line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunner, Amendment #1."

This is an Amendment which.. I quess I need to Brummer: "Yes. explain briefly the Bill to understand the Amendment. Bill requires that when an employer terminates a group employment...a group insurance, that the employer is required to give notice of that termination to the employees. I think that is fine. The Bill provided that in the event that was not done, there was liability on the part of the employer for damages and in the event of a corporation, the Chief Executive Officer was individually liable despite the corporate status for the failure and for the damages. I felt that provision was unfair. We have the agreement of the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor with regard to Amendment #1 which removes that provision. And I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell, Amendment #1? Your light is on. Representative Kulas."

- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is an agreed Amendment between the Senate Sponsor and Representative Brummer. I would move to adopt Amendment #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Schuneman, amends Senate Bill 1147 and so forth."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman."
- Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Floor
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Schuneman, amends Senate Bill
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman, floor Amendment #3."

 Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 would require that the insurance company involved in this Bill would have to give notice to the employer of his responsibility under this Act. And the intent is that the insurance company, in addition to notifying the employer that the insurance was being cancelled, would also have to advise the employer that he might become responsible for actually paying all of the insurance claims if he doesn't follow the provisions of this Act. I would move adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that Amendment, Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3, we've also agreed to and
 I would also urge adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Birkinbine, amends Senate
 Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Birkinbine, floor Amendment #4.

 Representative Birkinbine? Representative Kulas, your pleasure, Sir?"
- Kulas: "I have not seen Amendment #4. And I'd move to table

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Amendment #4."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Birkinbine on the floor? The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #4. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; opposed by saying 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is tabled. Further Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill992, Representative Miller. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Okay, we'll have to hold that, Representative Miller. Senate Bill 1049, Representative Ebbesen. 1049. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1049."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1049, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code, Second..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1081,
 Representative Schuneman, 1081. Out of the record. Senate
 Bill 1149, Representative Ropp. Is the Gentleman on the
 floor? Representative Ropp? Out of the record. Senate
 Bill 1193, Representative Ted Meyer. 1193, Representative
 Meyer. You wish to proceed, Sir?"
- Meyer: "I don't believe the Amendment has been distributed. In fact, I'm sure it hasn't been."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Representative Ropp, you want to run with yours? Okay, Senate Bill 1149, Representative Ropp. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1149, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp. Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1149 on page one and so forth."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment #1."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had a number of Bills go through the Legislature in terms of using the income tax for supportive schools. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1149 provides that on the income tax return that there will be a place for a school district designation so that we will have some valid statistics in terms of understanding the income by school district. This kind of information is not available now, and we believe that this is really the only way to get an accurate account on this particular kind of data. That's all this Amendment does, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Representative Ebbesen on Amendment #1."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yeah, you're....you're seeking information on the income tax record in terms of dollars, just, you know, exactly what happens? What takes place?"

Hoffman: "Nothing, it is merely, for example, we have now on the income tax form a place for a county. For example, we can determine what average income and those kinds of things. This identifies the school district on...well...require the identification of the school district in which the person lives on the income tax return just as we do now for the county."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman, Representative Friedrich, from Marion."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Representative Hoffman, I live in three school districts: a grade school district, a high school district, and a college district. Do you have to put all of that

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

down?"

- Hoffman: "It will...it will require you to identify the elementary and secondary school districts in which you live...or unit district as the case may be."
- Friedrich: "But if I....not the junior college district. I hope the average person will know which district they live in."
- Hoffman: "That is an excellent point, and this will be part of the responsibility of school districts to help people do that."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion? Representative Hoffman to close. Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1108, Representative Wikoff. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1108, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in connection with the Illinois State Lottery, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed in respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Keane, amends Senate Bill 1108 as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane on Floor Amendment #2."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think there is agreement with the Sponsor of the Bill on this Amendment. What it does is it limits it basically to one year and has another stipulation that we agreed on in Committee. I would ask for favorable consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wikoff, Amendment #2."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I concur in that Amendment..."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', excuse me. I'm sorry, Sir. Representative Ebbesen on Amendment #2. Excuse me, Sir."
- Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I couldn't understand what he was saying.

 There might be agreement between those two, but I think the rest of us would like to know also. What does it do?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane, would you mind repeating your explanation, Sir?"
- Reane: "Yes, I have no problem repeating it. The...basis of the Amendment was agreed upon in Committee by the Members of the Committee, Higher Ed Committee, or I'm sorry, Revenue Committee, and this Amendment encompasses that. What it does is it provides that this legislation will become effective only if sanctions are imposed against the University of Illinois, and it is effective...it limits the effectiveness of this Bill for one year from the effective date of this Section."
- Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ebbesen, no discussion. Alright, the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$2. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment \$2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 837. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Schraeder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 837, a Bill for an Act to exempt alternate energy facilities from property tax and occupation a use tax. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Schraeder, amends Senate Bill 837 on..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder on Amendment #1."

- Schraeder: "This is an Amendment that was going to be offered in the Senate, and due to the time element there, they decided to hold it until it got here. And it basically. What it does, it allows the local units of government to maintain their tax base and thereby removing a State Mandate Act. And there's... I don't know of any opposition. I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Schraeder? Your desire is to hold it on Second? Excuse me. Hold Senate Bill 837 on Second Reading. Senate Bill 875, Representative Schraeder. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 875, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed in respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Schraeder, amends Senate Bill 87..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder on Floor Amendment #2."

Schraeder: "This is a technical Amendment to replace...first of all I would like to remove the...remove the Amendment adopted in Committee because it is technically incorrect.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

And I would move to reconsider that Amendment."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment,

 Committee Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by
 saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and
 Amendment #1 is tabled. Now Amendment #2, Floor Amendment
 #2 is offered by Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Amendment #2 is the same as Amendment #1 only it is technically correct in the definition of the Section number, and I would move the adoption of Amendment #2 in conformance with the Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2.

 All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Ted Meyer, amends Senate Bill 875..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer on Floor Amendment #3."
- Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, that Amendment hasn't been distributed either."
- Speaker Daniels: "Floor Amendment #3 has been distributed,

 Representative Meyer. Do you wish to proceed with it?"
- Meyer: "Take it out of the record."
- Speaker Daniels: "No, Representative Meyer, it is not your Bill.

 Are you withdrawing Amendment #3? This is Senate Bill 875,

 Represent..."
- Meyer: "There was a mistake in the Calendar. I am the House Sponsor, but Mr. Schraeder is not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "If he likes it out of the record, fine."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Yeah, take it out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Senate Bill 875 will be taken out of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the record. Representative Meyer and Representative Schraeder, would you please both come to the well and straigthen out the Sponsor of the Bill so we have that correct in the record? Thank you. Senate Bill 909, Representative Hoxsey, out of the record."

Clerk Leone: "Senate..."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 17. Representative Deuster, out of the record. Senate Bill 62, Representative Stewart. Representative Stewart, out of the record. Senate Bill 89. Representative Kornowicz, Senate Bill 89. Out of the record. Senate Bill 294, Representative Vinson. 294, Sir. Out of the record. Senate Bill 300, Representative Watson. Representative Watson on the floor? It's 300, out of record. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3... Senate Bill 376, Representative Nelson. Is the Lady on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 407, Representative Terzich. Representative Watson, out of the record. Senate Bill 469, Representative Stuffle, out of the record. Senate Bill 499, Representative Pullen, out of the record. Senate Bill 501, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. 647, Representative Stuffle. 647, out of the record. Senate Bill 657, Representative Klemm. 657, out of Bill 703, Representative Birkinbine. record. Senate Representative Birkinbine, Senate Bill 703. Out of the record. Senate Bill 723, Representative Stuffle, out of the record. Senate Bill 769, Representative Daniels. Out of the record. Senate Bill 806, Representative Swanstrom. Where's Swanstrom. Out of the record. Senate Bill 875, Representative Meyer."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 875 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was tabled. Amendment #2 was adopted. Floor Amendment #3, Ted Meyer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer on Floor Amendment #3."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Schraeder and I got straigthened out. Amendment #3 is technical in nature.

 It...that it redefines recycling and it...it puts 180 days in a notice provision, and I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Any questions? Being none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 806, Representative Swanstrom, not on the floor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 909, Representative Hoxsey, out of the record. Senate Bill 992, Representative Miller. 992, the Amendment's being distributed, Sir. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 992, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Miller, amends Senate Bill 992..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Miller, Amendment #1."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 alters the situation in which one would be in violation of the Act, changing it from 'knowingly selling as gasohol any fuel which isn't gasohol' to 'selling it as a fuel...selling the fuel as gasohol after the Department of Ag has notified the seller that fuel isn't gasohol'. This was done at the suggestion of Representative Bradley. It is identical to an Amendment which was placed on Representative Slape's Senate Bill 966 a few evenings ago, and I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 769, Representative Polk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 769, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Land Sales Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?...tabled, excuse me. Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Daniels, amends Senate Bill 769..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk, Amendment #2."
- Polk: "The Amendment #2 is exactly the same provision as the Amendment adopted in Committee which we just tabled except that it is now technically correct, and I would move for adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Meyer, Senate Bill 1193. Out of the record? Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bills Second Reading, any Members have Bills that were not called or were called and taken out of the record...Representative Stewart, Senate Bill 62. If you have any Bills that you desire to be called now, would you please come up to the well, turn in

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the number, we'll call your Bill. Senate Bill 62, Representative Stewart. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed in respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$2, Currie, amends Senate Bill 62

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie on Amendment #2."

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

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62 began life as Senate Bill 433. It passed the Senate overwhelmingly. proposal to provide infant schools, infant laboratory schools for teen-age pregnant mothers. In the House Education Committee it developed that the Department of Public Aid has substantial reservations about the Bill, and this Amendment, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62 has been drafted by and with the Department of Public Aid so as to meet their concerns. Under the proposal, the State Board of Education would establish guidelines for the creation of infant schools for pregnant teen-mothers. The Department of Public Aid's liability for funding those programs would be limited in a way that makes sense to the Department, It makes sense to me, and to the Senate Sponsor of the original Bill, Earlean Collins. I would appreciate your support for Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Friedrich: "What is your estimate of the cost of this? I have a note that it would run between two and three million

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

dollars. Is that...what the cost is?"

Currie: "My understanding, Representative Friedrich, ís that there should be no direct associated costs with this Right now the Department of Public Aid funds under title...the Title XX program day care for public aid That proposal has not changed by virtue of this mothers. Amendment. You may be looking at the fiscal note on Senate Bill 433 as it originally brought over from the House to the Senate. But since that time this Amendment, although it reflects the concept in Senate Bill 433, is not subject large cost operations. No school district needs to operate these programs if they cannot afford to do so, and the Department of Public Aid's liability under the Title XX program is pretty much limited to what it is already doing under Title XX. What this proposal would do, however, to make sure the day care funds, at least in instances, are especially well spent. The findings from other...other cities and other school areas, areas in which laboratory programs for pregnant teens and their babies is that repeat pregnancy rates drop susbtantially and school drop-out rates reduce substantially."

Friedrich: "Actually, my note suggests that it is going to cost \$10,000,000. I don't know where the staff came up with that figure, because I..."

Currie: "That was on Senate...Senate Bill 433 as it came to the House. But the objections the Department had which were based on that \$10,000,000 assumed cost have now been met."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further..."

Currie: "I believe...is Representative Reilly on the floor? He is the Chair of the Education Committee, and I believe the Department has spoken to him about this Amendment which they drafted in order to make this Bill palatable to them."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich."

62nd Legislative Day June 12, 1981

Friedrich: "I yield to Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Inquiry of the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she'll yield."

Hoffman: "Is it still the contention of the Department that this claim will have first claim on any of the Title XX dollars that become available to the school? In other words, this would have to be paid first?"

Currie: "My understanding is that this Amendment meets their objections to the Bill as it came to the House. objection that it would be too costly and the objection that it would place first priority on Title XXT funds...Title XX funds for this kind of program. My understanding is that the Department supports this Amendment, because it does meet their...those two concerns Department expressed in House Committee. I did speak to Representative Reilly about the Amendment, and I'd hoped he would be on the floor and able to speak to it. He me that the Department had let him know that they were involved in drafting an Amendment that met their concerns."

Hoffman: "There seems to be some disagreement anyway on our side of the aisle in terms of the cost, at least from a staff point of view, that in fact the Amendment which is being proposed here is not that different from Senate Bill 433 and would cost approximately the same amount of money. But when we talk about this \$2,000,000 or \$10,000,000 cost, we're talking about, you know, an amount of money that if it...if they're additional dollars, I think it is safe to say that we really don't...we really don't have those particular...those particular dollars. We are in the process now of deciding whether we're going to prorate the catagoricals at 90% or 91% or 89%, because we don't have the resources to pay for those programs we have. So for

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the same reasons, I think that I had reservations in the Committee, those reservations have not been changed by the passage of the short amount of time."

Currie: "My...my understanding, if that was a question, my understanding, Representative Hoffman,..."

Hoffman: "No, it was not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly from Morgan."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a long run up here. The...this is the Amendment that the Department talked to about. The Department of Public Aid, which objections to the Bill, excuse me, which we killed Committee, has reviewed this Amendment and does agree that it is something they can live with that the costs...that there would not be costs, excuse me, imposed upon them. So Department does not have the objection to this the Amendment which caused us to kill the Bill in Committee. House, then, I guess, has to make a decision as a matter of policy as to whether this is a good idea or a bad idea. But at least the cost question which was uppermost in our minds and Committee is not present. The Department does agree with this Amendment and can live with it."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of Representative Currie's Amendment. Representative Currie's Amendment is most It says in effect if Title I (sic) funds are permissive. not available, there is no mandate here for the experimental laboratory infant care program to exist. T t places no restrictions on the Department of Children Family Services or the Department of Public Aid beyond those that they already have. It further says that in the event that the local schools are unable to provide the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

programs, the option remains for private not-for-profit institutions to incur or to accept that contract and negotiate directly with the Department of Public Aid and the Children and Family Services. It is permissive legislation. It addresses a very critical problem that we all are aware of in the area of infant care, and I think the cost as a result of not having this program, would be far in excess of the minimal cost under Title XX. For those reasons I would urge an 'aye' vote for Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart." Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Sponsor of ... as the House Sponsor of Senate Bill 62, I fully... I rise in support of this Amendment. It does meet...the Amendment does meet the objections that the Public Aid Department did have. I hope that the Members on the floor were listening to the comments of Representative Reilly and of Representative Bullock. Certainly we that the problems of teen-age pregnancy and subsequently the problems of ... of children who have children as parents one to this society can't, can't sweep under the rug, and it is one that we have to deal with. We can either deal with it now by sensibly planning, or we can deal with the later more costly problems of prosecuting people for child abuse, etcetera. I would urge the...the sympathetic reaction to this Amendment, and I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "The distinguished leader from Cook, Representative Chapman. Turned your light off. Okay. Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I,
 too, rise in support of this Amendment. If you read the
 latter part of the language of the Amendment,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

yourself...itself, I think it is clear that it is a totally permissive program. Also, I think we have to keep in mind that if the young girl is remaining in school, she will in fact have to have day care for her infant anyway which would also qualify for Title XX funding. And so it is not really an additional cost, but it is simply a provision for a possibility of having a program within the school system itself which makes it more feasible for the young woman to continue her education at the same time that she is making sure that her child is being well cared for and also it means that that school program can provide some parenting skills for that young mother and others of the same group. And so I think this just provides a permissive program that may be feasible in some school districts, and I urge your support."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady, Representative Currie, to close."

 Currie: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think Representatives Reilly, Bullock, Stewart, and Satterthwaite have well explained this proposal, and I will rest with their closing arguments in behalf of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.

 Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take...Representative Barr."
- Barr: "Mr. Speaker, my light is not working, but I would like to be recorded as voting 'yes'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Did you try your switch there? Okay, good.

 All those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

 On Amendment #2 there are 105 voting 'aye', 25 'no', and three 'present'. This Amendment having received the necessary votes, passes. Further Amendments?"

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Terzich, amends Senate Bill 62 on page one line two and so forth."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich, Amendment #3.

 Representative Terzich. Representative Stewart, your
 pleasure, Ma'am."
- Stewart: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not certain of the way I should present my...my next request, but I would like for my Bill to be advanced on to Third Reading. The Sponsor of Amendment #3 who isn't here hasn't spoken to me about the Amendment. I would also question the germaneness of this Amendment. I would move to table it and to advance this Bill on to Third Reading."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved to table Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 Amendment #3 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider, no, okay.

 Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if anybody else wanted one of these Flag Day..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay, excuse me for one second, Representative

 DiPrima. Senate Bill 62 has a fiscal note filed,

 Representative Stewart. We'll have to hold it on Second.

 Alright, Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "I just wanted to inform you that if anybody else wanted one of these Flag Day speeches for Sunday, I have a few more left. That is it. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins for an announcement."
- Collins: "Yes, Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have some attention, I think that the Members would be interested. Representative Sandquist's mother passed away last night, and for those of you who would like to know the arrangements are, the wake will be

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

held Sunday starting at 2 o'clock in the afternoon at Drake and Son Funeral Home, which is located at 5303 Northwestern Avenue in Chicago. The funeral service will be from the funeral home on Monday the 15th at 1 o'clock. That is the Drake Funeral Home, 5303 Northwestern Avenue."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 777, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 777, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Library Systems Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 89, Representative Kornowicz, Senate Bill 89, out of the record. Senate Bill 115, Representative Greiman, 115, out of the record. Senate Bill 147, Representative Barkhausen, Senate Bill 147, out of the record. Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Where is Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle? Take 1085 out of the record. We'll get to that. Want to go with Senate Bill 236, Representative Stuffle? Out of the record. Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar, page five. Senate Bill 98, Representative Giglio, Senate Bill 98. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 98, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Giorgi, amends Senate Bill 98 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

held Sunday starting at 2 o'clock in the afternoon at Drake and Son Puneral Home, which is located at 5303 Northwestern Avenue in Chicago. The funeral service will be from the funeral home on Monday the 15th at 1 o'clock. That is the Drake Funeral Home, 5303 Northwestern Avenue."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 777, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 777, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Library Systems Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 89, Representative Kornowicz, Senate Bill 89, out of the record. Senate Bill 115, Representative Greiman, 115, out of the record. Senate Bill 147, Representative Barkhausen, Senate Bill 147, out of the record. Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Where is Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle? Take 1085 out of the record. We'll get to that. Want to go with Senate Bill 236, Representative Stuffle? Out of the record. Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar, page five. Senate Bill 98, Representative Giglio, Senate Bill 98. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 98, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Giorgi, amends Senate Bill 98 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

following."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi on Amendment #2."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Amendment #2. I spoke with the Sponsor, and all this Amendment does is lower the safety responsibility fine from 36 to 12 months and that it doesn't...it prohibits an insurance carrier from raising your rates. If you've bought insurance, say for the year and your license is suspended, they cannot drop you then and double your premium. That is all it does, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Representative Schuneman."
- Schuneman: "Could you ask the Gentleman to explain the Amendment again, please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi, could you explain it once more please?"
- Giorgi: "Yes, the Secretary of State's office for years has asked for a 36 month safety responsibility filing. This Amendment lowers that to 12 months, and this Amendment also provides that an insurance carrier cannot increase your premium because of the revokation or suspension of your insurance or your drivers' license. In case it is suspended or revoked, they cannot increase your insurance in the event you have insurance already with an insurance company. For example, if you bought your insurance in January and paid for it for the year and in May you were suspended, the insurance company cannot increase your premium to keep you insured. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Representative Schuneman."
- Schuneman: "Well, I wonder if the Gentleman would mind taking this out of the record a minute, Mr. Speaker, so we could take a look at this thing. I really am not familiar with what he is trying to do here. If you're talking about

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

increasing the premium during the policy term that the insurance company has agreed to issue the policy and already collected the premium, I don't think there is any problem. But if you're trying to be innovative and start some new procedure, then I think that there could be a problem here."

Giorgi: "Cal, I have spoken with the Sponsor. He accepted the Amendment because this has been heard in Committee. And I'd rather...I would rather put the Amendment on and then if you find real differences with it, I will move the Bill back to Second Reading for corrections if you feel that they need them."

Schuneman: "Is this your Bill, Zeke?"

Giorgi: "No, it is Representative Giglio's."

Schuneman: "Well, okay, I'll come over and take a look at the Amendment. I won't oppose it at this time. I don't...I really don't understand what you're trying to do with this Amendment, but...a little suspicious of it, I guess."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi is ... "

Giorgi: "I move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "...My understanding that you're going to, if there is a problem with this Amendment, you'll return it to Second. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "My word is as good as yours."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. Alright, we'll leave it on Second.

Alright, take it out of the record. Oh, okay.

Representative Giglio, is that alright with you? The

Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$2. All

those...Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill is in the control of Representative Giglio. Do we have that kind of agreement with him?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giglio said that that was...he

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

said it was alright with him, too. Is that correct, Sir?"
Schuneman: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those..."

Giorgi: "I wasn't good enough."

Speaker Daniels: "...In favor will signify by saying 'aye' and opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 186, Representative Levin. Alright, Senate Bill 98 is Third Reading Short Debate. Senate Bill 186, read the...do you want to go with 186? Senate Bill 186. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 186, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Migrant Labor Camp Law, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 253, Representative McGrew. Representative McGrew on the floor? 253, out of the record. Senate Bill 527, Representative Leinenweber. 527, Sir, page five Short Debate. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 527, a Bill for an Act in relation to defacing identification marks on construction equipment, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Notions filed in respect to Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading Short Debate. Senate Bill 546,
Representative Schuneman. 546, Sir. Out of the record?
Well, Senate Bill 546. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Is the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Amendment filed? Representative Schuneman, we have an Amendment that is not printed yet. Excuse me, Sir. Out of the record on 546. Senate Bill 791, Representative Terzich, out of the record. Senate Bill 903, Representative Levin, out of the record. Senate Bill 1085, Representative Stuffle. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1085, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Keane, amends Senate Bill 1085 on page one line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane, Amendment #1."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we...what my Amendment does, and it has the approval of the Sponsor, is to make...it clarifies the language of the Bill and indicates that approval of the Board of Higher Education and the Community College Boards are...it specifies that that approval must be obtained. The Sponsor of the Bill indicates that or tends to indicate it, and all this does is clarify it and put it in very clear language that those approvals must be obtained. I would be happy to answer any question and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I would ask leave that that Bill remain on the Short Debate Calendar as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "You want to move it to Third, Sir?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Stuffle: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Third Reading Short Debate.

Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bowman: "I was going to make that point...excuse me. Thank you,
Mr. Speaker. I was going to make the point that leave of
the House has to be granted because I think on one of the
prior Bills that was amended and leave was not asked. It
was left on the Short Debate Calendar. You may want to go
back and clean that up a little bit."

Speaker Daniels: "They tell me that they were given leave on the other one, too."

Bowman: "I didn't...okay, I'm sorry I did't hear you ask for leave."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay, Sir. Thank you."

Bowman: "Thank you very nuch."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1218, Representative Ronan, out of the record. Page 25, Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 25, Consent Calendar, Second Reading...Third Reading, Second Day. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 66, Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 66, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Mass Transit District Act, Second Reading of the Bill... Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Consent Calendar, Second Day, Senate Bill 66.

The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 66 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, Senate Bill 66, there are 131 voting 'aye', no voting 'nay', nine voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Representative Priedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would you consider going to the Order of
Constitutional Amendments? I have one that needs to be
moved back for a technical Amendment from Third to Second?"

Speaker Daniels: "Let us finish the Consent Calendar Second
Reading, Sir. Then we'll go to that order."

Friedrich: "Excuse me. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the meeting on the second floor has been over for about half an hour to 45 minutes. The mushrooms are starting to get restless. Could you enlighten us as to what the program is for the rest of the day?"

Speaker Daniels: "We're waiting for a train."

Kulas: "Will that train ever come back though?"

Speaker Daniels: "I don't know. Consent Calendar Second Reading Second Day page 23. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 65, a Bill for an Act. to amend the Medical Practice Act. Senate Bill 155, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Senate Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the practice podiatry in the State of Illinois. Senate Bill 576, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act and the Veterinary Medicine and Surgical Practice Act. Senate Bill 799, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ownership rights in plastic dyes, molds, and forms, and to provide for their destruction under certain conditions. Senate Bill 841, Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Senate Bill 910, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Senate Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act concerning Department of Registration and Education. Senate Bill 1132, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Food,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1091

and Cosmetic Act. Senate Bill 1138, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the collection, claims, and accounts received by state agencies. Senate Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Senate Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Together with attached Amendments, Second Reading of these Bills."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Senate Bill, Mr. Speaker, 1201 is a Bill that I am sponsoring. It...it's mv understanding that Representative Keane had an Amendment to that Bill. And I have no objections to it. I don't know how you want to discose of that."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, there has been objections to Senate Bill 1132 on the Consent Calendar, and Senate Bill 1201 has an Amendment. We'll take those two Bills out of the Second Reading Second Day."

"muerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "On the remainder of the Bills, "hird Beading Consent Calendar. For the purposes of returning the Fill to Second Reading, go to Constitutional Amendments, "hird Reading page 26. HTDCA #15. Perresentative Friedrich for the nurpose of returning to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we...this Bill..."

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

Friedrich: "Excuse me."

#15."

Speaker Daniels: "Read the Constitutional Amendment, Mr. Clerk." Friedrich: "It has been read a second time, I believe."

Clerk Leone: "Mouse Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment

Speaker Daniels: "Representative...NJPCA #15. The Gentleman has requested leave to return the Bill to Second Reading for

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

the purpose of an Amendment. Leave granted. MJRCA #15. Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Dwight Friedrich, amends House
 Joint Resolution Constitutional..."
- "Representative Friedrich, Floor Amendment #2." Speaker Daniels: Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Mouse. on Amendment #1 we attempted to be sure that the units of local government and school districts were taken care of. Τn doing over this with some people that we think are Constitutional authorities, we have been advised to table Amendment #1 and...and adopt Amendment **#2.** For reason, Mr. Speaker, I move that Amendment #1 which was
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Is there any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saving 'aye'...excuse me, Representative Getty."

previously adopted be tabled."

- Getty: "Was this the Amendment that was purely technical that we spoke of vesterday?"
- Friedrich: "This will replace Amendment #1 and it is technical in nature. It merely conforms to constitutional language by using the words 'provided by law or ordinance' as opposed to..."

Getty: "Alright, fine."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. 111 in favor signify by saying 'ave', opposed 'no'. those 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. The Gentleman adoption of Amendment #2. Is there the discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saving 'ave', opposed 'no'. The 'aves' have it. Amendment #2 adonted. Any further Amendments?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading, Constitutional Amendments.

 Senate Bill 1201 will be on Short Debate, Second Reading.

 Senate Bills...There has been an objection to Senate Bill

 910 which appeared on the Consent Calendar, Second Reading.

 We are going to hold that Bill on Second Reading, Second

 Day, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 910. Okay, page seven Second

 Reading. Returning to the Order of Senate Bill 256.

 Senate Bill 256, Regional Transportation Authority.

 Amendment #6. Representative McClain to close."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, don't
 you think we ought to wait until Mr. Ryan and Mr. Madigan
 return to the floor?"
- Speaker Daniels: "We are..."

has been spared."

Madigan to close."

- McClain: "The agreement was that after the meeting was over, then we would return to 256."
- Speaker Daniels: "Would you advise Representative Madigan that we are proceeding with the Bill? We'll wait for him to come to the floor. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mike McClain said I should give my Jack Hill speech.

 But the truth of the matter is, I just called up my son.

 He didn't even recognize my voice. I mean, let's face it.

 When Mike McClain wants to go home, it's time to go home."

 Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, would be that we were spared what the kid
- Speaker Daniels: "Page seven, Senate Bill 256. Second Reading.

 Amendment #6, discussion being held. Representative
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as explained previously, this Amendment embodies the proposal of Governor Thompson to adopt a gross receipts tax on oil companies to finance road construction and maintenance and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

mass transit statewide. This was the original proposal of the Governor. In my opinion, it has not received the proper degree of support from the Governor. It has not received the proper degree of support from the Speaker of this House. And therefore, many people, especially those on the Republican side of the aisle, have no appreciation for the magnitude of the problem and the degree of remedy that is needed in order to provide a viable mass transportation system throughout the northeastern Illinois region and to provide for a good long-term road program for Illinois. I'd recommend an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Vinson from DeWitt to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Gentleman didn't quite explain in the course of his speech is this is the five percent gross receipts tax. What...There are changes from the Governor's package. He has changed the structure substantially..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Vinson.

Representative Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you inform the freshman that he spoke in debate?"

Speaker Daniels: "Inform the whom?"

Jones: "The freshman, Vinson."

Speaker Daniels: "Oh. The Gentleman from DeWitt."

Vinson: "Yes, on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman did mention my name. I think the votes are there now..."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This Amendment, having received 55 'yes', 96 'no' and 1 'present', the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Ted Neyer et al, amends
 Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, Floor Amendment #7.

 Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Withdraw Amendment #7."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, Huff Henry, amends Senate Bill 256..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff on Floor Amendment #8.

 Representative Henry, Amendment #8. Representative Davis,
 your pleasure, Sir?"
- Davis: "Move to table #8."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #8.

 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #8 is tabled. Further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Ebbesen, amends Senate Bill 256..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen, Amendment #9. Moves to withdraw Amendment #9. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Ted Meyer et al..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, Amendment #10."
- Meyer: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #10."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment \$10. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #11. Greiman et al, amends Senate Bill 256 as amended."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, Amendment #11.

 Representative Greiman."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment merely directs the RTA without any liability to apportion its resources in these difficult days with an eye to bringing all of the various component parts into equality, perhaps equally bad and equally befouled, but nonetheless equal. And so that if the system shuts down, it shuts down reasonably at the same time. I am a suburban and city Legislator. My district covers both suburb and city, and I want to be fair to both components of my constituency. And I don't know of any other way except to require them all to do it fairly at the same time."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, on Amendment #11."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

- Leinenweber: "Representative Greiman, would your Amendment require the Chairman of the RTA or whatever the Body will be that runs mass transportation to follow the existing law by apportioning these...the money that the RTA receives from the various areas to the transportation facilities in those areas?"
- Greiman: "It doesn't...it doesn't change the obligations of the present law in doing that. What it does do is merely direct that if they see that the system is to shut down, they have to apportion the resources with equality so that the system itself will not be impaired one place and running in full form in the next place."
- Leinenweber: "Well, does it provide any mechanism to see that that is done? As I read the existing law, the RTA Board is supposed to spend the money it takes in in the respective areas. Now we've seen in recent days that the RTA Board, or at least the Chairman in apparent direct violation of the RTA Act has plowed all of the money into one particular

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

area to the total exclusion of certain other...or almost total exclusion of certain other areas. Does your Amendment provide a mechanism so that we can enforce the existing law?"

- Greiman: "Well, I think the language is...if it doesn't, you know, they won't hang them from the highest yardarm in Portsmith Harbor if they don't, but it directs them, and it is the intent of the General Assembly, and it doesn't change the allocation of their other assets nor does it change their sources of funding. It merely says that this should be their policy. And that is about what it is. It is a statement of policy direction for them."
- Leinenweber: "Well, I would suggest that if clear statutory language doesn't work, your Amendment won't help the matters either if they are bent upon a course of action to shut down certain areas at the expense of other areas."
- Greiman: "Well, you certainly may be right. I am not going to stay in Lou Hill's office though, so this is the best I can do."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I....one of the Sponsors of the Amendment. I would rise in support just to point out that this Amendment is especially important, I believe, to those districts which overlap the City of Chicago and suburban Cook County. You know, the 11th District, the 15th District, the 16th District, the 18th District, the 21st District, the 25th District and so forth. That, you know, we represent suburban as well as city constituencies, and we don't want to see the transit system shut down. And we don't want to see it, you know, part of the system favored over another part of the system. All of our constituents need to be served equally, and the purpose of

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

this Amendment is to direct the Regional Transportation Authority to make sure that all transit systems within the entire region are equitably provided for. And...and so that no one particular component of that system should be starved of funds in order to keep any other particular component of that system running. I think it is equitable and especially important to those districts overlapping Chicago and suburban Cook County."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, just ask for a favorable Roll Call. I don't think anything more has to be added. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #12, Ted Meyer et al, amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, Amendment #12."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment \$12 says that in the event there is a shortage of funds by the RTA to pay all the RTA carriers in full, the available money must be distributed in...proportion provided by the RTA's annual budget. The funds would be prorated according to the last annual budget. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "Representative Meyer, can you suggest any difference between Amendment #11 which was just adopted and your Amendment? I've read them and they appear to be susbtantially identical."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Meyer: "Substantially, but mine speaks specifically and talks about the annual budget. And it says that it must be proportional. It, in my mind, makes it more clear."

Levin: "I mean would there...what would be, in terms of the current situation today, what would be the difference in the application between Amendment #11 and Amendment #12?"

Meyer: "Yeah, we don't know because the RTA won't release the figures of how much the carriers are getting."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion?"

Meyer: "I urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment adopted.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #13, Ted Meyer - et al, amends

Senate Bill 256 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #13, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #13 is keep the commuter rails going. A commuter railroad may notify the RTA if it has not received the full amount of its subsidies provided for in the purchase and service agreement. If the RTA doesn't pay the full amount within 48 hours after the notice, the railroad may implement an emergency fare increase or a series of fare increases or a combination of fare increases and service cuts and be exempt from the requirements of a public hearing. increases or combinations of fare increases and service cuts must be sufficient to allow the railroad to recover the entire, and I underline the word entire, amount of the subsidies which would have been paid after the railroad's notice was given to recover the revenues lost due to the decline in ridership from fare increases. If the RTA pays the commuter railroads the entire amount of the subsidies

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

when the...after the emergency fare increase takes effect, then the railroad must go back to the original fare increase. This exempts fare increases from the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Monthly tickets may be redeemed on a prorate, or proportion, or may be accepted in partial payment. The RTA may not cease or curtail service on the Rock Island which is the only commuter rail that they operate. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a good Amendment. It is good for the people of the...in the RTA region, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #13. On that Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he'll yield."

Madigan: "If this Amendment is adopted, if this plan were to be implemented by the Rock Island Railroad, what would be the percentage increase for a ticket on the Rock Island Railroad?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "I am told 165 or 176%."

Madigan: "What would be the percentage increase on the ICG?"

Meyer: "About 90% assuming no service cutbacks."

Madigan: "What would be the percentage increase on the Southshore Railroad?"

Meyer: "The RTA had no estimate when we..."

Madigan: "200%. What would be the percentage increase on the Burlington?"

Meyer: "About 70%."

Madigan: "What would be the percentage increase on the Milwaukee Road?"

Meyer: "About 100%."

Madigan: "Okay, what would be the percentage increase on the

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Northwestern Railroad?"

Meyer: "About 40. The Norfolk and Western would be about 30%.

That is the most efficient railroad."

Madigan: "And the smallest."

Meyer: "And I believe the only one that runs through your district."

Madigan: "Right. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Representative McClain complained earlier in the day that there was a great amount of protest from the Republican side of the aisle and especially from Republican suburban Legislators regarding the lack of action to solve the problem of funding the Regional Transportation Authority in northeastern Illinois. Finally, today with this Amendment, we now have a plan emminating from the Republican side of the aisle. And what that plan says is that even though the RTA is composed of the Chicago Transit Authority, commuter railroad companies, and of suburban bus companies, even though the RTA represents all of those components of this problem, this Amendment will proceed to treat just one part of the problem - one part only. And what it suggests as a solution to the problem is that people who travel trains, as an example, people from Mr. Meyer's district, the Sponsor of the Amendment, who travel on trains will be So that the paying fare increases of 165%, 100%, 200%. solution to the problem is that the trains will continue to operate, the service will be available, but only to those who can pay 100% more for a ticket to ride on the train. Now maybe it is true that all of the current users of these trains for a short period of time could afford to pay these significant increases and fares to ride the trains. it is true that they could do that for a short time,

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

not everyone who rides those trains is a well-paid executive working in downtown Chicago. Those trains carry many people: well-paid executives, clerical workers, secretaries, students, the poor. And don't forget, you cannot isolate this as a problem of people traveling from a suburb, downtown to a job, and then home at might. Because there are a significant number of people today who are innercity people who travel these trains to their place of employment in the suburban area. And they are not well-salaried employees of companies. In general, their salaries are moderate to low. So that this proposal on its face only attempts to treat part of the problem. And the solution that it offers says that the well-healed, people with a great deal of money, in the long term, could pay these fares to get to work. But those of moderate income and low income, in due time, will not be able to ride these trains to their place of employment. So not only does it attempt to treat just part of the problem, the part that it does attempt to solve is shortsigthed, illfounded, and should be soundly rejected by this House of Representatives."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis." I constantly marvel at the Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. distinguished Minority Leader's ability to twist the facts and to twist the arguments to his own political purposes. is indeed strange to hear him mouthing these words. We're concerned about the secretaries and about the lower people who ride the rails, as well. But the alternative that the Minority Leader and that the irresponsible actions of the RTA Board in discouraging any service alterations or any equitable distribution of monies or any fare increases on their own in the past weeks and then again as recently as yesterday when it would have been

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

very simple for one of the Chicago Board Members to join with the suburban Members to make those alterations and to insure equitable distribution of the current sales tax monies owing and doing, puts the hollow ring again into the We're simply seeking here an Minority Leader's ear. ability to allow the trains to move to a position of the purchase of service agreement on a temporary basis until the problem is solved. And I can only tell you this, that the irresponsibility of the RTA Board has brought us this point. There was no need for this. We don't wish to raise the fares of the commuters who live in the collar counties and in the suburbs, but they have told us time and time again, the letters and the phone calls are flooding our offices on both sides of the aisle in the collar counties and suburban rails. Let us continue to ride the rails. We'll pay the full fares on a temporary basis. yes indeed, on July 1 the purchase of service agreements run out and all of the railroads have filed for full fair anyway, unless the problem is solved. Now the rails will continue to run, and it is far more equitable for a secretary or a lower paid worker to be able to get to rather than pay \$15 a day to drive on a crowded expressway and try and park in the City of Chicago. And it is obvious that the equity that the Minority Leader would seek by closing down suburban rails is to put a political advantage into his particular hand in the negotiations that are extent to the solution of the problem. The obstructionists to the solution of the problem do not rest on this side of They rest on the other side of the aisle in the Minority Leader's head and where he would have great wealth accrued to the system to continue it the way it is at the expense of the taxpayers of Illinois. It is a very good Amendment. It is an Amendment that we should put on. It

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

is responsible. The Sponsors of the Amendment and this side of the aisle are saying to their own constituents, 'We must temporarily raise your fares dramatically and cause you temporary, temporary pain and temporary suffering until we can bring reason from the distinguished Minority Leader's Chicago contingent. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz." Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is a difficult spot indeed for suburban commuters with regard to the hobson's choice that is presented. The Gentleman Will says that this increase is temporary. What we mean, of course, is for now until the end of eternity. That it is, because once in fact rail fares are increased to the full cost that the railroad incurs, the Gentleman knows well enough that there will never be any state subsidy from that point on. Of course, I feel badly about the state subsidy, because I recall two years ago when we sat here furious, unable to stop the movement that resulted in the elimination of the state subsidy, a movement that I regret to say was led by the Governor and led by the Mayor, and as a result of that, downstate got in step and accorded the people of the six-county area the dubious honor of being able to support themselves and their transportation by an increase in the sales tax. Now, if we look around the United States, we will see that in fact, public transportation cannot pay its own way. On the surface it looks very good to say that we will simply temporarily increase the fares. But in every major city in the United States, the old pattern emerges. The old circle emerges. Every time fares are increased, Fares are increased. riderships go down. As riderships go down, net revenue They are therefore required to have further increases in fares, and every time you have a

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

increase in fare, you have a further decline in revenue because more and more people drive and use other means. And so that once you're on that circle, there is no end to it. For that reason, Illinois and every other state in the country that has really tried it out went to some form of public subsidy of the transportation system. Well, I'm sorry that we dropped that two years ago. But a having been made two years ago is no reason to ignore the true facts. We ought to go back to what we had two We ought to have a state subsidy for transportation in the six-county area. It is the only possible way and I do not maintain a public transportation system, believe that I would be doing any service to mу letting them pay the full cost of constituents bγ transportation, then have that vicious cycle begin again, declining ridership, decrease in net income, increases, further decline. It is a path and a vicious circle that has been disproved in every city in the United This is a step in the wrong direction. Gentleman says we have reached this point. Let's just do Where has the Gentleman been the last it temporarily. Why could he not have done in the last few weeks, what he sort of promises will be done in the future which is some solution to this problem. I have no reason to believe that the Gentleman will be any more conscientious in attention to this problem in the next few weeks than he has in the last few weeks, and I am very sure that if fact we permit this to go on, if in fact we permit the carriers to raise their fares to the full cost that required for their transportation system, that there will never again be any effort toward public subsidy of transportation in northern Illinois. And without that subsidy, the whole thing is due for failure.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

and reluctantly, I must rise in opposition to this and say why not do now what they say will be done in the future. This is a vicious and false path, and I urge my colleagues to reject it."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Representative Meyer, can you give me any idea of what the current fares are on any of the railroads?"

Meyer: "I can only tell you the Rock Island, which I ride downtown is a \$1.40 from the 91st Street train station."

Ewing: "And how far is that downtown?"

Meyer: "Oh, eight to nine miles."

Ewing: "I see, and would you...does the state provide you a free parking place downtown?"

Meyer: "Does the state?"

Ewing: "Or anybody provide you a parking place if you go downtown?"

Meyer: "No, I don't ... I'm not following the gist ... "

Ewing: "Alright, let's change the question. That's...if you drive your car downtown, of course, you have to find your own parking place. Right?"

Never: "Correct."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it is time we heard from somebody downstate. We know what the other side of the aisle wants. They want us to pick up the tab for mass transportation in the suburban and in Cook County. They have refused ever since last fall, when we talked about reform, to do anything. They won't raise rates. They won't cut uneeded service. All they're waiting for is a big blank check. Now all of us from downstate know that our constituents can't get their car out of the garage and

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

drive to work for \$1.40. We can't park...you can't park downtown for \$6.00 probably a day, and you say doubling the fare is inadequate? It is just about on a par with what it costs us downstate to go to work. When you people are ready to make some reforms, I think you'll see the rest of this state is willing to look at subsidizing mass transportation. You haven't moved one inch, and I hope nobody on this side moves an inch until you get off of it over there. What is fair is fair. It is not fair for the downstate taxpayers to pick up that \$1.40 for the commuters from the suburbs or from the people from the And when you finally get that message, we'll inner city. solve this problem. Until you do, I don't think anything is going to happen, or I hope not."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question or two?"
- Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."
- Lechowicz: "Would you be so kind and give the Membership, excuse me, be so kind to give the Membership of the General Assembly an approximate number of commuters that are affected by the seven respected railroads? As far as Chicago Northwestern with a 43% increase, how many commuters...do you have any figures as far as what's the normal daily ridership of the railroad?"
- Meyer: "Burlington Northern, 46,600; Chicago Northwestern, 100,000; Milwaukee Road, 39,750; Southshore, 8,000; ICG... IC Gulf, 60,575; Norfolk and Western, 3,700; and the Rock Island, 23,100."
- Lechowicz: "And could you also inform me as far as the duration of this immediate impact as far as cost, would this be a temporary thing, or this be until all of their operating

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

costs are on a normal basis?"

Meyer: "No, when the RTA begins to pay the regular subsidy as budgeted, then the fares would automatically drop."

Lechowicz: "To what level?"

Meyer: "To the pre...to the level that they are currently at prior to the raise. Today's level."

Lechowicz: "Well, presently, I believe that the commuters pay approximately 70% of the cost for operations on the commuter railroads. Now, my question to you, Sir, is the, would the level return back to 70% or 72%, and out of what fund would this be paid?"

Meyer: "Out of the RTA fund. That is assuming that there is no change in the statute, that the RTA fund is, through some miracle, refunded."

Lechowicz: "Well, my point is under Amendment #13 there are no revenue sources or additional revenue sources."

Meyer: "The sales tax. They're continuing to collect the sales tax."

Lechowicz: "Every figure that I have looked at, and that is also...may I speak to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker? figure that I have looked at in reference to the RTA situation specifically from the Department of Transportation and also our own Transportation Study Commission makes the reflection of a net loss starting in 1982 with a billion dollars of new money up through 1986. Unfortunately, I believe, the Amendment #13, what it is reflecting is asking that the direct cost be borne by the person who rides the trains from respective suburban into the City of Chicago and visa versa. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you are doing disservice for people who are just trying to get to their normal work place and back home. I believe that if General Assembly would really take a serious look and be a

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

participant in a railroad where you have to go to work or where you have to come down to Springfield and be exposed to these types of costs on a daily basis, you would soundly reject this Amendment. How in the world do you feel ... do you feel for the people of the Southshore Railroad? you going to tell them that you're going to be experienced to a 223% increase in the cost of going to and from work? Does that sound logical? Does that sound reasonable? in the world can anybody that represents that segment and this state try to authorize an increase from 43...I'm sorry, from 28% to 223%? What a range. What an injustice. What is the answer? I personally believe that this Amendment is not the answer. ... You're doing is creating a disservice, a tremendous fiscal impact on the livelihood of 300,000 people in the suburban areas. 300,000 people that supply a tremendous amount of revenue to the General Revenue Fund of this state. A tremendous amount of revenue that is generated from the businesses that they work for. from the amount of attitude that is given as far as the business impedance in this state. You're talking about the media makers, the image makers that are qoing to affected besides the ordinary clerical people that provide the day to day private enterprise system in this state. The Republican Party should be totally ashamed of this type of an Amendment. You're not providing the leadership that is necessary to provide an adequate transportation program and an adequate road program for the State of Illinois. will tell you this, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment will not solve any type of crisis. You're just creating an additional crisis for the 300,000 commuters that have to go to work on a day to If you were exposed to this, you would never forget who put this on you, and I strongly recommend a 'no' vote."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Speaker of the House, Representative Ryan."
Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I just rise for the purpose of an announcement. I
think it may be important to all of you. I just left the
Governor's office, and we've just had word that the Federal
Appeals Court has stayed the orders and that the commuter
lines will operate over the weekend. So I think that is as
far as it goes. They're going to re...go back into court
on Monday afternoon sometime, or Monday morning. So I
think it is important that we proceed with this Bill and
this Amendment and put it on the Bill and have the Bill in

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Speaker Ryan, for that announcement.

The Federal...the Federal Appeals Court has stayed the ruling of the lower court, so the rails will not close down this weekend. Thank you, Speaker Ryan."

passage stage for Monday afternoon."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am reminded every time we come to this issue of old quotation by Winston Churchill to the effect that the virtue of socialism is that its shares its miseries And every time we deal with this issue, that is what we come down to, sharing of miseries and burdens equally. I think that it is time we break out of that mold if we only break out of it in an emergency fashion. The Amendment that we are now discussing is an emergency a measure designed to insure that the commuter railroads can stay up, can continue to function, that the region will not be tied up in a terrible transit crisis. What the Gentleman from Cook, the Minority Leader, to discuss earlier was that every time we come to a discussion on RTA problems he discusses revenue, and we

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

discuss structure. We discuss structure because we believe that it is important in structure how revenue is spent. And if revenue is going to be wasted, if revenue is not going to be effectively spent on the delivery of mass transportation, then why raise revenue? We're only throwing it away if it cannot provide efficient mass transportation. Now he bemoaned the fact that some of his constituents who may not be well off financially may not be able to pay these rates, and I would call his attention to statements made by CTA staff in the summit discussions in the City Hall a week ago where CTA staff said to House Republican staff that the city does not care about the commuter railroads, that the city will not purchase service from the commuter railroads under any circumstances. that is the attitude of the CTA staff, if that is the attitude of Chicago's administrative heirarchy. wonder why Mr. Madigan sheds those crocodile tears today. Madigan chose not even to care enough to go into bankruptcy court yesterday to try to deal with the problem of the commuter railroads. He has evidenced...consistently and continually his lack of concern about this problem. And what we are simply saying in this Amendment. Speaker, what we..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Vinson, one second please. Representative Zito."

Zito: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Zito: "I would appreciate the Gentleman confining his comments to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, would you confine your comments to the Amendment please, Sir?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment is an emergency fare increase for the commuter railroads, and Mr. Madigan

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- opposes the Amendment. And chose not to go into bankruptcy court to try to keep the commuter courts up yesterday."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Vinson, excuse me, Sir. Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman, now flagrantly in violation of our rules, using another Gentleman's name in debate improperly in a matter that does not at all address the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative..."
- Getty: "I think the Membership would like to get out of here.

 Why not get on with the matter, stick to the subject at hand."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, would you please limit your remarks to the Bill. Proceed, Sir."
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will. What Mr. Madigan did yesterday though, is pale in magnitude by what the RTA Board has done in pouring money into the CTA in violation of statute and in violation of their own ordinances."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Representative Vinson....Gentleman, Ladies and Gentleman, you're on television in case you're wondering right now. We're trying to get this over. Representative Vinson, would you please limit your remarks to the Amendment so that we can move on."
- Vinson: "Yes, and what we are trying to do here is to get enough revenue to keep those commuter railroads up despite the fact that the RTA, the CTA, and Mr. Hill in particular want to do nothing more but to try to blackmail the suburbanites into supporting and to bailing out the CTA which they refuse to run in an efficient manner. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Amendment will rescue us from that situation. With this Amendment we can keep the commuter railroads up. We can keep the commuter railroads going.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

We can keep a great city and a great region functioning. And with this Amendment, we can discuss in an air not tinged by crisis, no atmosphere of crisis, no atmosphere of shut down. We can discuss the issues that are necessary. And I would simply echo Mr. Ewing's remarks who so aptly chaired the Committee of this House used to investigate earlier this year the CTA. I would echo his remarks when the Gentlemen from Chicago are willing to understand that reforms in structure and reforms in the operation of mass transit are necessary if we are going to put state or regional money into this system, then I believe every Member of the General Assembly is willing to recognize the need to fund mass transit. But if we are going to raise taxes that cannot be used to obtain mass transportation, then I, like Mr. Ewing, would share the fact that we ought not do that. I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move
the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative
Meyer to close."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going home this weekend, and I am going to go to Mayor Byrne's Irish Pestival which is to be held in my ward in Ridge Park, a park which I grew up in as a kid, and there are going to be several thousand people there. I won't know them all, but I will know a lot of them. And I'll look them in the eye and those that ride the commuter railroads will say, 'We're unhappy, but at least the railroad is running.' Mr. Madigan and the Democratic Leadership proposed Amendment #6 earlier today.

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

That \$600,000,000 turkey got 55 votes. Their present answer is stop the commuter rails. If we can't get all the dough, well then nobody else...everybody should suffer. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Amendment. It is going to go a long way to solving the problems. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are inefficiencies on the commuter rails. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #13. The question is 'Shall Amendment #3 (sic) be adopted?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The timer is on for explanation of vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jones, and the TV lights are off on explanation of vote."

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jones: "Thank you, In explaining my vote, I happen to represent the 28th Legislative District, too. And I haven't received any complaints from constituency concerning the shut down of the commuter rail. And I will be a rich pauper by Irish And I will be with Mayor Byrne, but no one friends. Ted. in the district has complained about the shut down of the We cannot isolate the commuter rail from commuter rail. the other mass transit problems in the six county area. The poor, the elderly, the disadvantaged throughout that area need transportation as well. I haven't heard one word said by the Sponsor of this Amendment of those individuals on the other side of the aisle about the bus lines that failed in Joliet or the suburban bus line is south suburban ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Jones: "Yeah, thank you. In south suburban Cook County or the bus line in Aurora. This is a class Amendment to take care

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

of only those individuals who can afford to pay the astronomical fee. But I didn't hear the Sponsor or the Speaker of the House say that the Governor was putting this astronomical fare hike on people who cannot afford to. We have elderly persons on fixed incomes in the 28th Legislative District, Representative Meyer..."

- Speaker Daniels: "Please bring your remarks to a close, will you, Sir?"
- Jones: "Yeah, thank you, that cannot afford this very high cost you're trying to showe down their throat. It is unfair, and you should each one be ashamed of yourself on the other side."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Reed, to explain her vote. Timer's on, Ma'am."
- Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll tell you that I am the last one to be ashamed of my 'yes' vote.

 I represent a commuter constituency that is 30 miles from Chicago. With a 150% increase, the fare will raise from \$3.25 to \$4.50 or \$0.75 one way, as opposed to a \$6.00 parking fee in the City of Chicago, a \$3.25 round trip ride which is \$9.25 if we were under existing rates. I am not ashamed to cast my vote for 150% increase in cost."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber. The timer's on, Sir."
- Leinenweber: "Yeah, I just want to make a comment. One of the Gentleman preceding me mentioned the Joliet bus line. We're not trying to do anything to help the Joliet bus passengers. We're trying to help the people in Joliet and the other areas that have to travel to the Loop or somewhere along the Rock Island Line. Well, I just want to tell you this. We are trying to help them. Our State's Attorney is in court trying to make the Chairman of the RTA live up to the law, something he refuses to do right up to

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

this very moment. I don't know if we'll get a fair court hearing because we can't have venue in a county other than...Cook County, the City of Chicago. But we're going to try to get our money that we're rightfully due to will County so that our buses can run and so that our subsidy from the RTA that our people continue to pay taxes for can go to our passengers so that they once again can have lower train fares and bus fares. This is a temporary measure. You can bet your life it is temporary because if we can get out of that RTA..."

Speaker Daniels: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

- Leinenweber: "If we can get out of the RTA and levy our own tax,
 we'll run our own buses and our own trains, an do a lot
 better job than the RTA does."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Early on the Gentleman that sponsored the Amendment had no idea of the impact of what his Amendment would have on the other commuter lines, and certainly if the Amendment allows the passenger now to pick up all of the costs, you'll find that what we're doing is underwriting all of the costs of the railroads and then the other work that the railroad does will actually go into the profit line. You'll find now that five of the seven railroads have been put into a profit position because of the subsidies, and this would just further that situation. I solicit your 'no' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Barr: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that this Amendment was drafted with the assistance of partners of mine who are registered lobbyist for the commuter railroad, and under those circumstances, I feel it

62nd Legislative Day

- June 12, 1981
- would not be proper for me to vote, and so I vote present."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I'm sick and tire of hearing my downstate colleagues perpetuating the fallacy that they have been picking up the tab for our transportation. Now, my constituents pay the highest sales tax in this state. They pay the highest fairs in the country. So don't perpetuate that fallacy. Now, if you believe that this fair raise is temporary, you believe in the Fair God Mother and, you believe that, I have any say so, as far as the work schedule here."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, to explain his vote. The timer is on."
- Huskey: "Well, I heard a couple of remarks, one saying something about the south suburban Cook County bus line being closed. My bus line is closed in my town. I have had one call. That is from the owner of the bus line asking if they couldn't do something about it. He don't know what he going to do to get money to keep his garage open. He needs money for overhead. That is the only call. I didn't hear from any of the riders, if they have any riders. But I will say this about the railroad. 80% of the railroad in my communty is paid by the fares. So we will certainly, and the riders would certainly be happy to pay the other 20% to stay away from all this confusion and give That is us back our 1% sales tax. it." Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, to explain his vote. The timer's on."
- Keane: "Well, as the only full blooded Irishman from the 28th
 District, I thought that I would extend a real invitation

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

to Irish Day tomorrow. One of the things that I wanted to point out to my fellow Members is that in the 28th District at the present time it cost \$40...in excess of \$40 for a monthly pass. The secretary who makes \$700 to \$900 will end up paying in excess of somewhere between \$100 and \$150 a month to go nine miles after income tax is taken out. If you don't think that this has a major economic impact, not only on that secretary or on that clerical worker, but also on the company that she works for, you're mistaken. I this going to have a very, very sorrow...sorry impact both individually and upon commerce in the Chicago area."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Oblinger to explain her vote."
- Oblinger: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly,

 I am attacking this from a different program. All I hear
 from Chicago and the suburbs is how much it is going to
 cost our secretaries and our moderate salary. Do you know
 that half of the secretaries that work here in this
 building come from Lincoln, from Litchfield, from Sherman,
 from Cantral, and they pay for their own fares. And they
 don't make anything over \$700 or \$800. So why are you
 feeling so sorry for one group of moderate salary people.
 We have to put up with it here. They can do it for a
 while."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On Amendment #13 there are 100 voting 'aye', 58 'no', two voting 'present', and 17 absent. This Bill...this Amendment having received a Majority of vote is hereby declared adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #14, Grossi, amends Senate Bill 256 as amended."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The TV light is on. Representative Grossi withdraws Amendment #14. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #15, Grossi - et al, amends..." Speaker Daniels: "Representative Grossi, Amendment #15. Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Representative Giorgi, Amendment #15." Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #15 is the North - South Highway on this Bond Bill. You know, you were talking about the RTA all afternoon, but this is really a Bond Authorization And what happened is that about three years ago the House and the Senate passed a \$40,000,000 appropriation for the North - South Highway, and the Governor vetoed it. you know Rockford is one of the few cities served by the Northwest Tollway, and Rockford has been forgotten in the Govennor's program. Now we've been promised the highway by Governor Green, Governor Stratton, Governor Ogilvie, and Governor Thompson. He's been up and promised the people enough money to build the North - South Highway. I have supported the bond issue transportation program from

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #15. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, on Amendment #15."

am going to support it, and I would

finished."

their inception. When we agree on a Bond Bill and a funding Bill for the Regional Transportation Authority, I

bond issue program so the North - South Highway can be

like support for

Vinson: "Again, I would oppose Amendment \$15 primarily because it is essential that we continue to affirm the will of this Assembly that we not link together in this Session mass transit in northeastern Illinois, and roads downstate. The two issues ought to stand on their own merits so the taxpayers can be represented on each issue. I would urge defeat of the Amendment."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only echo what Representative

Vinson just said. This is not the place for this

Amendment. I am sympathetic to Representative Giorgi's

project, but this certainly is not the place for it, and I

would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the Speaker from...Will...DeWitt County mentioned that downstate roads shouldn't be tied to an eastern...northeastern transit problem. Every solution broached by the Governor of this state, by the Mayor of Chicago, and every leader in this House has tied the two together...they're going to be tied together. I am going to support it, and I want support for our North — South Highway."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #15. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir." Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment #15 there are 67 voting 'aye', 76 'no', one 'present'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I would like to Poll the Absentees..."

Speaker Daniels: "Requests a Poll of the Absentees. Poll the Absentees, Mr. Clerk. There are 22 Amendments to this Bill. We are now on Amendment \$15. We will finish the Bill before we adjourn, so you make your plans accordingly. Proceed with the Poll of the Absentees. Representative Dunn, John Dunn."

Dunn: "Please change me from 'aye' to 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Dunn, John Dunn, from

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

'aye' to 'no'. Proceed with a Poll of the Absentees.
Representative Beatty from Cook."

Beatty: "Change me to 'no'."

- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Beatty from Cook from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed with a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Abramson, Bluthardt, Bradley, Capparelli, Christensen, Darrow, Deuster, Epton, Ewell, Flinn, Garmisa, Henry, Jackson, Jones, Katz, Kosinski, Kucharski, Margalus, Martire, Peters, Rea, Redmond, Rhem, Rigney, Sandquist, Slape, Stearney, Swanstrom, Telcser, Terzich, Van Duyne, White, and Yourell."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Darrow as 'aye'.

 Representative Katz as 'aye'. Representative Emil Jones as 'aye'. Representative Leverenz change from 'aye' to 'no'.

 Representative Rhem to 'aye'. Any further changes, additions, corrections, deletions, alterations? Mr. Clerk, what's our count? There are 68 'ayes', 79 'nos'. This question having failed to receive the necessary votes is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #16, Younge, amends Senate Bill 256..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Younge, Amendment #16."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #16 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #17, Barkhausen, amends Senate
 Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barkhausen on Amendment #17."
- Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, I would request to withdraw Amendment..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdraw Amendment #17. Further Amendments?"
 Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #18, Barkhausen, amends Senate

Bill..."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barkhausen, Amendment #18."

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #18 is similar to Amendment #13 adopted a few moments ago only that it applies to carriers other than commuter railroads under the RTA. Like Amendment #13 it authorizes on a temporary, and I emphasize temporary, basis. Emergency fare increases to permit fares to rise so that revenues from fares and any other sources will equal costs. In addition to the problems that we have with the potential for the commuter railroads going out of business in the near future, we also face the prospect of suburban bus companies which have already ceased operation and the possibilities that others will follow suit. FOR that reason, I felt it necessary to introduce this Amendment so that the temporary fare increases that we seek to authorize by this Bill will apply not only to the commuter railroads, but to other carriers as well. I would be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #18. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #18 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #18 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #19, Barkhausen, amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barkhausen, Amendment #19."

Barkhausen: "I would ask that Amendment #19 be withdrawn."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #19 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #20, Leverenz, amends Senate Bill 256 on page..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #20, Representative Leverenz withdraws #20. It is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #21, Ted Meyer - et al, amends Senate Bill 256..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #21, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #21."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #21 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #22, Ted Meyer - et al, amends..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, #22."

Meyer: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #22."

Speaker Daniels: "#22 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Conti on Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 378, Giorgi; 379, Giorgi."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have two Resolutions pertaining to the same subject commending two brothers by Representative Giorgi. House Resolution 378 commends Joe 'Sarnelia'. At the age of 17 bowled a 300 game. In his career has bowled 22 300 games and for over 25 years of a composite average of 198. And his brother, Paul J. 'Sarnelia' of Rockford on House Resolution 379 by the same Sponsor won the bowling congress tournaments for 27 years and has placed in the money 75% of these tournaments. It is about the only thing we've agreed on this whole Session on these Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1913, Huskey - J.J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill."

62nd Legislative Day

June 12, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Adjournment Resolution, Representative Collins.

 For Motion...Adjournment Motion."
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House now stand adjourned until Monday, June 15, at the hour of 12 noon."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved that the House stand adjourned until Monday, June 15, at the hour of noon. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned until Monday, June 15, at the hour of 12 noon."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 12, 1981

PAGE

HB-1913	1sT	READING	PAGE	180
SB-0061	2ND	READING	PAGE	6
SB-0062	2ND	READING	PAGE	134
SB-0065	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0066	3RD	READING		146
			PAGE	
SB-0098	2ND	READING	PAGE	141
SB-0116	2ND	READING	PAGE	71
SB-0118	2ND	READING	PAGE	73
SB-0155	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0168	2ND	READING	PAGE	7
SB-0170	2ND	READING	PAGE	12
SB-0172	2ND	READING	PAGE	76
SB-0186	2ND	READING	PAGE	144
SB-0209	2ND	READING	PAGE	13
SB-0209	2ND	READING		
			PAGE	15
SB-0227	2ND	READING	PAGE	17
SB-0255	2ND	READING	PAGE	74
SB-0256	2ND	READING	PAGE	17
	2ND	READING	PAGE	150
SB-0263	2ND	READING	PAGE	54
SB-0267	3RD	READING	PAGE	59
SB-0270	2ND	READING	PAGE	55
SB-0295	2ND	READING		73
			PAGE	
SB-0355	2ND	READING	PAGE	55
	2 N D	READING	PAGE	77
SB-0377	3RD	READING	PAGE	60
SB-0384	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0390	2ND	READING	PAGE	56
SB-0404	2ND	READING	PAGE	59
SB-0405	2ND	READING	PAGE	58
SB-0414	3RD	READING	PAGE	69
SB-0455	2ND	READING	PAGE	78
SB-0457	2ND	READING	PAGE	98
SB-0475	2ND	READING	PAGE	78
SB-0476	3RD	READING	PAGE	61
SB-0477	2ND	READING	PAGE	103
SB-0512	2ND	READING	PAGE	94
SB-0527	2ND	READING	PAGE	144
SB-0528	3RD	READING	PAGE	62
SB-0575	2ND	READING	PAGE	73
SB-0576	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
5B-0579	2ND			74
SB-0579		READING	PAGE	
	2ND	READING	PAGE	98
SB-0585	2ND	READING	PAGE	102
SB-0587	2ND	READING	PAGE	99
SB-0591	2ND	READING	PAGE	100
SB0596	2ND	READING	PAGE	74
SB-0611	2ND	READING	PAGE	79
SB-0614	2ND	READING	PAGE	85
SB-0639	2ND	READING	PAGE	79
SB-0642	2ND	READING	PAGE	85
SB-0674	2ND			
		READING	PAGE	79
SB-0714	2ND	READING	PAGE	83
SB-0717	2ND	READING	PAGE	83
SB-0769	2ND	READING	PAGE	133
SB-0777	2ND	READING	PAGE	141
SB-0783	2ND	READING	PAGE	63
	3RD	READING	PAGE	63
SB-0794	2ND	READING	PAGE	81
SB-0799	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0733	2ND	READING	PAGE	128
SB-0841				
	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0875	2ND	READING	PAGE	129
SB-0899	3RD	READING	PAGE	64
SB-0904	3RD	READING	PAGE	65

JUNE 12, 1981

SB-0910	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-0911	2ND	READING	PAGE	81
SB-0920	2ND	READING	PAGE	75
SB-0922	2ND	READING	PAGE	82
SB-0925	2ND	READING	PAGE	82
SB-0953	2ND	READING	PAGE	81
SB-0957	2ND	READING	PAGE	81
SB-0989	2ND	READING	PAGE	82
SB-0992	2ND	READING	PAGE	82
	2ND	READING	PAGE	132
SB-1034	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-1060	2ND	READING	PAGE	83
SB-1073	3RD	READING	PAGE	66
SB-1085	2ND	READING	PAGE	145
SB-1086	2ND	READING	PAGE	83
SB-1103	2ND	READING	PAGE	84
SB-1108	2ND	READING	PAGE	127
SB-1109	2ND	READING	PAGE	86
SB-1110	2ND	READING	PAGE	85
SB-1132	2ND	READING	PAGE	147
SB-1138	2ND	READING	PAGE	148
SB-1143	2ND	READING	PAGE	85
SB-1145	2ND	READING	PAGE	75
SB-1146	2ND	READING	PAGE	148
SB-1147	2ND	READING	PAGE	123
SB-1149	2ND	READING	PAGE	125
SB-1198	2ND	READING	PAGE	122
SB-1201	2ND	READING	PAGE	148
*HJR-0015	3RD	READING	PAGE	148

SUBJECT NATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER SPREEN	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE DIPRINA IN CHAIR	PAGE	1
SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	4
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	6
RECESS	PAGE	52
HOUSE RECONVENES - REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	53
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	56
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	180
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	181

PAGE