127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Father Hugh Cassidy from the Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church of Springfield, Illinois. Father Cassidy."
- Pather Cassidy: "God, our Father, we ask of You a share in the faith of our fathers. Give these Members of the House of Representatives courage to put their lives into Your hands, trusting themselves and those they love to Your wisdom, providence and love. Guide them in their deliberations. Help them to make right decisions, so that the world may be filled with faith and love. May Your blessing come upon them today and always. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Father. We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Slape."
- Slape et al: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 161 Members answering the Roll, a guorum of the House is present. Are there any excused absences, Representative Getty?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I have not received any requests for such.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "No requests, at this time, from Representative Getty. Representative Telcser. None. The record will so indicate. On the Calendar on page two under the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 1256, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1452, Representative Telcser. What's your pleasure, Representative? Representative Telcser, you want the Bill read? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser on Senate Bill 1452."

- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1452 amends the Pension Code to allow two of the funds who not now have the ability to purchase 'Israel' Bonds, I think they're a teacher's bond funds - both downstate and Chicago teachers. Secondly, the Bill puts money market funds into the list of available investments. 2516, I believe was the number, Representative Daniels, out of the House, dealing with changing pension investment authorities, and that was left out of the original Bill. We're amending it into Senate Bill 1452. Thirdly, 1452 includes an Amendment we adopted last Thursday, allowing trustees to participate by buying in both their end of the contribution and the state's contribution. That is what Senate Bill 1452 is, Mr. Speaker. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Byan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill... Whoops. Representative Schraeder, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr....Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week I introduced an Amendment to this Bill, but it didn't come up until after it was moved...moved to Third, and I wonder if the Sponsor will be so kind as to let me have a run at the Amendment, at this time."
- Speaker Byan: "Representative Telcser, did you understand what the Gentleman said? He said that he had an Amendment last week prepared...or, that wasn't ready when you called the Bill. You moved it to Third. He wants to know if you'll take the Bill back to Second to give him a run at his Amendment."

Telcser: "I haven't seen the Amendment, but I would certainly

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

give the Gentleman the courtesy. If you want me to take it out of the record now, and I'll talk to you, then we'll take it up again tomorrow, if you want."

- Speaker Ryan: "Did you want to remove it? Did you want to move it back to the Order of Second Reading?"
- Telcser: "Well, let's...let's take it out...put it back on Second, and I'll... Or, take it out of the record. Let me talk to Representative..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1579,

 Representative Oblinger. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Sp...Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this is the Bill that corrected a technical error which said that people who retired on January 1, 1977, and it added 'on or before'. The three Amendments: number one is 2516, House Bill 2516, which passed the House with a good majority, but failed in the Senate, is the investment Bill for the various pension funds; the other Amendment has to do with allowing Representative Schisler to repay the money to the Pension Fund and get credit for it; and the fourth one is showing that the state is under no mandate. I would request the passage of 1579."
- Speaker Ryan: "There any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1579 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1593, Representative McMaster. Representative McMaster on 1593.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

of the Calendar under the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1242, Representative Stearney. Senate Bill 1247, Representative Dwight Out of the record. Priedrich. Time out. Out of the record. 1259. Representative Christensen. Out of the record. 1260. Representative Christensen. Out of the record. 1292, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. 1305, Representative Ewin...Ewing. Out of the record. 1358, Representative Stuffle. Senate Bill 1358. Representative. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1367, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act to exempt taxation receipts from the sale of gas or electricity or transmission of messages to school districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, last week when the Bill was moved to Third Reading, Representative Hannig had a...an Amendment that was submitted, but yet not printed. And I told him that I would bring the Bill back to Second Reading for, you know, the purpose of consideration of his Amendment because of that delay; and thereby, I would like to have leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 1367 to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections?

Hearing none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 1367 is now on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Hannig, amends Senate Bill 1367..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hannig on Amendment #5."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
Amendment would add, 'church or religious denomination' to
the definition of those institutions which would be exempt
from the message tax and the gas tax. I talked this over

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

with the Senate Sponsor. He's in agreement. I thank Representative Terzich for the opportunity to bring the Bill back so I could offer this Amendment, and I would move for its adoption."

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

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative Hannig, aren't there some other institutions that probably ought to be added to this exemption?"

Hannig: "Pardon me. I didn't hear your question."

vinson: "Aren't there some other institutions that probably ought
 to be added to this exemption? I mean, why should we favor
 churches over veterans' groups?"

Hannig: "The...The Amendment that I'm offering addresses the institution of churches, and I, you know, have no objection to the veterans; but, that's not my... priority by this Amendment. If you would like to offer that Amendment, certainly you could do so."

Vinson: "Will you hold the Bill on Second Reading so I can have that drafted?"

Hannig: "It's not my Bill."

Vinson: "Who's the Sponsor? Will you ask the Sponsor if he'll hold it on Second Reading so I can draft that? Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I certainly have no problem with churches getting this particular tax break. I think it's appropriate that they do. But, until the Sponsor of the Amendment is willing to draft the Amendment so that other not-for-profit groups who have good intentions and good missions in life are added to the Amendment, I would suggest we ought to defeat it. Now, Representative DiPrima is in the back of the room, there. He normally watches out for the veterans, and I would suggest to Representative

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

DiPrima that he stand up now and speak for the veterans. And, until the veteran groups are added to this Amendment, we ought not adopt the Amendment. There are conservation groups that ought to be...that ought to be protected by the Indeed, I would argue that any group exempted from federal income tax, under 501 C3, certainly ought to be allowed the exemption that this Amendment would provide. Why should we tax some groups that are not-for-profit, well intentioned groups, ta...and at the same time tax others? It's improper. It's...It's special legislation. creates a set of distinctions that are wrong, and we ought to defeat this Amendment until every 501 C3, well-intentioned group, be it the League of Women Voters, the veterans' groups, be it the...the conservations groups; We ought to defend...We certainly the veterans' group. ought to defeat this Amendment until the veterans receive the same treatment as the...as the church groups in this Amendment, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This dis...discussion on this Amendment took place in the Revenue Committee, and it was a concensus there that this would be a proper Amendment to submit to the House. And Representative Hannig has gone forward with the Amendment, and I wholeheartedly endorse the Amendment as he's...as drafted and ask for its support."
- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr."
- Barr: "Mr. Speaker, we don't have copies of that Amendment here.

 Has it been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? Yes, it has, Representative Barr.

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- Representative Getty, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Getty: "To ask some questions of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman indicates he'll yield."
- Getty: "Mr. Hannig, I wonder if you would tell us what you mean by 'church or religious denomination', and explain the difference."
- Hannig: "In a church or religious denomination, would be an organization which is a religious organization which is exempt under the IRS definitions for that..."
- Getty: "Well, then, what is a religious denomination?"
- Hannig: "I think that...that basically a church and a religious denomination would be one and the same."
- Getty: "The language, then, is surplus, that you're suggesting.

 Because, your language is 'church or religious denomination'."
- Hannig: "I think that they both explain the same...same group of individuals, or same group, for the most part."
- Getty: "Well, could you mean, by that, a religion that does not have churches, but is still considered to be a religion?"
- Hannig: "I think that would be correct. It would not have to physically have a church building to be considered a church."
- Getty: "All right. So, the religious educational or charitable uses or purposes could be for either a religion that has a church or a religion that doesn't have a church; but, it could not include a non-religious organization that claim to have a church. Is that correct?"
- Hannig: "I'm not certain that I followed your line of questioning."
- Getty: "Well, you say 'church or religious denomination'."
- Hannig: "That's correct."
- Getty: "All right. Now, I... I can understand that there are some

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

religious denominations that do not have churches, but you use both phrases. Instead of just saying 'religious denomination', you seem to have to make some distinction."

Hannig: "This is the way the Bill was drafted. It's my intention, by the Bill, to basically address the question of churches and parochial schools and these organizations which are generally accepted and are recognized under the IRS as tax-exempt religious organizations, church organizations."

Getty: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Hannig, the language of the first portion of the new part that would be inserted by this Amendment leaves me some cause for concern, where it's talking about the transmission of messages exclusively for religious, educational or charitable uses. Do you feel that, if this were to pass, that this would give some license to monitor what kinds of messages were transmitted that would be, therefore, tax exempt or not tax exempt. You see my concern?"

Hannig: "I'm not certain that I totally follow your question.

The rules regarding your civil rights and what is protected and...as such, would not be interfered with by this...by this Act. This is simply trying to exempt certain operations from the state tax. I'm not trying to..."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I understand your purpose."

Hannig: "I'm not trying to give anyone a...a right to wire-tap or anything of this nature."

Satterthwaite: "I understand that purpose, but, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do feel that the language,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

particularly in that Section from lines 5 to line 8 of the Amendment, leave some serious guestions about whether or not we would be opening a door to, in fact, monitor the kinds of messages and conversations that would be going on in order to determine whether they were for these charitable purposes or were they...whether they were for some other purpose. And, I would suggest that even our religious institutions might not want to open the door to that possibility."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hanniq, to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is basically a simple Bill. It would exclude churches, parochial schools and the like from the that we now charge them on electricity and the message tax and the tax on natural gas. Now, I agree with Representative Vinson, to a point. I would like to see veterans and other organizations included, and I would hope that someday we could come back to this chamber and exempt those bodies from this tax. But I think that we have to take a step of exempting one organization at a time, and my effort here is simply to ... to exempt the churches and the parochial schools, and it's not to offer an exemption to each and every...every operation, at this time; although, I would support those at a later date. I think that if those individuals would like to draft the Amendments and them to Bills, there are still Bills pending before the House, and we still have well over a week's work certainly, they will be able to find vehicles to that But, I would ask that we do adopt this Amendment extent. today, and add schools and paro...parochial schools and churches to the definition which we are attempting to exempt. I would ask for your favorable vote, and I would

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

ask the Speaker, if I could have a Roll Call, please."

Speaker Ryan: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1367 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 80 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present', and Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1365 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1375, Representative

Karpiel. Representative Karpiel, Senate Bill 1375. You

want it read, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Development Credit Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1375 amends the Development Credit Corporation Act. This Act authorized the creation of a corporation in which financial institutions are allowed to invest for the purpose making loans to small and medium size businesses. was never used, because its provisions restricts the amount an institution can invest; and, therefore, it was not sufficient capitalization for possible to gain the Development Credit Corporation to survive. The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Act to encourage financial institutions to invest in the Development Credit Corporation which, in turn, will provide a source of capital not otherwise available to small or medium size We hope that this will help to stimulate the economic growth and the creation of jobs in Illinois. There is no state funds involved. Senate Bill 1375 follows the recommendations made by a 1980 legislative small business conference on capital formation.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Development Commission is...supports this Bill, as does the Small Business Council of the State Chamber of Commerce. It had bipartisan sponsors in the Senate, and was passed by a 57 to zero vote. It's a bipartisan Bill in the House. I know of no opposition, and I appreciate your affirmative vote."

Speaker Byan: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, on Senate Bill 1375."

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

Speaker Ryan: "She indicates she will."

McPike: "Currently, we have a Development Credit Corporation and law. Is that not correct?"

Karpiel: "Yes, it is."

McPike: "Then, how does this change that?"

Karpiel: "Well. this makes it...this nakes changes. Representative, to make it a more functional Act. present Act has restrictions in it that restrict the amount of money that a financial institution can invest in corporation; and, in some of the restrictions, it also places a burden, so to speak, on small institutions in which they would really not be able to participate. therefore, making the Credit Corporation not very viable. because almost all of the funds would have to come from very large institutions."

McPike: "Why would a financial institution invest in the De...in this Development Credit Corporation with the passage of this law? What makes it different that would want...that a financial institution would, in the future, wish to invest? You indicated that the problem was that no financial institutions are investing in our Development Credit Corporation today. With the change of this law, why, then, would a financial institution wish to invest in a Development Credit Corporation? Why wouldn't a financial

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

institution continue to invest in government securities, or in normal business activities? Why would it invest in this?"

Karpiel: "Well, Representative, I think that's kind of a two-part question. First of all, the reason that the credit corporation has never been formed in Illinois is because of some of the restrictions making it almost impossible for small banks to be a part of the credit corporation, and also making it impossible to assimilate make the credit corporation viable. capitalization to Aς to why an institution would want to invest in a credit corporation, it would be to help, perhaps, businesses in their locality that otherwise would not be able to re...you know, to get a loan, and this shares the risk. I mean, it makes a...by all the financial institutions pooling into this credit corporation, their exposure is less, and would have more of a reason to participate and be able to loan to small businesses in their area."

McPike: "Would a financial institution get a greater rate of return on their investment or on their dollar by investing in this, or would they get a greater rate of return from investing in normal, everyday investments? What would be the incentive for a financial institution to invest, if they're not going to make more of a profit?"

Karpiel: "Well, Representative, their...their rate of return would be about the same, as far as interest. I mean, they re going to still receive, you know, interest. But, this makes it possible for them to loan money to small businesses or medium size businesses in their locality that would not be able to get a loan any other way. And it might be a business that possibly will, in the future, in, you know, a few years, be a source of economic growth and a very good, you know, bank venture for them in the future.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

It might be a new business, for instance, that is just getting started and is unable to receive, you know, to get a normal loan, or a high tech firm that doesn't have an experience rate, or something."

- McPike: "Well, Representative, I don't think I'm arguing against you. I'm just trying to find out, in practice, how this would work. Is this...Is the risk going to be underwritten by the state, or is someone going to underwrite the risk of this?"
- Karpiel: "No. No, it's underwritten by the corporation. The businesses that will be receiving loans from this corporation are businesses that have been turned down for a normal loan, and this would be their only method of getting a loan. So, this would be the type of corporation that, perhaps, has not been in existence for very long and needs a loan and doesn't have a history."
- McPike: "So, the rate...if this...this is intended, then, for corporations that would have a difficulty getting a loan under normal circumstances through a normal financial market, and I take it that the rate...the rate that they would get that loan at would be higher from this cor...Development Corporation than it would be from a normal institution. Is that correct?"
- Karpiel: "It could be, or not...it would not necessarily have to be."

McPike: "Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel, to close."
- Rarpiel: "Yes, well thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very good

 Bill that, I think that, perhaps, in some small way, will

 be able to benefit the small businesses of Illinois,

 especially in these very difficult economic times; those

 business that are, perhaps, just now starting out and need

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

some...need a loan or have been in business for just a few years and are unable to...to get loans from the normal...through the normal channels in their small town banks, perhaps, in some small towns in Illinois. And, this will pr...provide that the financial institutions can pool the money and...and have a less...less share of the risk, and also help out business in Illinois. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Byan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1375 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 156 voting 'aye',

none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1383, Representative Findley. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1383, a Bill for an Act to provide for assistance to certain employee owned enterprises. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Findley."

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. We may decry the excesses of labor, the excesses of corporate management. We can complain about the roads, and we even complain about the weather. But, whatever the facts...or whatever the factors are, the facts are these: jobs, industry are leaving the state and we have to do something about it. In my district, the DATA Corporation closed its doors several years ago, not because they weren't making money, but because they were not making enough money. In the district represented by Representatives Tuerk and Schraeder and Saltsman is the Hiram-Walker Distillery; now another plant, but which closed, not because they weren't making enough money

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

and could make more elsewhere. The Pabst Blue Ribbon Brewery has just closed in Peoria Heights: not because they weren't making money, but because they could make more elsewhere. The Bill that I propose, Senate Bill 1383 will employees of those industrial plants allow the opportunity to keep their jobs in Illinois. It's my view that the employees are more interested in jobs than they are in high profits. This...This Bill, if enacted. allow those employees the opportunity to participate in the for obtaining ownership of that corporation: acting with the expertise of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, with the expertise of an council composed of experts in finance and business and labor. And, with the authorization potentially from the Illinois Industrial Development Authority for the issuance of bonds as loans up to but not exceeding 50 percent of the purchase of that industrial plant. I submit that this Bill will protect jobs in Illinois. I hasten to add, this is not the Enterprise Zone Act, and neither is it what was called the Industrial Hostage Bill of last Session. This is entirely at the volition of the employees and the employers. It encumbers no General Revenue Fund. It only gives IDA bonding authority, and I would move for its passage."

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

McPike: "Well, I'd like to speak on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I may."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."

McPike: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

McPike: "How much can the...can IDA loan a...a group of employees under this Bill?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Findley: "Mr. McPike, I owe you an apology, Sir. When we spoke in...before the Committee meeting of Labor and Commerce last week, I indicated to you an incorrect percentage. The amount that IDA can loan is up to 50 percent of the cost of the purchase."

McPike: "Is there a dollar maximum?"

Findley: "There is only the percentage, Sir. As the Bill now reads."

McPike: "So, it can be any amount. It could be 100 million dollars, as long as the total cost was 200 million."

Findley: "Sir, I would be absolutely delighted if IDA could authorize 100 million dollars in bonds to keep a corporation of that size in Illinois."

McPike: "But, there are no restrictions in this."

Findley: "There are none, Sir."

McPike: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cass, Representative Findley, to close."

Findley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suggest this is a good Bill, and I hope it earns the same measure of support as it did when it was reported out of the Senate with 56 or 57 affirmative votes and no dissenting votes. I move for its passage."

Speaker Ryan: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1383 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1384, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1387, Representative Getty. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1401, Representative Telcser. Representative Telcser, Senate Bill 1401. Read the Bill,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1401, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capitol Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1401 increases the authorization by 109,100,000. It also has an Amendment adopted to name a building, I believe, which Representative offered. It's the annual CDB Bill, which I imagine we'll send to the Senate, and probably wind up in a Conference Committee, and I appreciate a favorable vote so we can continue to work on it."

Speaker Daniels: "There any discussion? Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Art, is this one that, by Amendment, permits us planning money for Corrections?"

Telcser: "Yes."

Kosinski: "Then, I'm certainly in accord with it."

Telcser: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 1401."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Mautino: "On the CDB authorization, it is yo...is it the intention of this General Assembly and you, as Sponsor, that, by the increased authorization, if programs are put in, would the Governor then be signing off on those programs? I'd like to point out, the last time we did this same thing, the Governor stopped about 100 million dollars worth of authorized programs. I'm concerned that by increasing the authorization he would not be acceptable to fund the programs we authorized last Session by virtue of his freeze."

Telcser: "Representative, I think what occurs from time to time

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

that, because οf the changing bond market, authorizations which were sincerely made during the Session have to be delayed, which I think is perhaps what you are referring to. The interest rate situation, which we're all aware of, has been very volatile, and that has a direct effect on the bond market which, in turn affects the authorized projects. I would simply say to you that this the agency wants. It's the Governor's administration, and I would assume he sincerely wants to move forward with whatever we've authorized. money markets, obviously, could alter our plans."

Mautino: "Two...Two other short questions, are you...are you..."

Telcser: "Let me also say, Representative, that the funds are still in there for those projects delayed. We're going to simply reappropriate them."

Mautino: "Okay. That...That was my next question. My final question is this; under this authorization for extended...an extended issue, how much money is included for the new correctional facilities that were presented originally by Governor Thompson, and where are those allocations?"

Telcser: "There's 30 million dollars for Dixon, 500,000 dollars for planning money for a new correctional center, location, as yet, not determined. That's planning money, that 500,000."

Mautino: "How much money in the authorization?"

Telcser: "And 300,000 for Bowen."

Mautino: "Okay. That's what I was going to ask. The other...The other concern I have is, then, these are not the two new facilities. Those are upgrading facilities. What is in there for the two new, yet unannounced facilities? Those are conversion facilities you're talking about."

Telcser: "Well, the new fa...the new facility would be the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

500,000 dollars we have now for planning money for that new facility.

Mautino: "But, there's no money in there for a new facility, only..."

Telcser: "The Dixon site is specific."

Mautino: "That's conversion. That's conversion money, as well as

the other one. But the new money for corrections is not

included in the CDB, just the planning money?"

Telcser: "Just planning money, Representative."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon,

Representative Kane, on Senate Bill 1401."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Is this the Bill that increases the ceiling on the state debt?"

Telcser: "Yes, it increases the ceiling on the bonded indebtedness."

Kane: "By how much."

Telcser: "By 109,100,000."

Kane: "What does that bring our total general obligation indebtedness up to?"

Telcser: "As of April 30, it will be 1,818,211,850."

Kane: "Well, that's just for the capital..."

Telcser: "That's for CDB."

Kane: "That just under the Capital Development Board, but...but the total general obligation debt of the state, what would this bring it up to?"

Telcser: "4,883,273,100."

Kane: "That's just the principal? 4,800,000,000."

Telcser: "That's principal and interest obligations."

Kane: "That's on stuff that is already sold, not what is obli...not what is authorized, but not yet sold. Is that

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

not correct?"

Telcser: "That includes some that's not issued, as of April 30, 1982."

Kane: "And how much would that be?"

Telcser: "Our best estimate is of 1...1,305,250,000."

Kane: "So, what we're doing here is, we have a total obligation of debt that is already sold of 4.8 billion. We have unobligated principal that is authorized of 1,500,000,000 did you say?"

Telcser: "1.3."

Kane: "1.3."

Telcser: "You went up a little more. 1.3, you had 1.5."

Kane: "And what will be the interest on that?"

Telcser: "It depends on the marketplace, what we have to go in and pay to get that money in the marketplace."

Kane: "Well, given the present market, what would that do? Would that be another billion dollars or so?"

Telcser: "My guess is, and it's only my own guess, we're probably paying 10 to 12 percent. It depends on the day we're in the marketplace and what other issues are being offered."

Kane: "So..."

Telcser: "So, 10 or 12 percent of that amount."

Kane: "Under...Under the new Constitution, then, we've obligated ourselves to about 8 billion dollars worth of debt in about ten years. Is that not correct?"

Telcser: "It sounds like your arithmetic is pretty...pretty fair."

Kane: "So, we're...So, the state is going into debt at the rate of about 800 million dollars a year."

Telcser: "Using your rationale, one could view it from that point of view."

Kane: "Would you suggest to us a different rationale?"

Telcser: "No, I think that as we look back the cost of building

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

these things at a later date or rehabilitating them, it makes these figures look like a bargain."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, T º d Kane: address myself to Senate Bill 1401. What this is is the Bill which increases the debt ceiling for State Government, and, if you'll look back over what we have done, Legislature and the Executive together, in the last ten years under the 1970 Constitution when going into debt from approval by the voters in a referendum; we've gone into debt at the rate of about 800 million dollars a That includes authorization of both principal and vear. the...the repayment of interest, or the interest that will be due on that amount. You say that we're running a balanced budget; but, in fact, we are going into debt at faster rate than the Federal Government, and we all throw up our hands at federal debt. But, whether чe general obligation debt or whatever, is that the state is going into debt at a tremendous rate. The interest payments now are between 250 million to 300 million a year, simply for interest payments. I would suggest that it's time to slow down this kind of debt financing. We get into a lot of discussion about balancing the federal budget, and everybody is in favor of balancing the federal budget. when it comes to going into debt at the state level, But. we all put up three-fifths vote to go into debt at the I would suggest that that's an inconsistency state level. and that, if we're going to urge the Federal Government within its means, the State Government also should And I would urge a live within its means. *no* vote this Bill at this time."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

127th Legislative Day June 21, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Getty: "Representative Telcser, is this Bill important?"

Telcser: "Yes, it is quite important, Representative."

- Getty: "The...The Capitol Development Bond Act of 1972 is what the original Bill spoke to, and we've heard quite a bit of discussion about that. Unfortunately, I was off the floor Friday afternoon at the time that Amendment #1 was put on to it. Are you aware of that Amendment, Representative?"

 Teleser: "I think Is that the one that names a building or
- Telcser: "I think...Is that the one that names a building or something?"
- Getty: "That's right. That's right, Representative Telcser.

 Could you tell me, in the Capitol Development Bond Act of
 1972, are there any other provisions naming buildings?"

Telcser: "Not that I'm aware of, Representative."

- Getty: "Representative, are you aware of the provisions of the Constitution regarding single subject of Bills?"
- Telcser: "Yes, I have a...a general knowledge of that,

 Representative."
- Getty: "This isn't an appropriation Bill. Is that correct?"
- Telcser: "It's not an appro...It's an authorization Bill, not an appropriation."
- Getty: "And it's not a revisory Bill, is it?"
- Telcser: "A revisory Bill? No, it's not a revisory Bill. It's an authorization Bill. It's not...It's not an appropriation Bill, Representative."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Absolutely."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Representative Telcser, Members of the House, it may seem like a small thing in...at the time last Friday, the Speaker, not the permanent Speaker, but a temporary Speaker, unfortunately ruled that Amendment #1 was germane. Unfortunately, I wasn't on the floor at the time this happened. I probably would have recorded a very

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

ardent dissent in protest: not because I'm opposed to naming a building out at the fairgrounds after John W. Lewis. I have no objections to that at all. I would so doing. But I happen to believe in Constitution of the State of Illinois, and I don't think any Speaker, for any political or other transitory reason, ought to subvert the Constitution of the State of Illinois in so glaringly a manner. I think it's an insult to this Body to permit an Act which has to do with Capitol Development Bond Act of 1972 to be further amended to designate a particular building to be named after somebody. Now, if there's any sense to this Body at all, you ought to vote 'no' or 'present' because of that. suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if this were to be passed in this condition; if it were to be concurred in the Senate and if the Governor were to sign it, it would be nullity anyway. So, Representative Telcser, believe this was an important piece of legislation, defeating your own purpose. So, whether you're for this or against it, you ought to vote 'no' or 'present': because. if you believe that the basic Bill ought to be passed, this isn't going to do it, because we're violating the Constitution if we pass it in this present shape. I respectfully suggest that the Sponsor would be well advised to take this out of the record, move it back to Second. take off Amendment #1 and then proceed with this Bill. Until that time, I'll vote 'no'."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, on Senate Bill 1401."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1401, as some of you re...may recall, had some...an Amendment on. The Sponsor has alluded to it, regarding the conversion of Bowen Developmental Center,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

for 500 300,000 dollars planning, and also dollars...500,000 dollars to plan another prison of which we don't know where it's going to be placed, yet. I to that issue last week. I think there is enough here where Members on this side of the aisle in addition to what Representative Doug Kane has said regarding the debt this is forcing upon us. What Representative Getty has said in...in that this Bill is being made unconstitutional by allowing the first Amendment to stay on the Bill. those reasons, I would urge the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'present' or 'no'."

- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."
- O'Connell: "Representative Telcser, can you tell me what is the ratio of percentage income? That is to say, can you tell me what the ratio of outstanding general obligation indebtedness is to personal income as reflected by this increase?"
- Telcser: "Representative, I don't have that statistic. Do you have an idea? Perhaps you can tell us. I, frankly, don't know."
- O'Connell: "Well, Representative, I have an idea. I think it...it exceeds the level that we're at right now, which is 2.54 percent of the general obligation indebtedness to overall personal income in the State of Illinois. That level of in...that ratio of indebtedness is regarded by investors at a proper level. That level has contributed to the triple A rating. That level, that ratio was the objective of legislation that was proposed last Session, which passed the General Assembly; however, was vetoed by

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the Governor of this State. His basis for vetoing that was his expression that we would re...remain at. a level significantly acceptable to the investors of this state. and he felt that by putting forth a ceiling of 2.54 percent ratio would provide for an inflexibility. I would submit that what is happening right now is glaring evidence of the intention behind the Majority Party in trying to chip away at that secure level of indebtedness. It is, as was discussed by Representative Kane. our...our way saying to our future that we have indebted ourselves, that we have mortgaged ourselves in the year 1982, Fiscal Year 1983 for our children. And I would submit that, in terms of fiscal responsibility, this is what we all expressed last Session would not happen. Well, I would submit that it is happening right now. I would vote Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the authorization Bill to spend Capitol Development Bond Fund monies for capital projects that have been approved by this General Assembly. We have already put some projects into the CDB appropriation Bill in the This simply gives Appropriations Committee. the us authorization to spend the money to do tho...to issue the bonds to spend the money to do those projects. bare bones amount of capital projects in the CDB Bill It was designed by the Governor. In res...In regards to the Gentleman's concern on the other side Amendment #1; if that Amendment is unconstitutional, it can be addressed in the Conference Committee, because this Bill now will have to go back to the Conference Committee. There is funds for correctional institutions. Two mental

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

health institutions are going to close. We are only playing games in this General Assembly if we think that we are going to fund those two mental health institutions. They have...commitments have been made to make them correctional institutions. Without this funding, there will not be correctional institutions in those previous mental health institutions. Let's not play games. Let's get on about the business of the state, and let's support and vote this Bill out immediately."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to close."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Ι very greatly the concern of a number of the Nembers who have risen to speak on Senate Bill 1401. Let me first address myself to a couple of the questions that arose during the course of this debate. Every year, we are all concerned with the level of debt which we impose upon Illinois citizens. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the were it not for long-term bond financing, WO wouldn't be able to offer to Illinois citizens any services which are contained in this Bill, which we are now considering, or all of the other CDB capital Bills which we've considered over prior years. It would be virtually impossible to build a new prison, a new university building, any type of capital improvement, if it the concept of long-term bond financing which over a long haul gives us the opportunity to build projects with long-term fixed dollars. And. no matter what you may think, it is my opinion, over the long haul we will always be faced with inflation as part of our everyday life. as we look back upon the cost incurred in building these projects, I assure you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that, opinion, a cost which may seem high today will look very,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

very much like bargain prices, indeed, as we reflect back OVET qone...years that have gone by. Now. Gentleman has risen and made a point about the personal income and how it would relate to the level of bond financing which we're discussing today. I'm sure what the Gentleman says is true; that the level of income this year may not be what he particularly cares for in that relationship. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of I...it is my opinion that, when this economy picks up again, personal income will pick up at a faster rate and a higher clip, and those relationships and those ratios will again look much better than they may Corporations that do bond financing look at a ratio 'times interest earned', which I think is akin to what the Gentleman from Cook was referring to when he was considering personal income in relation to the increased bond authorization. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of I think one has to look at the personal income over a long period of time: perhaps the period of the bonds would be issued. And, therefore, take a look at that statistic, not simply one which may not too well today, but may be exaggerated in fact in some other year. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if one to look at Senate Bill 1401, you would simply have to were at the important projects with Illinois...which Illinois citizens need and should have, so that we can move and get these projects completed. distinguished Gentleman from Cook rose on another point. Speaker. Нe rose and spoke upon...about germaneness of an Am...of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1401. Frankly, he is a Member who is a very distinguished attorney and someone who does indeed have a great deal of knowledge in the subject matter; and I know how sincere

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

when he raises the question of constitutionality and that single issue question. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I pledge to you and to the Gentleman from Cook that would be willing to work with him when this Bill goes to a Conference Committee and if it becomes necessary to that Amendment out in the Conference Committee. Speaker and Members of the House, to hold up Senate Bi11 at this point really doesn't make sense. No matter what we do, this Bill is going into a Conference Committee, at which time Amendment #1 could be put back in if it be removed now, or it could be taken out if we did the converse. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Senate Bill 1401 ought to be moved along now with my promise and my pledge to work with the Gentleman from Cook on the constitutionality in relationship to And, if he can show and the Members of Amendment #1. Conference Committee agree, we would take Amendment #1 out of the Bill. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me, once again, say to you, that I'll bet there isn't a Member serving in this Assembly who, from time to time, will not be coming to Springfield to try and alleviate a need which his or her constituents have. And the only way to do it will be to go to the Capital Development Board and seek bond authorization to provide some needed service or facility for his or her constituents. Senate Bill 1401, just like every Session in the past, fulfills those important piece of legislation. We're simply asking that we move it along to a Conference Committee questions raised this afternoon can be all of the handled in that Conference Committee. Anything else we do to Senate Bill 1401 could very well be meaningless, because the Conference Committee could put back in anything we take today or it can do the reverse. Anything we put in

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

today, the Conference Committee can remove. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is for these reasons and, once again, my pledge to the distinguished Gentleman from Cook to work with him on the constitutional question. I ask and sincerely appreciate an affirmative vote on Senate Bill 1401."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1401 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Bowman, to explain your vote on Senate Bill 1401. You have one minute."

Bowman: "No, Sir, a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does this take to pass?"

Speaker Ryan: "107."

Bowman: "Thank you."

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

Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 33 voting 'present', and this Bill, having failed to receive...Representative Telcser, do you seek recognition?"

Telcser: "What were you saying, Mr. Speaker? We'll put this on Postponed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "You'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Telcser: "Yes. Postponed Consideration, unless you want..."

Speaker Ryan: "Postponed Consideration for Senate Bill 1401.

Senate Bill 1492, Representative Ted Meyer."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1492, a Bill for an Act in relationship to radiation safety. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to move Senate Bill 1492 back for..."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 1492 to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections?

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Hearing none, leave is granted, and Senate Bill 1492 is returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Ted Meyer - Telcser, amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Heyer on Amendment #2."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is the Amendment of the Hospital Association. It changes the word 'diagnostic' to 'dialysis', and it adds a sunset provision to this Bill. I urge its adoption."

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

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will"

Meyer: "Yes."

Kane: "Yeah. What is the effect of this Amendment? I mean, you were mumbling very slowly there. And what is the effect of this Amendment?"

Meyer: "Reduces the filing fee and inspection report from 50 dollars to 25 dollars a report."

Kane: "Does it change any other procedures?"

Meyer: "Adds a sunset provision, that it sunsets in ten years."

Kane: "But it doesn't change any of the other procedures, just the filing fee and a sunset provision."

Meyer: "It includes therapy as well as diagnosis. Those are the only changes."

Kane: "In other words, therapy would have to be licensed also."

Meyer: "Yes."

Kane: "It means that...So, it broadens the scope of the Bill, it doesn't narrow it."

Meyer: "I would...Yes, Sir."

Kane: "Is there anything in this Amendment which excludes things that were covered under the original Bill and the original

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Amendments?"

Meyer: "No, Sir."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "I would just like to point out to the Members that
we have a former Member here, and a close personal friend
of the Speaker's, Representative Ed Bluthardt. Nice to
have you back, Ed. Representative Meyer, do you want to
close on your Amendments?"

Meyer: "I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2

to Senate Bill 1492. All in favor will signify by saying
'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the

Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Ted Meyer - Telcser, amends

Senate Bill 14..."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 adds to the Accreditation Board a position specializing in nuclear medicine, increases the board by one physician Member. I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any questions? Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 (sic - #3) to Senate Bill 1492.

All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Byan: "Third Beading. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, the board's incorrect. That's Amendment #3."

Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. That was Amendment #3 we just adopted. Third Reading. Senate Bill 1534, Representative Watson. Out of the record. 1549, Representative J. J. Wolf."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1549 is exactly identical to a House Bill which passed out of here, House Bill 2609, earlier this year on the Consent Calendar. It amends the Horse Racing Act, and it prohibits all delivery of wages on horse races by a person for another without fee. Presently, the...the law states that...it prohibits delivery of wages by one person for another for a fee, and what has happened is we have outlawed, as you know, the...the messenger racing service office. We go to the track and place money for individuals, and we outlawed that some time ago. They had been circumventing the law, because of the words says 'for In many cases, what they're doing is...is advertising that they're doing it without a fee and, of they'll accept...they'll accept tips from the course, winner. There have been some lawsuits against the Police Commissioner of the City of Chicago and the City of Chicago, and this would effectively close that door by eliminating just those three words and outlaw these race track messenger services, the way it was intended by the General Assembly."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1549 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye', ' voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1559, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1558, Barkhausen. Representative Barkhausen. Out of the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

record. Senate Bill 1614, Representative Bower. Run the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1614, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bower on Senate Bill 1614."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 1614 is an outgrowth of studies by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. The Bill would require the Department of Registration Education to adopt rules which specifically detail what constitutes the sufficient rehabilitation of a physician desirable and unethical unprofessional conduct, immoral conduct, repeated acts of gross misconduct and gross or repeated malpractice. This legislation is intended to clarify existing language. It's is supported by the Illinois State Medical spo...It There was a very significant Amendment that was put on in the House, sponsored by Representative Sandquist, Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer to Representative Sandquist to explain that Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment that Representative Bower is referring to is that one we put on last week, which re...call for a mandatory reporting of deficiencies in regard to doctors by state agencies, by hospitals and by the courts and insurance companies to make sure that the Department of Registration Education and the Disciplinary Review Board could follow up on such complaints. In addition, we put on an Amendment which calls for two public members to the Disciplinary Board to make sure that the procedure was carried out. I think we explained the Amendments when they were put on last week."

Speaker Ryan: "There any further discussion? Representative

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Bower to close."

Bower: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, this is an intent to clarify the...the language in the Medical Practice Act. It has the support of the Medical Society, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1614 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 159 voting none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Bill 1670. passed. Senate Representative Daniels. McBroom, 'aye' on the last vote. Semate Bill 1670. Representative Daniels. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Pullen. Out of the record. Page three of the Calendar under the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 1562, Representative Giorgi. The Gentleman in the chamber? You want to...You want it read? Representative Giorgi, you want this...you want to hear this Bill?"

Giorgi: "Hello, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record?"

Giorgi: "Temporarily, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1599. Representative Piel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1652, Representative Watson. Senate Bill 1652. Representative. Second Reading Short Debate. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1652, a Bill for an Act in relationship to fees for wall certificates. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

127th Legislative Day June 21, 1982

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 1652..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle on Amendment #2."

Stuffle: "Yes, ask leave to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Stuffle - Vinson, amends..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle on Amendment 3."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #3 clarifies the situation with regard to the early retirement program that we passed here for university pension employees some years ago. We're aware, under the Pension Code, that the intention of the law is to provide from personal services, part of the prepayment, if you will, for early retirement in this system. The Comptroller's Office has asked for specific language to be put in the Pinance Act, as well, to clarify that fact, and this Amendment merely clarifies what's already in the Pension Code in Article XV: that the employer's share of the retirement funds, which are in the appropriation Bills for the universities, is payable from personal services line And this is all that that does is a clarification. items. and I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "I support this Amendment and urge its adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle, do you want to close?"

Stuffle: "I...I'd just appreciate a favorable Roll Call. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3

to Senate Bill 1652. All in favor will signify by saying
'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the

Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill...Leave to keep it on Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Short Debate. Senate Bill 1667, Representative McBroom. Out of the Senate Bill 1672, Representative Olson. Out of the record. On page four, under the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1231, Representative record. Out of the Senate Bill Daniels. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Daniels. 1251, Representative Peters. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1285, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1285, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Leone: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1289, Representative Barnes. of the record. Out Senate Bill 1299, Representative Birkinbine. Out? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1352, Representative Peters. Senate Bill 1352, Representative Peters. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1353, Wikoff. Read the Bill. You want the Bill heard, Representative? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Board of Trustees to the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #1, McClain - McPike, amends Senate
Bill 1353..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McClain on Amendment #1 to Senate

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Bill 1353. Representative McPike, are you going to handle this? Representative McPike. Representative Wikoff."
- Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, has this Bill...Amendment been distributed?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Clerk, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? Yes, Representative, it has been printed and distributed."
- Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, is that Bill in the correct form? I question the propriety...propriety of that Amendment."
- Speaker Ryan: "You mean the Amendment? Are you talking about the Amendment, Representative?"

Wikoff: "Yes."

Speaker Ryan: "Is the Amendment in order? Is that your question?"

Wikoff: "Yes."

- Speaker Ryan: "Tell you in a minute. Your point's well taken,
 Representative Wikoff. The Amendment is out of order.
 Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek
 recognition?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we've been trying to work with the Appropriations Committee staff, and I was un...under the impression that this is one of the Bills that wasn't going to be called. I would ask the Gentleman to take it out of the record, only because the way I look at it, we're moving through appropriation Bills quite rapidly, when there isn't that need on appropriation Bills when we have a substantive deadline. Now, I...you know, the Chair runs the...the House, but I don't know what the rush is when we're trying to work together, both staffs, the Democratic Republican staffs; and, according to our agreement, this wasn't one of them that was going to be called. think that, in order to live up with that agreement, you ought to take it out, Virg."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "For all practical purpose, Representative, the deadline is the same. One is the 25th, the other's the 27th. One's Friday, the other's Sunday. So..."

Matijevich: "You can do a lot in two days."

Speaker Ryan: "I would ask Representative Wikoff, what's your pleasure, Representative?"

Wikoff: "I'd like to move it to Third Reading."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1354, Representative Richmond. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Friedrich, amends Senate Bill 1354 on page one..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Friedrich on Amendment #1."

Friedrich: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, the highest paid state employee in the State of Illinois is the Chancellor of SIU. The University of Illinois, in all of its greatness, does not have a Chancellor. It has one President. I thought this might be a good time to save a little money, so this Amendment merely takes 100,000 dollars out of GRF money for SIU, with the hope that the board would see the light and eliminate this unnecessary position."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman might yield to
a..."

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Bradley: "What...What is the sa...What's the amount of the salary for the Chancellor?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Friedrich: "I believe it's 85,000, but that's just the tip of the iceberg. They...We've got his mansion and a few more things, and I'm sure it would be considerably over 100,000."
- Bradley: "What...And the Governor of the State of Illinois' salary is something like 52,000. Isn't that right?"
- Friedrich: "That's right and, as I say, this is the highest paid
 man on the state payroll. And, we've already got a

 President of the campus at Southern, one at Edwardsville,
 and I'm not exactly sure why we need a Chancellor at all,
 Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "We ought to take the funds and tack it onto the Governor's salary, as far as I'm concerned."
- Speaker Ryan: "There any further discussion? Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Well, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I speak against this Amendment. I believe that this General Assembly has reviewed the respective budgets. This is for Southern Illinois University. We're talking about one institution, and I don't believe that there is a motion or a movement to re...reduce or eliminate the President or Cha...at the other universities. The Chancellor's position has been long established in this university. It's a university that serves at Carbondale, Edwardsville and Springfield; and, for that reason, a Chancellor's position was adopted and preserved. I would hope that this General Assembly would vote 'no' on Amendment #1."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Younge."

Younge: "Will the movement yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Younge: "Representative Friedrich, is there any evidence that there has been some difficulty in the transfer providing the services that he was employed to do?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Friedrich: "No, I'm just saying that we already have a President at Carbondale. We have a President at SIU, and I'm not sure why we need a Chancellor when we have one President who can run the University of Illinois with two separate campuses. We don't even have two Presidents there, so, why we need two Presidents and a Chancellor for a smaller school, I can't figure out. I can't ... We're talking about enough money to fund 100 scholarships; 100 scholarships for people in your district and mine, who can't go to school because this guy's drawing over...taking over 100,000 dollars of the taxpayers' money."

Younge: "Are...Are you aware that, even though there are...there has been a rule by the Board of Trustees that both of those campuses be one university, they still have different tenure policies at the Edwardsville campus than they have from the Carbondale campus. Are you aware that there is a difference there?"

Priedrich: "No, but I...as far as I'm concerned, we ought to either have two universities or one. If we have two, they have...already have separate Presidents. If we have one, we only need one President. I don't know why we needed...need two Presidents and a Chancellor to run a university no bigger than the University of Illinois."

Younge: "And the effect of your Motion eliminating the 150,000 dollars would be to take out of the budget the salaries for the two Presidents?"

Friedrich: "No, no. No, the Chancellor."

Younge: "Oh, for the one Chancellor. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Chancellor of the SIU system was in Committee, and I thought he did a very, very

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

job in that Appropriations Committee. effective T can sense that he is a very effective administrator. I think that both of the universities appreciate his position as a I... I hate to say it, but I almost think Chancellor. recurrence over a problem that developed last year in the appropriations process, when it had to do particular job that the Sponsor of the Amendment wasn't happy with. And, if that's it, I would hope that matter has been...it ought to have dissipated by now. that time. I stood on the floor of the House. and that I wouldn't want to be a part of having vindictiveness put into the statute books, whether it be substantively or through the appropriations process. This Amendment makes no sense if you believe in the further progress of Southern Illinois University. I think we've all seen it progress through the years, and we want to see it By eliminating the Chancellor, you don't do anything for that system. I would urge the Members to loudly, if it's a voice vote; or by your vote, vote against this ridiculous Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's seldom that I disagree with my good friend from Centralia. However, on this Amendment, I have to. think that we are tied up on a matter of what we call the positions that lead the various universities. The University of Illinois Chancellor has and two Presidents...or the Southern Illinois University has a Chancellor and two Presidents. The University of Illinois has two Chancellors and a President. It's just a matter of is...the title you give to the which position leadership. I think Chancellor Shaw has given effective leadership to SIU over the last several years. They ve

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

experimented with different forms of leadership roles at SIU and, under the current leadership, I think it's worked out best. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the As...As Sponsor, the House Sponsor of this Bill, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I think unfortunate that this would be brought up to disrupt something that is really working well. The system the Chancellor. I don't think that I want to be in on the decision as to not whether or the Chancellor is appropriate. Ι think that...we have a Board of Trustees. We have a Board of Higher Education. The entire system working well, and I... I certainly urge everyone to help me defeat this Motion, because I... I think it is untimely it's unfair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Well. Speaker, very briefly, I think all of the Mr. previous speakers have clearly enunciated the merits of the Bill and the demerits of the Amendment. I just want record to show that I've spoken personally with Chancellor on numerous occasions. I know him to an outstanding public servant. 1 know him to be aп outstanding educational administrator, and I certainly don't think that he needs to be subjected to this type of irritation each year. He has done a fine job. And. I'm not from Southern Illinois, I do have friends in Southern Illinois, and I certainly consider the and I don't think that we need to encumber his effectiveness with this type of Amendment. Representative Friedrich has made his point, and I trust that he will quickly dispose of the Amendment. And, in lieu of that, I urge a 'no' vote, so that we can move on

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

with the business of the House."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "I would like to say that I intend to vote for this Amendment, because I am beginning to have serious questions about the competency of the Chancellor of SIU. We have, as a community, been experiencing some very bad administrative decisions in reference to the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. The employment of minorities at this university is very, very low, at best. The..."

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

Representative Flinn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Plinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I get tired of her speaking every time she wants to. This is the second time she's spoke on this Amendment. I'd like to have one at a time, please."

Speaker Daniels: "Did you speak in debate on this issue?"

Younge: "I only asked a question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Younge, I'm advised by the Parliamentarian that you did address the question, which would be considered speaking in debate."

Younge: "I only asked a question. I did not speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Thank you. Further discussion?

Gentleman from Perry, Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, Ralph: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Just so you won't think the whole back row back here is opposed to the Chancellor of Southern Illinois University, I'd like to speak in opposition to the Amendment. I think that when the Representative from...I think that when the Representative from East St. Louis and the Representative from Marion County agree on a Bill, there's something wrong with it. This is the first time I've ever noticed that these two people have been on the same side. I'd urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment, and

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the preservation of Southern Illinois University as it exists now. It's important that we have a Chancellor, a man of the character and the caliber of the fellow that we have now, and I'd urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich to close."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a lean year, when we see what we can try to see what we can get along without. Here's a man who makes 85,000 dollars a year and in my, without adding it up, I can assure you that it costs state 150,000 dollars a year. We are short of money for scholarships for...for young men and women who want to go You can take that 150,000 and send 150,000 to college. boys and girls to university this fall. To me, that's more important than having somebody who's in a job that's superfluous to start with. I know that Chancellor Shaw is a very attractive fellow, and apparently he's a very good lobbyist, because he made a good impression before the Appropriations Committee, and that's not an easy task, still say that we do not need a Chancellor and two Presidents to run one university, when the President of the University of Illinois runs it by himself. Here's a good place to save a little money, and I urge you to do it."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment
#1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed
'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment #1 is lost. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, McClain - McPike..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, Amendment #2.

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would make a parliamentary inquiry or objection, whichever the case may be. I would argue that Amendment #2 is violative of the Illinois Constitution, the Legislative

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Article, Section A, Paragraph D which says, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriations', and the Amendment explicitly affects the Revenue Code, and is makes appropriations contingent on that; and, because of that, is out of order."

Speaker Daniels: "Your point is well taken, Representative Vinson. Representative McPike, the Amendment is out of order. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1355,

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

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1355, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Wait a second. Amendment #1...I'm sorry."

Speaker Daniels: "All right."

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #1, McClain - McPike..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me. I said that in error.

The Bill's still on Second Reading. Amendment #1, read..."

Clerk Leone: "...amends Senate Bill 1355 as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McPike, Amendment #1.

Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Vinson: "Same objection, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment's out of order, because its a revenue Amendment on an appropriation Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Same objection, same ruling, the Amendment's out of order. Purther Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1356,

Representative Keane. Representative Woodyard, do you want

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- to handle that? All right. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1356, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Governors of state colleges and universities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, McClain McPike, amends Senate
 Bill 1356..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, Amendment #1.

 Representative Vinson, same objection?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Sir."
- Speaker Daniels: "Let me see the Amendment. It's well taken,

 Representative Vinson. The Amendment's out of order.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1357,
 Representative Woodyard. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College and Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, McClain McPike, amends Senate
 Bill 1357..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, same objection? Let me see the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Representative Vinson, once again, you are correct. The Amendment's out of order. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1359,
 Representative Kustra. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 1361, Representative Wikoff. Representative Wikoff. Out

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1362, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1362, a Bill for an Act making appropriations from the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Auditorium Reconstruction Fund. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1363,
Representative Wolf. Out of the record? Out of the
record. 1364, Representative Wikoff. Representative
Wikoff, Senate Bill 1364. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State University Civil Service Merit Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1374,
Representative Leverenz. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Terzich - Matijevich..."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know, this year the Governor, in his budget request, made a req...request for pension funding. This is probably one of the biggest travesties that have been bestowed upon

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the people of the State of Illinois. Last year there was approximately a deficiency of 300 million dollars, and once again this year, the state is going to attempt to use Pension Fund money to support the General Revenue Fund for an amount in excess of over 300 million dollars, which will be over a half a billion dollars in the last two The State Auditor...Comptroller, I should say, pointed out that, since 1972 the unemployment liability was...for state systems was 2.786 billion dollars. By the end of the year 1981, the unemployment liability increased to 5.14 billion dollars, an increase of over 2 billion dollars. Now, again, this gap is again increasing. time the employees are requesting for pension benefits, we say that what's happening to the unfunded liability. what's happening to the unfunded liability is that the state or the government is not putting in sufficient monies to meet their own obligations. This is a simple Bill. Governor stated that he wants to increase the unfunded liability to only 70 percent of the 100 percent payouts, which would still increase the unfunded liability, rather than the 62.5 percent. We owe this to our state employees. We owe it to the participants in the Pension Fund, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Parliamentary inquiry. Would you have the Parliamentarian look at this Amendment and see if it's technically correct, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "Let me see the Amendment."

Wolf: " It refers to deleted language. It does not reflect the Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Leverenz: "Would you take this out of the record?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Wolf: "That cured that."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1386, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary, and contingent and distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1396, Representative Wolf.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone "Senate Bill 1396, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Administrative Services."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1397, Representative Wolf.

Out of the record. 1398, Representative Wolf. Out of the record. 1399, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission of Banks and Trust Companies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Notions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, J. J. Wolf - Vinson."

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

Wolf: "Well, this really breaks out the legal service line at the request of Commissioner Harris."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1400, Representative Wolf. 1400. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Committee
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #4 by Representative Rea."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea, Motion to table Amendment #4."
- Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I...In terms of Amendment #4, it would provide funding of 300,000 CDB bond funds for planning the conversion of the Bowen..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me. The Sponsor requests this be taken out of the record. Out of the record. 1402, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1 and 2?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Matijevich Terzich."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #3."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Matijevich: "You want to go...Representative...I've been joined by Representative Terzich. This is the...similar to what he had advanced in the prior Bill that was taken out of record, out of the record. Amendment #3 proposes to \$17,700 to the retirement line item in the general office of the Capital Development Board. This would increase the funding level, the retirement line item to 70% of the pay-out level. As Representative Terzich has said to this Body originally, we had always been at 100% of the pay-out level until last year. That was supposed to be a thing. Now we're reducing that pay-out level all the way down to 62 1/2%, 62.5. Many times on the floor I have heard Members say - and I know Representative Ebbesen does such a good job of it - that we had better watch out about the benefit levels in retirement Bills because what that is doing to the unfunded crude liability. Now, nobody seems to be taking the other side of the coin except Representative Terzich, who, as you know, does so much with regards to retirement Bills and the pension funds. What we are doing by reducing the state's contribution is surely putting these retirement systems in jeopardy in the future. Make no mistake about it, that's what we're doing. us to say we're going to balance the budget on the backs, should we say, of the people who are retiring either as teachers or public employees, I think is a wrongful thing to do. So I offer this Amendment at least to get it up to Many of us think that it should be 100%, that the Governor should have lived up to his word and said that it be a one-time thing. But surely, it should not be all way down to 62.5%. So I would urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the distinguished Minority

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee just said, this is a restoration of the pension fund to the 70% level as introduced by the Governor. The amount of dollars on this small. We're going to support the Gentleman's Amendment, but I would like to point out to the Members of House, at this particular time, we \$120,000,000...we have appropriated about \$120,000,000 over the Governor's budget at this time. And so we are not going to get in a hassle at this particular time on this level of pension funding, which I say is restoring it to the Governor's level as introduced. At least till we get to the university system, we are talking about a lot of different dollars there, and we may have a different attitude when we get to that point; but at this point, we would support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman,
Representative Terzich, moves for the adoption of Amendment
#3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed
'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted.
Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. We're going to go back and pick up 1352 on page four of your Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1352."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1352, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, McClain - McPike."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Spea...Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Chair look at the Amendment in regard to its germaneness. It does appear it is the same Amendment and the same arguments as

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

with the other Bills dealing with the Board of Higher Education, a similar Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "You're raising the Vinson objection?"

Peters: "Yes, yes, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "And the Webb ruling. And the ruling is that the Amendment's out of order. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1403, Representative Wolf.

Representative Wolf, 1403. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1403, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Civil Service Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Matijevich - Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich - Terzich, Amendment

#2. Representative Terzich."

Matijevich: "Bob, \$200. Take it, Bob."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Amendment #2, again, is to bring the pension funding up to the 70% level. It adds an additional \$200."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion?"

Terzich: "Not for \$200."

Speaker Daniels: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "1404. Read...Third Reading on 1403. Senate
Bill 1404. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act making

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Macdonald, Amendment #7."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this changes the amount to...by deleting 271,700 in lieu thereof and adding 450,000. The Displaced Homemakers' Program in Illinois has suffered disastrous cuts. It is probably one of the most effective ways that we have in this state of preparing people and having successful programs of people going back into the work force. We have had to cut out three or four of our various homemaker programs throughout the state, and it is essential that they have the money to keep going, to keep this program viable and to keep it so that women of this state who are either divorced or widowed may go back into the work place if there are jobs to be held for them. So I urge your support of this small amount to be added to this original

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."
Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
would agree with the Sponsor on this worthwhile program and
would support this Amendment and urge others to do so."

Bill of Commerce and Community Affairs."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Lady from Cook moves the adoption of Amendment #7. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', and the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Matijevich Terzich."
- Speaker Daniels: "Which one of the duo? Representative Terzich,
 Amendment #8."
- Terzich: "Well again, Mr. Speaker, this will add the...approximately \$67,000 onto the Commerce and Committee (sic Community) appropriation which will bring their funding level up to 70% of which only \$18,900 will be coming from the General Revenue Fund. And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #8. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Wolf Winchester."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. Representative Winchester, Amendment #9."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #9 corrects a drafting error made in the House Amendment #2. It just changes the line number from line 12 to line 13. I would ask for adoption of Amendment #9."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman...the Lady from Cook, Representative Alexander."
- Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, has this Amendment been distributed yet?"
- Winchester: "Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. It has not been distributed."
- Winchester: "Could I have leave since it just simply makes a technical change in the...in the legislation. I'll repeat it for the Lady."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I always have a problem doing that when we're talking about appropriation Bills. If the staff sees

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- the Amendment, and I'm convinced that that's all it does...it doesn't sound..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Do you have a copy of the Amendment, Sir? I think your staff has it right there, don't they?"
- Matijevich: "No, I asked the staff, and they don't have it."
- Speaker Daniels: "No? Take it out of the record. Representative Winchester, perhaps you can go across and discuss it with..."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Speaker, I've just found my staff did take a look at it just now, and it is alright. So..."
- Speaker Daniels: "You have no objections then?"
- Matijevich: "No objections."
- Speaker Daniels: "Are there any other objections? Hearing none, any discussion on the Amendment? No further discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #9. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading on House...on Senate Bill 1304 (sic 1404). Thank you, Representative Matijevich.

 Senate Bill 1405, Representative Wolf. 1405. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1405, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2 and 3?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #2 by Representative
 Bowman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman has a Motion to table

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Amendment #2. Out of the record. Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1406, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Emergency and Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf, Amendment #6.

Representative Wolf, Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1406."

Wolf: "We don't have a copy of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, this is the 190,000 insect - pest Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Wolf: "Why don't we take it out of the record. It's not been printed, I understand."

Matijevich: "Oh, this is alright. We didn't see it, but it's alright. We know what it is."

Speaker Daniels: "You have no objections to it being considered?"
Matijevich: "This is a gypsy moth Amendment?"

Wolf: "Why don't we just take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1407, Representative Vin...Representative Wolf. Representative Wolf, 1407.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1408, Representative Wolf.

Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1408, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees for the General Assembly Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1409, Representative Wolf.

Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1409, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Terzich - Matijevich."

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

Terzich: "Again, Mr. Speaker, this will bring up the funding to the 70% level, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

#2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1411, Representative Wolf.

Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1411, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Historical Library. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1412, Representative Wolf.

Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Judges' retirement system. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1413, read the Bill."

clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1413, a Bill for an Act making
 appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of
 the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill.
 Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

:lerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Matijevich - Terzich."

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

Terzich: "Amendment #3 restores the funding to the 70% level of
 the State Employees' Retirement System."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment \$3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. \$3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1414, out of the record. 1415.

Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1. 2 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Terzich - Matijevich."

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

Ferzich: "Again, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 will restore to the
70% level of the state employees."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Matijevich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #5."

Matijevich: "Speaker, I understand this is agreed. Could we have
leave to table Amendment 2 and 3? Amendments 5 and 6
are...replace those Amendments. They...they change some

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

technical changes that have to be made."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendments #2 and 3. Any discussion? Being none, all those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendments #2 and 3 are tabled. We are now on Amendment #5. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Amendment #5 replaces Amendment #2, which contained technical errors. It transfers \$15,000 in GRF out of grants and aid to local units of government Section to a new Section, 5.1. It was requested by the Office of Comptroller for payments to be made to the Federal Government because of undermatched or unallowable costs arising from the audit."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Swanstrom Matijevich."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Swanstrom, Amendment #6.

 Representative Matijevich, you want to handle that?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, this replaces Amendment #3. The Amendment reflects recent action by the Planning and Budget Committee of ILEC to provide federal funds for support of the regional training program within the Police Training Board. I move for the adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1416. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1416, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training
Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3
were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Terzich - Matijevich."

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

Terzich: "Amendment #4 adds an additional \$1,000 to bring up the funding to 70%, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1418. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments \$1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1419. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments \$1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

#1, 2, 3, 4 and 5?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Matijevich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, #6."

Natijevich: "Mr. Speaker, La...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 deletes the EDP line items within Support Division within the Department Technical and creates a new section to continue the contractual agreement with the Department of Public Health for these services. Based on existence of possible duplication of efforts and the problems associated with transferring these functions, it is recommended that this remain within the Department of Public Health. I move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1420. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1420, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Personnel."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1421. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Pollution Control Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1423. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Teachers' Retirement System.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1424. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to certain retirement benefits for teachers.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1425. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1. 2 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Terzich - Matijevich."

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

Terzich: "Amendment #4 will bring up the appropriation to the 70% funding level."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1426. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act to make an

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Employees' Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1427. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, DiPrima - Wolf."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative DiPrima, Amendment #5."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #5 would appropriate \$5,000 from the General
Revenue Fund to the Comptroller for payment to the Freedom
Foundation at Valley Forge for the improvement and
perpetual maintenance of the Illinois Area of the Medal of
Honor Grove. Jake Wolf is the Cosponsor of this Amendment
with me."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Terzich - Matijevich."

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

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- Terzich: "Once again, Amendment #6 will bring up the pension funding level to the 70% level."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being...Representative
 DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "No, I'm on...are you on 7, Amendment #7?"
- Speaker Daniels: "No, we're on #6. Your light is on, Sir. Any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #7, DiPrima Stuffle."
- Speaker Daniels: "Take the Bill out of the record. 1428. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1445. Read the Bill."
- Tlerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State, Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1498, Representative Rigney.

 Read the Bill."
- clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1498, a Bill for an Act to make an
 appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. Second
 Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

:lerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1503, Representative Stanley.

Out of the record? Out of the record. 1514,

Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill."

:lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1514, a Bill for an act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

:lerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

:lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Leverenz."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, Amendment #3."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 would appropriate \$233,000 for the Board of Law Examiners, also \$744,000 for the Attorneys' Registration and Disciplinary Commission which were left out of the original Bill submitted. Last year we appropriated the same type of amounts for these operations. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

ipeaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman
 moves the adoption of Amendment #3. Representative
 Matijevich."

Natijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes."

National latificients: "Representative Leverenz, is this the same thing that was attempted last year on the recommendation of the Auditor General where we got into that whole issue of separation of powers and...on the examination and the...Well, Mr. Chair...Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we went through this whole show last year, and when you talk about separation of powers and then the Supreme Court has got to, if you will, rule on whether

127th Legislative Day

Wolf."

June 21, 1982

something has to be done or not, I think we're probably fighting a losing battle, as far as that goes. I think the issue has been made enough in the Committees, and I don't think we ought to jeopardize this particular appropriation Bill with that issue. There is always going to be that discrepancy between the feeling of the Auditor General and We've raised it. Somebody said we the Supreme Court. adopted it. but it didn't get passed the Conference Committee process, as I recall. So, I don't think we ought try it again. We've attempted it once. It didn't go anywhere in the end, so I would urge the Members to vote down this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "I think the Gentleman asked if I would yield to a The answer to his question is that yes, is similar to the Amendment that we adopted last year. The analysis shows that it is similar to the Amendment we adopted last year. We are not debating the question of whether it is or is not a state agency. But in the federal ruling that has happened since we adopted the last Amendment, the Federal Government has ruled that, fact, they are a state agency since that time, and they have been now fighting in court to keep a separate entity. So since they are part of State Government, I think we should appropriate the money so that they can expend it." Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf, J.J. Speaker
- Iolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I was fust going to support Mr. Leverenz in his Motion. I think in view of the information just presented this House, I don't think it is an unconscionable act to have the Auditor General audit the accounts of the court, and I think it's arrogance on their part to rule otherwise. And I would support the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Gentleman's Motion."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. I would ask for the support of a favorable vote in Amendment #3 to the Bill."
- ipeaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of
 Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',
 opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment #3 fails.
 Further Amendments?"
- :lerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #4, Davis."
- ipeaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- .everenz: "Well, I hear about three or four people yell 'no'. I
 was trying to get your attention prior to the vote being
 announced, and I'd like a Roll Call."
- ipeaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. I'm sorry. We'll go back to 3 for you, Representative Leverenz. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Vinson. Representative Getty."
- etty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I think some people just misunderstand what this Amendment does. This is an attempt to provide some sort of legislative oversight over funds which the Legislature has no business in overseeing. This is a very serious mistake. understand in some areas that there has been an ongoing feud, if you will, disagreement between the Auditor General and the Supreme Court. Regardless of your position on that, this is not the way to respond. This is just a silly attempt at making a point, and it doesn't do the General Assembly well to continue to try to harrass the court

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

system. We should have separation of powers. The Constitution so provides, and to pass a silly Amendment like this is just absolutely absurd."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. I'd like to explain my vote, too. Earlier we heard that there was a possibility the Amendment was adopted and did not stay on by signature of the Governor. The fact is that it was included in the Bill signed by the Governor. This is not a silly attempt. Those that perhaps are voting red might be attornevs. Certainly Disciplinary Commission needs to have a little oversight. It is the only part of State Government that, for 18 employees, has its own profit-sharing program. They claim that it's not state money when, in fact, that money which is collected by R and E, that is state money. We put it on I ask you for your support now in doing the last time. same thing. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

ichuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in support of this Amendment. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in of this Amendment. I don't know what the people on the Supreme Court are afraid of. I don't know why they think that they are better than the rest of the state, and why the State Auditor shouldn't have the right to go in and look at their books. They're spending taxpayers' money. They live like kings across the street, very arrogant, don't see... This is a very arrogant attitude of them to come and say that they don't want to have their audited when everybody elses' books are audited. I see nothing wrong with this Amendment. I urge its adoption."

:peaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Sullerton: "Mr. Speaker, if this gets a majority of votes, I'd

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

like to ask for a verification."

:peaker Daniels: "Representative J.J. Wolf."

- folf: "Parliamentary inquiry. How long you going to milk this, Mr. Speaker?"
- ipeaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 80 'aye', 79 'no'. The Gentleman, Representative Cullerton, asks for a verification. Proceed with a Poll of the...or a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Leverenz."
- "Should we require it, I would like to verify the Negative."
- :peaker Daniels: "Well, at the time that it's appropriate, you
 can raise that question."
- .everenz: "Normally it is better to do that..."
- ipeaker Daniels: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with a verification of the
 Affirmative Roll."
- :lerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Ackerman, Barnes, Bartulis, Bell, Bianco, Birkinbine, Bradley, Brummer, Capparelli, Catania, Christensen, Davis, DiPrima, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Farley, Fawell, Findley, Flinn, Dwight Friedrich, Griffin, Hastert, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huskey, Karpiel, Keane, Jim Kelley."

'peaker Daniels: "Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Leave to be verified please."

- :peaker Daniels: "The Lady asks leave to be verified. Leave is
 granted. Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Kociolko, Kornowicz, Krska, Kucharski, Kulas, Kustra, LaHood, Laurin...no, Leverenz, Hacdonald, Mautino, Mays, McAuliffe, McBroom, McGrew, McNaster, Ted Meyer, R. J. Meyer, Miller, Mulcahey, Neff, Oblinger, Olson, Piel, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Saltsman, Satterthwaite, Irv Smith, Stanley, Stuffle,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Swanstrom, Tate, Terzich, Topinka, Tuerk, Van Duyne, Vitek, Watson, Wikoff, Winchester, J. J. Wolf, Woodyard, Younge and Zito."

Expeaker Daniels: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll, Representative Cullerton? Representative Leverenz."

"everenz: "Did you Poll the Absentees?"

ipeaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir. You're...we were in the midst of the verification when you asked for that. Proceed with the questions of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Representative Vitek."

;peaker Daniels: "Vitek, John Vitek. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

:lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

ipeaker Daniels: "Hold on to that one, Sir. Further questions?"

'ullerton: "Representative Keane."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane. The Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Keane. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

'lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

'ullerton: "Representative Ronan."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Ronan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

:lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

'ullerton: "Representative Farley."

peaker Daniels: "Representative Farley. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him. Further questions?"

'ullerton: "If Representative Vitek is not feeling well, I'll

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

withdraw my request to ... "

:peaker Daniels: "I'm sorry."

Cullerton: "If Representative Vitek is not here for health reasons, I'll withdraw my request to have him verified off."

peaker Daniels: "He's in the rear of the chambers."

Jullerton: "That's fine."

:peaker Daniels: "Further questions?"

Cullerton: "No."

"Connell: "Would you record me as 'no' please?"

peaker Daniels: "Record the Gentleman as "no". There are 77 'ave'. 80 'nos'. Representative Henry. Representative Henry as 'no'. There 81 are Representative Schraeder 'aye'. Record Representative Schraeder as 'ave'. 78. 81. Representative Pechous. Change the Gentleman from...Representative Schraeder has changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Pechous from 'present' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Change Peters from 'present' to 'aye'. There are 79 'aye' and 81 'no'. Representative Leverenz, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

.everenz: "Well, since we can't Poll the Absentees, we'll verify
the Negative."

:peaker Peters: "Verify the Negative. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

.:lerk O'Brien: "Alexander, Balanoff, Barr, Boucek, Bower, Bowman, Braun, Breslin, Bullock, Chapman, Conti, Cullerton, Currie, Daniels, Darrow, Deuchler, Domico, Donovan, Jack Dunn, John Dunn, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Virginia Frederick, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Grossi, Hallock, Hallstrom."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson asks leave to be

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

verified. Does he have leave? Leave is granted."

- :lerk O'Brien: "Hanahan, Hannig, Henry, Hoffman, Huff, Jaffe,
- 'aye' to 'no', and he requests leave to be verified, Mr.

 Leverenz. He's right up here. Leave is granted.

 Representative Kane."

lane: "Leave to be verified."

- Speaker Daniels: "Leave is granted. Representative Carey.

 Change Representative Carey from 'present' to 'no'.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Kane, Katz, Dick Kelly, Klemm, Koehler, Kosinski,
 Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, Levin, Loftus, Madigan, Margalus,
 Matijevich, McClain, McPike, Murphy, Nelson, O'Brien,
 O'Connell, Ozella, Pechous, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Rhem,
 Sandquist, Schneider, Slape, Harry Smith, Margaret Smith,
 Steczo, Stewart, C. M. Stiehl, Telcser, Turner, Vinson,
 White, Sam Wolf, Yourell, Zwick and Mr. Speaker."
- :peaker Daniels: "Questions of the Negative Roll. Representative
 O'Connell."
- ('Connell: "Could I have leave to be verified?"
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Representative Leverenz, questions of the Negative Roll."

Leverenz: "Bower."

peaker Daniels: "Representative Bower is in his chair."

'everenz: "Catania."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Catania is in her chair."

everenz: "John Dunn."

'peaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn's here. You want John Dunn or Jack Dunn?"

everenz: "John."

:peaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn. The Gentleman on the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

floor? John Dunn. He's right over here. He's here."

Leverenz: "Garmisa."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Garmisa is right up here in front."

Leverenz: "Hoffman, Gene."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

"everenz: "Nelson."

Speaker Daniels: "She's here, as always."

Leverenz: "Madigan."

peaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan. Do you wish the Gentleman to come out, Representative Leverenz?"

everenz: "No, we'll leave it in his illness position until we need him."

peaker Daniels: "No, there is no illness. Traditionally..."

Leverenz: "Then, yes."

Peaker Daniels: "You want him to come out? Alright.

Representative Madigan, Representative Leverenz would like you to show yourself. He's right here, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Good trooper."

:peaker Daniels: "Okay."

".everenz: "Slape."

Speaker Daniels: "Slape. The Gentleman on the floor? He's here.

He's in the rear."

Teverenz: "O'Brien."

:peaker Daniels: "O'Brien. Representative O'Brien. The
Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

:lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

"everenz: "Turner."

ipeaker Daniels: "Representative Turner. Turner. Is the
 Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"
ilerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "I can't see him. He's here."

Leverenz: "White."

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

Leverenz: "Jesse White."

peaker Daniels: "Jesse White. The Gentleman in the chambers?

Representative White. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

peaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Mautino: "For the purpose of announcement, Mr. Speaker."

"peaker Daniels: "Not yet. Proceed, Representative Leverenz."

everenz: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish him to..."

Leverenz: "I had my leader out here."

Speaker Daniels: "I thought...Mr. Speaker is your leader. You want him out? He'll be out."

everenz: "Not today. My County Chairman is Barr today. That's just for the afternoon."

:peaker Daniels: "Speakers* in the rear of the chambers. Further
 questions? Wait a second. Now, wait a second.
 Representative Jones, Emil Jones."

'ones: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

peaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

'ones: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Jones as 'no'.

Representative Jack Dunn."

Dunn: "How am I recorded?"

:peaker Daniels: "How is Representative Jack Dunn recorded?"

'lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

unn: "Record me as 'aye'."

ipeaker Daniels: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'.
 Representative Irv Smith."

June 21, 1982

Smith: "How am I recorded?"

127th Legislative Day

speaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

mith: "Change me to 'no'."

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

Alright now, any other changes? Representative McAuliffe,
any other changes? Representative Leverenz."

:everenz: "Normally you don't do that until after the verification, but that's alright. Boucek."

peaker Daniels: "Representative Boucek. He's over here."

I everenz: "Ewell."

'peaker Daniels: "Representative Ewell. Ray Ewell. The
Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

'peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

everenz: "Katz."

peaker Daniels: "Representative Katz. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

.everenz: "Schneider, Glenn."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider. Glenn Schneider.

The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

'lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

:peaker Daniels: "Remove him."

everenz: "Watson."

Speaker Daniels: "Frank Watson. He's over behind you, Sir. Over here on your side. Further questions?"

Leverenz: "Domico."

peaker Daniels: "Domico. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Take the record."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Kucharski, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

ucharski: "Yes, how am I recorded?"

peaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

ilerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, any further questions?"

Leverenz: "Smith, Irv."

peaker Daniels: "He was here. He changed his vote. Further questions?"

everenz: "He went red. I ask if he is now in the chamber, Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Garmisa. How is Representative Garmisa recorded?"

lerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

armisa: "Change that to 'aye' please."

peaker Daniels: "Change Representative Garmisa from 'no' to
'aye'. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

'peaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman was removed from the Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "You were removed, Sir."

Ronan: "I'd like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Roman as 'no'.

Representative Farley."

"arley: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "You were removed from the Roll Call, Sir."

'arley: "Vote me 'no'."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty is right here."

Leverenz: "I just thought he needed the recognition, Speaker.

Irv Smith."

ipeaker Daniels: "Parliamentarian advises me that he cast an oral
 vote and is therefore not subject to removal,
 Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Oh, I don't think that's true."

speaker Daniels: "Further questions, Sir?"

"everenz: "No Counselor."

:peaker Daniels: "What's the vote, Mr. Clerk? 79 'aye', 79 'no'.

The Amendment fails. Further Amendments? Representative
Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Por the purposes of announcement. In the gallery to the right we have 26 young people who are biking 500 miles from St...starting from Kaskaskia to Princeton, Illinois. They are from the Covenant Childrens' Home in Princeton, and they are on a political awareness and growth tour, and they are under the direction of Rick 'Vanacker' and his wife, Nancy, Kim 'Patton', Tom Newman and Bev Newman, and they're up here. If you'll please welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Daniels: "Further Amendments?"

:lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Davis."

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

Navis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a technical Amendment. In refiguring the state contribution to employees retirement in the Judges' system, we overfigured when we put back in the pay raises. It is a net reduction of \$104,000 in employees' retirement from the General Revenue Fund."

peaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman
moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor
signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

:lerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1516. Read the Bill."

clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act making
 appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community
 Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was
 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1519. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1519, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McAuliffe."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe on Amendment #2.

Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. 1532. Read
the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1532, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #2, Watson."

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

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 simply changes the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

language in regard to township assessors and their requirement to return the assessment books to the Supervisor of Assessment. It changes it from April 15 to within 120 days after they receive the books."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Sam Wolf."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative Watson, on your Amendment in which it refer...I don't have a copy of it in front of me, but just exactly what does it do? Would you repeat that again please?"

Watson: "The Amendment changes the date...requirement date for returning the assessment books to the Supervisor of Assessment from April 15 to 120 days after the township assessor receives the books."

Wolf: "Are you familiar with House Bill 1294 that was passed in the latter stages of last year?"

Watson: "Yes, Sir."

Wolf: "What would your Bill do in the face of the legislation that we passed last year?"

Watson: "Simply change the requirement from April 15 to within
120 days after the township assessor receives the books.

Nothing more than that."

Wolf: "Well, now in your Amendment, I think you refer specifically to the assessment books. I don't think there's anything in that Amendment that refers to workbooks. Is that correct?"

Watson: "That's correct."

Wolf: "In the legislation that was passed last year, I believe the Bill, House Bill 1294, that was sponsored by Representative Slape provided that the Supervisor of Assessment, in the event that the original assessment books were not available by January 1, would furnish workbooks to

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the local township assessor with a due date of April 15.

Isn't that correct?"

Watson: "I'm not positive. I do not have the language in front of me."

Wolf: "Well, my question...my question is this, would your Amendment, in its reference to assessment books, refer to those assessment books as either the assessment books or workbooks, whichever is furnished by the Supervisor of Assessment? Is that your intent with that Amendment?"

Watson: "Whatever the definition of assessment book would be would be my intent. I'm not sure whether that includes a workbook or not, but..."

Wolf: "Well, I think...Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in view of the way this is worded, I would have to oppose the Amendment, because I think it flies in the face of House Bill 1294 passed last year and which was sponsored by was Representative Slape. Now in that Bill. we attempted to...to establish the tax cycle for all taxing bodies and make it possible for the local tax assessor to have either the assessment books or workbooks by January 1, giving local tax assessors time until April 15th to return those books to the Supervisor of Assessments. We've also passed legislation which will make it possible for Boards of Review to go into session some six weeks earlier than has been previously provided. In the absence of phraseology in this Amendment referring to those workbooks as legitimate substitutes for the assessment books, I would ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Brunner."

Brunner: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- Brummer: "Representative Watson, will this not have the...will this have the effect of delaying tax bills in...in some instances or many instances?"
- Watson: "What this legislation will do will require the County

 Supervisor of Assessment to get his act together and get

 his books out to the township people prior to the date.

 And..."
- Brummer: "Yeah, but isn't he required to do that currently by January 1?"
- Watson: "That's right. Yes, he is. All we're talking about here is 120 days from that date, the date that they receive it.

 The current legislation says April 15, so we're talking about May 1 versus April 15."
- Brummer: "What creates the necessity for this legislation?"
- Watson: "Well, if the Supervisor of Assessment doesn't get the books to the township assessor, why this...then they have to operate under a cramped period of time, and we're just giving them adequate time and days to complete their work."
- Brummer: "So it may delay the tax cycle then. And in any event, it would delay the tax cycle by at least 15 days, if I understand that correctly. Is that right? 120 days being May the 1st."

Watson: "Under current provisions, that's right."

Brummer: "Or approximately May the 1st."

Watson: "Yes."

Brummer: "So it would delay the assessing cycle, and it would delay the cycle in which tax bills would get out."

Watson: "By that 15 days, if the County Supervisor of Assessment gets his books out."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Watson to close."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment simply will

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

change the requirement that a township assessor have to have the books back to the County Supervisor of Assessment 120 days instead of by April 15th. I think this provides common sense. It gives the township people adequate time to provide for the work to be done, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Watson, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Ewing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing on Amendment #3."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 provides for permissive authority in county boards to fix compensation of members of the County Farmland Assessment Review Committee. It is...nothing mandatory. It's completely permissive, and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',...saying 'aye'...Amendment #3. Saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. 'Ayes' have it. Amendment #3's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #4 simply takes off the maximum compensation limitation with regard to the appointed superinten...Supervisors of Assessments in the various counties of the state. We've done this with regard to the other...the elected county officials. We retain the minimums now in the law that have been in there for some years. It's not a mandate question, because it allows the county boards to set the level of compensation for

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- these people. And I would urge an affirmative vote on the $$\operatorname{\mathtt{Amendment.}}^n$$
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Brunmer."
- Brummer: "Yes, I'd like to ask an Amendment with...a question with regard to Amendment #3. I had my light on then.
- Speaker Daniels: "You turned your light on when I was asking for the vote, Sir. I specifically saw that. You have any questions on Amendment #4?"
- Brummer: "Amendment #4 removes the...does not raise the minimum but raises the maxi...removes the maximum."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "That's correct. It removes the maximum as we've done for the other county people and leaves up to the county board the decision as to whether or not compensation will be paid at above the minimum levels."
- Brummer: "Does this add any minimum or maximum with regard to members of the County Farmland Assessment Review Committee?"
- Stuffle: "No, that's #3."
- Brummer: "#3 authorized compensation. Does this Amendment set any maximum or minimum with regard to those individuals?"

 Stuffle: "This Amendment has nothing to do with those people at all."
- Brummer: "Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Ewing."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing on Amendment \$5."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #5."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

127th Legislative Day June 21, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Vinson."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "On page one by changing the title to read as follows: An Act relating to state revenue, amending certain

Acts therein and by inserting before the effective date the Section the following: Section 3, Section 9-917."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is designed to save taxpayers money and to make the process in dealing with the Department of Revenue much simpler. Currently the Department..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Vinson.

Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kane: "Is this Amendment distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "I am advised that it has been. Yes, Sir.

Proceed, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The language, the way in which the Amendment's drafted is at the...is drafted bу Department to satisfy a constituent problem that I have encountered. Currently, in dealing with the Department of Revenue, an attorney, if he seeks to represent a taxpayer, has to have a signed power of attorney by the taxpayer. What the Amendment does is to obviate that unnecessary requirement and probably save the taxpayer anywhere from \$50 to \$100 in the legal process. I don't believe there is any controversy regarding the Amendment. There are no hookers in the Amendment. and I would ask for adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

:lerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1558. Excuse me, 1519. We'll go back and pick up Representative McAuliffe's 1519. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

:lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1519, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1
 was adopted in Committee."

:peaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. Ploor Amendment #2, McAuliffe."

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

**CAuliffe: "Amendment #2 merely deletes the part of the law that would require conservation officers to make arrests in the field and have the suspects fingerprinted. It would be very inconvenient for conservation officers 10 or 15 miles from town to make an arrest, have to take the subject to town, have them fingerprinted and then go back out and resume their duties. So this would delete that part of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? There being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment \$2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. \$2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

'lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Tate."

:peaker Daniels: "Representative Tate on Amendment #3."

date: "Read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adds new language, 'means a bullet comprised of a...mass of metal amounting to more than 90%."

peaker Daniels: "Okay, Representative Tate."

'ate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 amends the definition of the Bill or...yeah, the Bill on a bullet. Amendment #3, as many of us will recall, Representative Kosinski and McAuliffe had a House Bill, 2103, that passed out almost unanimously out of this

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

chamber which was an agreed Bill by the gun lobby as well as by the different law enforcement agencies. And what I am attempting to do is make the language...the language I am offering in Amendment #3 in the definition of a bullet consistent with the same Bill...the same Bill that we had passed up earlier in this Session."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock. You're on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know if I was on or not."

speaker Daniels: "I know. That's the trouble. You're starting to wonder when you're on and when you're not. So do we, Representative."

ullock: "I'm in a melancholy...I'm in a melancholy mood today,

Mr. Speaker. I don't know about you. Would the Sponsor

yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

ullock: "Well, Representative Tate, it is kind of noisy in here, and I didn't quite hear your explanation of this Amendment.

I was wondering if you could, in a brief sort of way, tell me what you're trying to do with this Amendment."

Tate: "Representative Bullock, as you recall, earlier in the Session we passed out a House Bill with Representative McAuliffe and Kosinski. And there had been quite a bit of controversy over that Bill in the definition of penetrating bullet. At that time, the opponents to that Bill had been the Illinois State Rifle Association and the National Rifle Association, and the proponents of the Bill had been the various Department of Law Enforcement What I am...what I am offering here is a definition of a bullet which I feel that the Department of Law Enforcement has offered, a definition... I think my mike is...a definition which is a little bit too broad in its scope which would virtually eliminate a substantial amount

127th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1982
- of ammunition that is presently used by many sportsmen throughout the state for rifle ammunition."
- Ballock: "Okay, so what we're doing here is that we're trying to limit the definition. Is that what we're doing with this legislation, limiting a definition?"
- Tite: "I have no objections at all, and I feel... I... "
- 'ullock: "No, is that what you're trying...is that what this

 Amendment does, amends the definition of a bullet?"
- Tate: "Yes, I am re...I am redefining the definition of a bullet.
 Yes."
- 'ullock: "Of a bullet. And the purpose of limiting the definition is to do what?"
- The: "My purpose is, Representative Bullock, is that in the Department of Law Enforcement's definition, which is included in Senate Bill 1519, it would preclude the use of many different types of ammunition presently being used in rifles. For example, they are...they would like to disallow the use of zinc, of lead, and aluminum and other sintered metal."
- "illock: "Okay, so in limiting the definition of a bullet, you, in fact, intend to increase the supply of bullets that people use."
- ite: "No, those are presently usable in the State of Illinois."
 illock: "They are presently...what now?"
- ite: "You can presently use that ammunition in the State of Illinois. I just hope that we can continue the use."
- Billock: "But then why are we limiting the definition if we can use it?"
- Fite: "Well, the Department of Law Enforcement would like to limit the use."
- particle: "Mr. Speaker, I think staff's explained to me a little better than the Sponsor, so let me just briefly address the Bill."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "On the Amendment. Proceed, Sir."

3:1lock: "I don't know where most of the Members of this Body come down on the side of this issue. But from what I able to gather from both the Sponsor and from reading the Amendment and reading the staff's notes on this - and I have great respect for the staff's evaluation of these measures - it does indeed appear to me that we're trying to legalize, at this point, a certain type of bullet that, heretofore, we have not looked favorably upon. T personally don't think we need to be increasing bullets of any type. I think we should be decreasing bullets as well as the use of bullets. And about the best way to use a bullet, I would think, is to use a gun. So when Gentleman rises on the floor and tells me that the Rifle Association and the bullet manufacturers are behind measure, it does indeed cause concern. So, I know how I'll vote on this, and I think most of you in the Body are obviously decided on how you'll vote on it. But I, quite frankly, don't see the need, at this point, for us to go on record in support and declaring public policy in Illinois to increase the supply of bullets, because bullets intended to do basically one thing, and that is to do harm, to do damage and in some cases, to kill people. And I think you know the issue here, and I would say that deserves a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative McAuliffe."
McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
just wanted to correct one thing that Representative Tate
said. I think he said it inadvertently. He said that this
Bill would ban the use of lead in bullets, and of course,
that's not true, because lead is in almost all the bullets.
So, that part is not true. That's all I'd like to say."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

- reston: "Representative Tate, my information tells me that the bullet described by your Amendment would still be of a nature that would penetrate bulletproof vests that are currently worn by police officers. Is that in accordance with your information?"
- "ate: "Representative Preston, it is my contention that if you know anything about bullets, that you could use a .22 and...shot at the right projectile, shot at the right speed, just about any bullet on the market would penetrate a bulletproof vest. It depends on the angle. It depends on the moisture. It depends on the composition of...and the bullet."
- reston: "But, Representative, from what my information says, the bullet described in your Amendment is of a nature that is most likely to, regardless of the angle at which it is shot or the distance within certain...reasonable parameters, it will penetrate a bulletproof vest, which is the whole reason that this Bill was introduced in the first place, to restrict and prohibit that."
- ate: "Representative Preston, again I will restate, you're correct that that is a purpose that the Department of Law Enforcement has introduced this Bill. But it is my intent, if we allow this Bill to pass in its present form under this definition of a bullet, you will virtually eliminate many types...a substantial amount of ammunition presently on the market. And given that, again, to restate that, it is not necessarily the composition of the bullet. There's a lot of other factors involved. There is moisture. There's the velocity, the acceleration...speed of the bullet. There's the projectile it's shot at; and given

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

those factors, I see no sense in eliminating a substantial amount of the market which will do nothing to really address the problem. I agree with you that the Teflon bullet which is called the cop-killer bullet is a very dangerous bullet. It is something that I strongly support, and I totally embrace in this...this Bill and this Amendment. But in broadening this definition, I don't think their actual intent is to take, virtually, away from all Illinois sportsmen a lot of the ammunition that they presently use."

reston: "Well, Representative, if this Bill were...if your Amendment were adopted, and the Bill did pass, the bullets...let me restate that. If your Bill... If your Amendment was not adopted, and the Bill passed without your Amendment, the bullets that sportsmen use, don't they have substitute bullets on the market that they can use that are currently available rather than the ones that are being described in this Amendment...in this Bill?"

Tate: "That is my whole contention. I would hope that we would not make 70% of the sportsmen in the State of Illinois criminals just because they're using a bullet which is commonly used..."

reston: "No, I'm not talking about making them criminals."

ate: "By the way, you know, as far as that goes in the same definition, the definition of this Bill was rejected in the States of California, Missouri, Iowa, Maryland, every other state that has attempted to define a bullet like this, it has been overwhelmingly rejected by all State Legislatures."

reston: "But what I am trying to get at, it seems to me in my indica...and my information so indicates, that it is not a burden on these sportsmen to buy one package of bullets versus another; one package being less likely to penetrate

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

bulletproof vests and the other being more likely to penetrate bulletproof vests. What is the terrible burden? Is there some animal that they now hunt that they could not sufficiently kill with a bullet that would not penetrate bulletproof vests? Is there some target that they might shoot at that they could not more ac...as accurately shoot at with a bullet that would also not penetrate bulletproof vests?"

Tate: "Well, under that...under that reasoning then,
Representative Preston, I would strongly encourage everyone
then to use rubber bullets or rocks and take us back to the
Dark Ages."

does? Preston: "Is that what your Amendment I support that speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? Amendment. May I Amendment. would make available. would restrict...would enlarge the definition of the bullets that would prohibited to again make more bullets available that would come into the euphemism, the cop-killer bullet. More of these bullets would be able to penetrate bulletproof vests without one good reason having been given for why it is necessary to have those bullets on the market. intent of this Bill is to do exactly...to restrict the bullets that are more readily able to penetrate bulletproof To expand that definition to make more bullets vests. available on the market would defeat the whole purpose of And on the other side, there is no reason the Bill. There is no target practice that is more easily used with these bullets. There is no hunt and no animals are more easily huntable with these bullets than with other that could not penetrate or not as readily penetrate bulletproof vests. So for those reasons, if care about police officers and preserving their lives, I'd ask you to reject this Amendment. There is no reason

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

put this Amendment on the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Kane."

ane: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

- Kane: "Does this Amendment expand the coverage of the Bill or limit the coverage of the Bill? If we adopt this Amendment, will more...what kind of bullet will be available that is not available now?"
- Tate: "Representative Kane, again, to restate. I think we covered that earlier in the discussion. I'm sure that, due to the noise, you might not have been able to hear that. But, this Amendment would allow the use of metal amounting to more than 90% of the weight, and metals like lead, zinc, aluminums are metal. That is presently under the...in the present form of the Bill, that ammunition would not be legal."
- ane: "For what purpose are they...is this ammunition used that you are trying to exempt from the Bill?"
- Tate: "I'm sorry, I didn't...I can't hear. Can you speak up a
 little bit?"
- ane: "What purpose is the ammunition used for that you are exempting from the Bill that would have been included in the Bill as it was originally presented to us and would be exempted if we adopt this Amendment?"
- ate: "For sporting and recreation purposes."
- ane: "Is there alternative kinds of ammunition that can be used for sporting and hunting?"
- ate: "I'm certain that they could find alternative forms. I am certain that rubber bullets are available, and slingshots and bows and arrows."
- ane: "What other kinds of bullets? If this Amendment was not adopted, would it eliminate all kinds of bullets?"
- ate: "Yes, it would."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- ane: "All kinds of..."
- Tate: "It would eliminate a lot of different uses of bullets."
- ane: "No, answer my question. If this Amendment were not adopted, what kind of bullets would still be available to the hunter and the sportsperson?"
- every different metal content of every...that is presently be...ammunition that's presently on the market. I'm sorry.

 I'm just not familiar with all types of ammunition."
- Kane: "But if this Amendment were not adopted, there would still be bullets available to the sportsperson and the hunter."
- Tate: "Yes, I am sure they could find some."
- ane: "Why, if there are such bullets available, what do these particular bullets do that the others don't do that is necessary for a hunter or a sportsperson?"
- "Representative Kane, I'm sure that...depending on the ate: individual sportsmen using the Bill or using the bullet, which a lot of sportsmen will make their own ammunition to...for their own qualifications. And they could probably give you a much better rationale for their individual taste in ammunition than Ι do. But they would have probably...the performance of the bullet that would be improved under the different combinations or allies (sic alloys) of metal that they are utilizing. And it is contention that, in this case, that zinc, aluminum, and lead are commonly used bullets."
- Name: "What kind of...what kind of performance. I mean, is it necessary for a sportsperson, or a target person or a hunter to have this kind of a bullet? I mean, what does it do that an ordinary bullet would not do?"
- ate: "Representative Kane, I think I've answered you as well as
 I can, and I would like to terminate this."
- ane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

address this Amendment. It's obvious that the Sponsor of this Amendment cannot give us any reason why a hunter or a sportsperson needs to have this kind of ammunition, because has not been able to tell us anything bullet cannot do hunter...that an ordinary sportsperson or a hunter would want to have for a bullet. I think that for the reasons enunciated by previous speakers, that we should vote down this Amendment, because it is obvious that for ordinary hunting and sporting needs, this kind of bullet is not needed, and I would urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

inson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on this issue, because I believe that there is a...some confusion in Members minds. would draw attention to one particular situation where the Amendment would permit the language of of ammunition that would be totally consistent with the minds progressive people, unless they favor the total abolition of guns. There is currently federal las which requires the use of ammunition which does not have a lead projectile in areas along the inland waterway. For instance. you cannot shoot a duck with...with lead shot along the inland waterway today. And the purpose of federal regulation was to guard against lead poisoning, and particularly lead poisoning of the fowl shot along the Now what the Gentleman's Amendment would inland waterway. do would be to make that kind of ammunition legal, you would be using ammunition with steel projectiles in it rather than lead projectiles. The language of the Bill, as drawn, would prohibit that kind of ammunition from being used. And I believe it's totally...the entire purpose of the conservation movement in doing this has been to limit lead poisoning, not to cause the death of policemen or any

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

law enforcement people. The Amendment would permit that kind of ammunition to be used, ammunition with steel shots, steel projectiles in it. And for that reason, I would rise to support the Gentleman's Amendment, and I would hope that people would understand that, in those cases, steel projectiles in ammunition are no more dangerous than lead projectiles, indeed are much safer for people who eat the fowl and for the fowl themselves."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun."

'raun: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady 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, and the Gentleman, Representative Tate, to close." Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. bullet Bill...or the bullet was eliminated when the cutback Amendment was passed. But, this Amendment...this Amendment has been...or this Bill and this definition of a bullet has been overwhelmingly rejected by every State Legislature that has addressed the same definition of a bullet that's presently in this Bill. What I am attempting to do is allow for the use of ammunition which is commonly used by the majority of sportsmen in the State of Illinois. And if you want to vote for the sportsmen, this is a vote for the sportsmen. This same Bill in the same form has been defeated earlier this year in California, Missouri, Iowa and Maryland. Since 1968, there has not been a policemen shot by a bullet of this type. I totally embrace the concept of eliminating the cop-killer Bill which Teflon Bill. But I am totally opposed to a Bill that would take away ammunition that is commonly used for recreational purposes and by many sportsmen through this state. So, a vote for the sportsmen is a 'yes' vote for

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the Bill."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think what the Gentleman isn't saying to you is that the Department of Law Enforcement does not want this Amendment. This Bill limits the definition of armor piercing bullets. It limits the definition, and it will increase the types of bullets that are used. As a matter of fact, you will have bullets used that you really don't have any use for. I think you ought to go along with the Department of Law Enforcement and defeat this Amendment."
- peaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz to explain his vote.

 The timer's on, Sir."
- Leverenz: "I would suggest that you would vote 'no', because

 Amendments from this fine Representative end up generating

 a lot of mail. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester to explain his vote.

 The timer's on, Sir."
- Winchester: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure how I'm going to vote, because I'm confused between the comments made by Representative Tate and Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson talks about shotgun shells. Tate talks about bullets. But we're talking about stainless steel lead versus...stainless steel shot versus lead shot, then I can't support it. Can you answer that, Sam? What are we talking about? I vote 'present', Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 51 'aye', 82 'no', 16 voting 'present',

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

- and the Gentleman's Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
 Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1558, Representative McAuliffe.

 Read the Bill. 1558."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..."
- peaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1566, Representative Hastert. Out of the record? Out of the record. 1627, Representative Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Read the Bill."
- lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1627, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Emergency and Natural...Energy and Natural Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- ^lerk O'Brien: "None."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1654, out of the record. 1656.

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- 3 peaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #12"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- peaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Yourell."
- peaker Daniels: "Representative Yourell, Amendment #2."
- ourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 relates to the grand...statewide grand jury Bill in that it takes out the portion that deals with the statewide grand jury, drug investigation part of that Bill; wherein, they have to have the permission of the State's Attorney in the several counties to have a statewide grand jury. I don't know of any grand jury

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

that's ever denied anyone the right to investigate drug narcotics and the profiteering from that element in the State of Illinois. What this does simply makes it easier for the Attorney General to include that part of the grand jury Bill in House Bill 1656. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

'elcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1656. This is a similar Amendment which this House defeated in the House version of this same particular subject matter. I'd like to tell the Members of the House right now that this is a modified Bill. We are dealing only with Senate Bill 1656 in the area of narcotic trafficking and abuse of controlled substances. And what we've done with the Bill provide what the State's Attorneys of Illinois wanted. That is participation and the ability to grant permission to the Attorney General before he would go into their particular county. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, believe that this Bill could become a critically important tool in stemming the terrible tide that's run across this country and this state in the field of drug abuse and narcotic trafficking. If we were to adopt Amendment #2, we would then encourage the opposition of a great segment of Illinois' law enforcement community, various State's Attorneys. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is for those reasons that I rise to oppose Amendment #2 so that we may retain the support of the State's Attorneys throughout Illinois for Senate Bill 1656."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Cullerton."

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

the House. I am sure everyone here knows that there's no

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

way, whether this Amendment passes or not, whether ... that I would be in favor of the Bill. But, I want you to know that this Bill, at this point in time, is almost farcical. Tribune and Sun-Times originally had endorsed this Bill; but after looking at what Representative Telcser brought to us today, they have redefined their position on the Bill. As a matter of fact, the Chicago Tribune said that this Bill has been watered down to meet objections from various interests and by now, it's all water. The in today's editorial, called it a cheap imitation of what it once was. What Representative Yourell's Amendment is intended to do is to make some sense out of the Bill, to make some sense out of what has been claimed as a tough law and order measure. The way the Bill reads now, the State's Attorney has to approve whether not the Attorney General can come in and indict somebody in this county. Well, current law says that the State's Attorney, with his approval, the Attorney General could come in right now and use the current county grand jury. So, the Bill is absolutely farcical. What he is saying with this Amendment is that, in the extreme. possibility that there is a State's Attorney who refuses to allow the Attorney General into his ... into his county. that that is wrong, and that that should be taken out of his Amendment. He says that it was put in to please the State's Attorneys' Association. I want you to know that the State's Attorneys' Association is, again, another group that has changed their position on this Bill, and now are not in favor of the Bill. I can assure you that they are not in favor of the Bill. So, it won't make any difference one way or the other. I would suggest to Representative Telcser, if he's going to run with the Bill, at least try to make some sense out of it; and, for

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

reason, I would encourage everyone to vote for this Amendment."

ourell: "Thank you. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, Representative Cullerton said it right, I believe. What we're trying to do is to provide some force to what is now a very weakened statewide grand jury Bill. They've taken everything out of the Bill, except, except the prosecution narcotics agents and druggers in the State of Illinois. Again, I don't think that there's a State's Attorney in Illinois who runs for re-election every four years that will say to the Attorney General, if this Bill ever becomes law, that, 'No, no, you cannot come into my county and prosecute in several counties any drug offenses'. This vetoes that and says to the Attorney General of the State Illinois, 'You don't need the State's Attorney's permission to do this. We're giving it to you through legislation. This is the strongest part of the Bill, as it exists today, if you adopt Amendment #2. I think it's a good Amendment. It does something for House Bill... Senate Bill 1656 that the Sponsor of the Bill has not done. It makes it stronger. It makes it a better Bill, and I don't know of one State's Attorney that's written to any Member of this House that says, 'No, they're not in favor of Amendment #2. I ask for a favorable Roll Call Amendment #2."

"Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 75 'aye', 83 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Poll of the Absentees? Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees. Record

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Representative Diana Nelson as 'no'. Virginia Frederick as 'no'. Frederick. Representative Piel from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Sandquist 'no'. Representative Stuffle 'aye'. C. L. &cCormick 'no'. Representative Nelson, your light is still on. Representative Nelson, your light's on. Representative Bullock from 'aye' to 'no'."

Bullock: "'Present'. 'Present'."

'present'. Representative Johnson. Change Representative
Johnson from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Leinenweber
'no'. Findley 'no'. Preston. Representative Preston from
'aye' to 'no'. Okay, proceed with a Poll of the Absentees.
Representative Yourell."

fourell: "One last chance to get on a good Bill. I'm not going to ask for a Poll of the Absentee, but..."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay."

(ourell: "Let her go."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Representative Leverenz wishes to be recorded as... from 'aye' to 'no'. Alright. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "'Aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "She wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'.

Representative Braun."

3raun: "Leave to be verified, please."

Speaker Daniels: "There's no verification."

3raun: "Oh, sorry. Thought that's what it was."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Christensen."

:hristensen: "Vote me from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Christensen as 'present'.

Okay. What's the count? Representative Lechowicz."

lechowicz: "Kindly record me from 'no' to 'aye'."

ipeaker Daniels: "Record Representative Lechowicz as 'aye'. There
are 72 'aye', 91 'no', and the Gentleman's Amendment fails.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Further Amendments?"

:Lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Getty."

speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, Amendment #3."

etty: "Ar. Speaker and Members of the House, provides simply that, if the Attorney General does come and gets the indictment, that he shall prosecute it. Ι that, apparently, through oversight would suggest in drafting. the language on page three, line 11 of the Amendment #1 provides that the Attorney General or designee shall attend each statewide grand jury and may prosecute any indictment returned by it. I would suggest that it would be very strange indeed if the Attorney General, who prepared the case, who presented the facts, investigated, presented the facts to the grand jury, got the indictment, would then walk off and have an ... State's Attorney, not familiar with the case, left holding the bag. Certainly, in the interest of orderly prosecution of a criminal offense, the Attorney General certainly prosecute the case which he investigated, brought, should had the indictment returned on, he should be in charge of the prosecution, and this would make it clear that our local State's Attorneys would not, later on. be left without the aide of the resources and the statewide abilities of the Attorney General having to prosecute a case brought by the Attorney General's Office. I would certainly ask for your support, and I hope that the Sponsor would gladly accept this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I must rise to oppose Amendment #3 which the Gentleman has offered, because Amendment #3 gets to the heart of the very matter we discussed in Amendment #2; that is, the cooperation between the various State's Attorneys in Illinois and the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Attorney General. If an indictment is obtained from a grand jury, it is our feeling that that same cooperation ought to exist between the various State's Attorneys and the Attorney General. And, if it's in the best interests then the Attorney General would prosecute. the case. If, for some reason, it's the best interest of the case the prosecution that the State's Attorney should prosecute, then that's the way it ought to be. Amendment #3 would take out of the Bill that cooperative effort between various State's Attorneys and the Attorney General, and Amendment #3 would, in effect, do the same thing which Amendment #2 would have done. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in order to preserve the essence of Senate Bill 1656 and it's efforts to curb drug abuse and drug trafficking, I rise to oppose Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Purther discussion? Gentleman, Representative Getty... Getty, to close."

Getty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

3peaker Daniels: "Excuse me. We have a late light. His light just showed up. Representative Cullerton."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House. I think the opposition of Mr. Telcser to this Bill, the opposition of the Attorney General through Telcser to this Amendment is really points out what this is all about. He wants all the glory. He wants all the headlines, but he doesn't want any of the work. done here is to say that he can go in and get the indictment and all the headlines; but, after that, doesn't have to try the case. He doesn't have to try the case. He can just give it to all the local State's Attorneys and say, Here. Do the best you can. If it's a not guilty, it'll be... it won't be... it'll be buried in the...in the back page, and the Attorney General wouldn't

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

have taken the heat. That's what ... That's what it amounts we're saying with this Amendment is this: shall be the one in charge of prosecuting the case. Ιf he's one that got the indictment, he's the one that shall prosecute. This doesn't, in any way, eliminate ability to cooperate with the local State's Attorney. He can ask the local State's Attorney to come in and help him, As a matter of fact, under current law, he right now. go in and help the State's Attorney in his drug cases right to say that this in any... this Amendment is now. So. designed, in any way, to eliminate cooperation, is a farce. What this Amendment does is points out what this Bill is really all about. It's an opportunity for the Attorney General to get his name in the paper when he gets but without any of the work in actually trying to prosecute and get a conviction. That's why you be for the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Getty, to close."

"Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would be absolutely Setty: amazed if our present Attorney General did not support this I can't believe that he would not support this Amendment; because, if you don't adopt this Amendment, what you're doing is reversing the role which we have in this state now where the Attorney General makes his resources available to the local State's Attorney to prosecute That is the cooperation that Mr. Telcser eloquently spoke of. Now, if we don't adopt my that reversed. You would have the you would then have Attorney General going out and getting indictments and then mandating, mandating that your local State's Attorney It won't hurt much in Cook County, and it it. prosecute won't hurt much in DuPage County, but I don't know that you

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

downstate counties have the resources to prosecute that, nor do I think it would be very fair, nor would I like it, if I were the State's Attorney of a county, that some other prosecutor came into my county, whether he's the Attorney General or anyone else, got his indictment and then said to You prosecute the case. Here. You county's funds prosecuting the case. You spend the time of your men, your prosecutors, your meager staff prosecuting this case. I'm going back to Springfield.' Now, if that's you want, then vote against my Amendment. Vote with Mr. Telcser if that's what you want. If you want, the man, the State's Attorney, if he brings the indictment, or the Attorney General, if he brings the indictment, to prosecute their own cases, and let them cooperate. certainly, with one another - that's understood. want cooperation, but you want responsibility accountability in government, then vote 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote. Timer's on, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm...

like to speak in opposition to this Amendment, and I really
think it shouldn't go on this Bill. One of the things
that... Representative Getty points out that the Attorney
General can come in and get an indictment and then leave
the matter in the hands of the State's Attorney; but, on
the other hand, it may very well be that, politically, it
would be very much to the advantage of the State's Attorney
to prosecute the indictment. Now with this Amendment,
you've totally eliminated any discretion; and, inasmuch as
the State's Attorney can keep the Attorney General out, in

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

the first instance, they're going to be cooperative. So, it's absolutely nonsensical, in my judgement, to tie the hands of the local State's Attorney to prevent him from performing, from prosecuting the indictment just there is a fear that ... (cut off) ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Leinenweber: "Well, it just seems nonsensical to absolutely tie the hands here, because you're going to have cooperation, in the first instance, because the State's Attorney could keep the Attorney General out. So, I urge everybody to vote against this Amendment which eliminates discretion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Leinenweber is exactly correct, and I think you're hearing a lot of ob... obfuscation from the other side. I think we all know what that's all about. I can tell you that State's Attorney in Will County is going to President Elect or is the President Elect of the Attorneys' Associations, and he does not want to see this Amendment on this Bill, nor does anyone else. The cooperation can exist very well after the indictment, because the Attorney General's Office will then furnish the same cooperation, the same staffing and the same effective kind of help that they have in the past. It keeps autonomy State's within the Attorney's office. but allows multi-county grand juries to indict beyond the capacity of State's Attorney. I can tell you the State's Attorneys Association does not want this Amendment on this Bill, and it seems to me these Amendments are only for political reasons."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich, Dwight Friedrich. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 85 - 85,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

and this Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Llerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Cullerton."

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

Julierton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of As you may have guessed, I've read this Bill House. very carefully, and I've noticed that the Attorney General whoever wrote this Bill misspelled subornation. don't know whether or not the Sponsor would be in favor of agreeing to this Amendment, but I don't want to take any So, I will just say that I think it's a very good Amendment. It corrects the spelling. It changes the word 'subordination'... I'm not sure what subordination means. but perhaps the Attorney General wants it in the Bill. Т I would like for it to read 'subornation', don't know. and; therefore, I would ask and move for the Amendment #4."

ipeaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. #4 is adopted. Congratulations. Further Amendments?"

:lerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Hannig."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig, Amendment #5."

This Amendment attempts to broaden the scope of this Bill as proposed. This Bill... This Amendment would put hazardous waste back into the Bill, as an offense that the Attorney General could prosecute through statewide grand juries. Hazardous waste, as you might suspect, is a direct threat to the health and welfare of our citizens, as is narcotics, and I do believe that there is room and, certainly, reason to put that into this Bill. You might recall that we have had three Bills before us in the past, none of which have passed; but, nevertheless, all three of

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

which have addressed the situation and have included narcotics, hazardous waste and consumer fraud. This Bill is strictly limited to narcotics. I believe that hazardous waste is an important enough offense that the Attorney General, the crime-fighter of our state, that he should include it in his Bill, and I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

'elcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, frankly, I support the concept of what the Gentleman has embodied in Amendment #5, but every Member of this House knows that what we went through with this piece of legislation in previous few months; and, if I might paraphrase the Minority Leader, for whom I have a very high regard, the Minority Leader stood on the floor of this House just a few weeks ago and he said that the genius of the legislative process is the ability to learn to compromise and take what you hope you can get. And it's clear to me that t he provisions of Amendment #5 would simply kill the Bill. And Speaker, I, therefore, rise to oppose Mr. the provisions of Amendment #5. Perhaps, someday, another General Assembly or the Gentleman who's offering this Amendment, who I... who may be coming back next Session, could introduce another Bill to do just this very thing; but, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't want this Bill killed. Amendment #5, as lauditory as it may be, would simply kill the Amendment. And so, going along with, only my own personal philosophy, but that of the Minority Leader, my good friend from Cook County, I rise and ask the Members to please oppose Amendment #5."

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

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

believe that the Minority Leader probably would be in favor but, in closing, I would like to say of this Amendment: that I believe that this Amendment restores some authority to the Attorney General and would provide some meaningful legislation... some meaningful elements to legislation. I believe that, if he really wants to live up to his. his campaign title as a crime-fighter, that he really must have the ability to fight some crimes in Now, we all know that hazardous wastes, by their very definition, are life-threatening substances, and I think that we have to have legislation which would address Now, I think that simply passing the Bill as that. introduced is simply a watered-down proposal. 1 don't really think that it solves really any of the problems of our state, and I think that it's important that we include I would hate to think that, perhaps, the this Amendment. Sponsors of this legislation have bowed to some of special interest groups that are seen around this Legislature who have opposing this Bill in the past simply because they're afraid that the Attorney General might prosecute hazardous waste violations. I think that's his job. I think he should live up to it, and I think we should adopt this Amendment. I would ask for favorable vote, and I'd ask for a Roll Call vote."

ipeaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'... no. Looks like the 'nos' have it. Further Amendments?"

:lerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, I specifically asked for a Roll Call vote. I know you weren't paying attention to the debate, and you have other things to do on the podium, but I would ask for

127th Legislative Day

June 21. 1982

a Roll Call vote."

- *5. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

 There are 79 'aye' and 80 'no', 5 voting 'present'.

 Amendment... Representative Cullerton."
- :ullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry after you announce the results of this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Amendment fails. Your inquiry, Sir?" :ullerton: "The ... The Bill on my Calendar, on page eight, reads, amends an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. That's what the Bill, the Senate Bill did; and, apparently, this Bill has been amended in Committee to change the title. This came up once before this Session. Representative Barr had a Bill having to do the Park District, and he amended it in Committee to change the title. And it, inadvertently, was misprinted in the Calendar: and, again, the same thing appears to have happened with this Bill. So, I believe, to be consistent and to follow our temporary rules - because after all, what are temporary rules for - I suggest that this Bill back to Second Reading. First Legislative Day and the Calendar be corrected to read the actual title as it. now . is, as it was amended in Committee."
- speaker Daniels: "Parliamentarian advises me that the rule you're referring to only requires that the Bill be sent back to First Legislative Day when it's amended on the floor. It was amended in Committee, and it's properly on the Calendar as it appears. So, it's in order."
- Sullerton: "Well, just out of curiosity. Tomorrow, when it's on the Calendar, how is it going to read? Is it going to read, 'it amends an Act in relation to criminal

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

identification and investigation, or it is going to read as it read as it came out of the Committee with a new title? And I'd also like to know what the temporary rules mean? It says it has to be read by title three times. This has been read by a different title three times.

Speaker Daniels: "The Assistant Clerk is advising me at the moment. Mr. O'Brien tells us they change it when they are advised by Enrolling and Engrossing, and they have yet to advise them. It's a Senate Amendment. So, they don't advise them. So, everything, because it's a Senate Bill, Mr. O'Brien has advised us that it is in order; and, if you have further questions, he invites your inquiry and would like you to chat with him about it. Further Amendments?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow has filed a request on the State Mandates Act and also a fiscal note request. The Parliamentarian has advised me and the Chair so rules that the State Mandates Act does not apply in this individual instance. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Did you rule on the State Mandates Act?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

Telcser: "Alright, that's... Is there anything else that's..."

Speaker Daniels: "And there is a fiscal note filed."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, who filed a fiscal note that guickly? And, secondly, does the fiscal note pertain as to the financial impact on the counties?"

Speaker Daniels; "Representative Telcser. Alright.
Representative Darrow, there is a fiscal note request. I'm
sorry. I said it was filed. I meant the request was
filed. Now, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in my view,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

a fiscal note effect is not in order regarding Senate Bill 1656. There is no way possible anyone could conjure up or dream up what, if any, fiscal impact would ... this would have on the state. And the Attorney General, in moving his appropriation through the process, I believe, has not... has not indicated a request for funds for this function. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Members, that ... that you couldn't... couldn't predict what it would cost, and my recollection... to correct myself - in the Attorney General's appropriation, he had an amount of some 60 or 65.000 dollars for the function of the statewide grand juries, should they becomes law. In fact, I think a Member side mentioned that on your when we passed his appropriation Bill. I don't know if it was an adopted Amendment or not, or if it's even in the Bill yet or not; but, Mr. Speaker, I would say that a fiscal note is not in order and, if necessary, I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the House determine that the fiscal note is not in order. That would take a simple 'yea' or 'nay' vote, if I remember correctly. I might add, for a Bill that doesn't mean much, according to some Members on the other side, there sure is a lot of ruckus over it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that was just the point... just the point of Amendment #3. The Gentleman, apparently, missed the point. Again, I wish he would personally contact the Attorney General, because I think, if Ty Pahner thought about this, he would have supported Amendment #3. The point is, this won't affect State Government. I am sure the Gentleman who requested the fiscal note was not interested in what it would cost State Government. He's interested in what it's going to cost local government, what it's going to cost local government,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

fiscal impact on the counties, we are entitled to a fiscal note from the Department of Local Government Affairs. It is going to cost the counties; because, if it stands as it is without my Amendment #3, the Attorney General can waltz into any county, get his indictment and then leave the local State's Attorney, the local county board paying and the local taxpayers paying instead of the state. I suggest to you that this will definitely require a fiscal note on the impact on local government. That's what the Gentleman asked for."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yeah, on the issue, I would refer to page three of Representative Telcser's Amendment #1 that provides that the cost of impanelling a statewide grand jury and the cost expenses incurred in the performance of its function and duties shall be paid by the county. Then, it says the county shall be reimbursed for such cost of the expenses onto the state... by the state out of funds appropriated, etcetera. So, it seems to me that, indeed, by its terms, it says that it will have an impact on state... on state finances. So, I would allude to Section 8 of Amendment #1, which clearly, it seems to me, makes a requirement for a fiscal note."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the earlier speakers on our side of the aisle that we must be cautious about the cost involvement at the county level, but I find it difficult to believe that there will not be state costs. And, while I was wondering if I was misinformed about the impact of this Bill, a copy has been presented to me of a letter written to the <u>Quincy Herald Whig</u> by the Illinois Attorney General, and in that letter, the Attorney General says, '.. and most important, the state would bear the

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

costs of the prosecution, not one small county or six small counties. So, apparently, the Attorney General of this state believes that there will be a state impact; and, if so, we are entitled to know what that impact is. And, in order to find out what the impact is, the proper procedure is to ask for a fiscal note, and a fiscal note has been requested and a mandates note as well. And any ruling by the Chair to provide that such a request is out of order certainly doesn't agree with the letter written by the Illinois Attorney General to the <u>Quincy Herald Whiq</u> on this very point."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It seems really quite interesting that for a Bill, which Members in the chamber said didn't do anything and was watered down and meaningless, there sure is an awful lot of interest about this piece of legislation. Now, that the Members of the House are entitled to know if something costs them money, and I think, above all else, we should comply with the law ourselves. And, if Gentleman... someone has filed a fiscal note request or a fiscal impact request, whatever it is, I'm certainly going to comply with that. I'm going to comply, and I'm going to file that note properly from the proper source. And then, Mr. Speaker, move this Bill hopefully to Third Reading call it up and down, but I do want the Members to know that this is, indeed, a meaningful piece of legislation to get to the heart of one of the most worst, serious problems we have in our society today. This is not a frivolous Bill, and I think the Members who are filing fiscal notes, state mandate notes, and Amendments and what have you know it's a meaningful Bill, and for some reason they want to thwart it. Well, I think it's important to move forward

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

with this Bill; and, Mr. Speaker, leave it on Second, and I'll file any note that any Member requests in my zeal to get this Bill enacted into law."

- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you. Representative Peters in the Chair."
- Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 1665, Representative McBroom. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1678, Representative Wolf. Out of the record. Page seven of the Calendar to pick up a Bill we passed, Senate Bill 1566, Representative Hastert. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Aurora Civil Center Act and the Waukegan and Joliet
 Metropolitan Exhibition Auditory Authority Act. Second
 Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Van Duyne."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Van Duyne, Amendment #1."

- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 simply changes the title of the Joliet Metropolitan Exposition Authority from Joliet to Will County. This is an agreed Amendment by the four... four Representatives from our district; Repres... myself, Hastert, Leinenweber and Davis, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Hastert. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1566 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Giorgi."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #2, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment allows metro centers to have a security force within the confines of the metro centers,

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

much like we've given the airport authorities, park districts and sanitary districts the same authority. I've cleared it with the Sponsor, and there are no objections to the Bill... Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This Amendment was drafted in part by the head of the Rockford Metro Authority and also the State's attorney in Winnebago County. I ask that you adopt the Amendment.

Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Giorgi, to close. Representative Lechowicz, on the Amendment."

Lechowicz: "Does this Amendment affect Chicago?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "It specifically amends the Little McCormick Place in downstate Illinois, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "I urge the support of the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 to Senate Bill
1566 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying
'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair,
the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 2 is adopted. Any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Page two of the Calendar, House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2461, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Davis."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, is Representative Zwick on the floor?"

Speaker Peters: "Who?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Davis: "Representative Zwick."

Speaker Peters: "Yes."

Davis: "I wish.. permission to return this to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Well, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2461, a Bill for an Act creating the
Department of Central Management Services and amending
certain Acts in connection therewith. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis. Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 2461 to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendments. Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk. Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #12, Representative Zwick."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. If you will take a look at Amendment #12, I think you might see it's one of the simpler Amendments that we have to deal with. It simply deletes the word 'and', which was a technical error that came out in a previous Amendment that was adopted. It was brought to my attention after adoption of the Amendment, and I think we have to correct it at this point. So, I would appreciate your support. It simply deletes the word 'and'. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 to House Bill 2461 be adopted?'.

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #12 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Do you wish it heard now, Sir?

House Bill 2517, Representative? Out of the record.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 1256, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1452, Representative Telcser. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 1452. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1593, Representative McMaster. Out of the record. Representative Leverenz, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- Leverenz: "I wondered if we could go back and pick up 1374, when
 the Chair would entertain that. The Amendments are in
 order."
- Speaker Peters: "I didn't hear you. I'm trying to be very quiet and polite."
- Leverenz: "1374. We took it out of the record. We can go back and get that. The Amendments are in order."
- Speaker Peters: "Senate Bills, Second Reading, page four of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1374, Representative Leverenz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Terzich - Matijevich."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #3."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the 70% retirement Amendment, similar to the others that we have approved. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would... Would the Sponsor tell us 70% for what? I don't know. Oh, it's the funding."

Matijevich: "This is the retirement Amendment, right, Ted? I

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

don't have it. I sent all my stuff upstairs. Isn't this the retirement? Yeah, this is the one which would pay at 70% of the pay-out level, similar to the others that we've approved."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, before we do that, #3 I thought was out of order, and I find now that it is. #4 does the same.

So, let's withdraw 3, and everything I said would apply to #4. And I'd move..."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #3, Representative Matijevich withdraws Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Terzich - Matijevich."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Move for adoption of #4."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir?"

Friedrich: "The notation I have here that this is inadequate for the purpose you say it's for, and would actually take 5283 dollars to do what you put down 4500. Now, is there any reason why you would have an inadequate amount?"

Matijevich: "This is what my staff has told me is adequate for the purposes of bringing it up to 70% of the pay—out level. I couldn't respond except that that is the information given to me by my staff."

Friedrich: "Well, I quess..."

Matijevich: "Oh, I ... just a moment. Both Amendments #1 and 4 do this, not 4 by itself, Dwight."

Friedrich: "Apparently, our figures don't agree. I think you're
 still wrong."

Matijevich: "Move for adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leverenz.

Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1374 be

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf and Matijevich, are there any more appropriations, Second Reading that we now have the Amendments that are basically agreed to? Pardon? No. Alright."

Matijevich: "We're ready to go home."

Speaker Peters: "Page eight of the Calendar, Consent Calendar.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bills."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day.

 Senate Bill 1298, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform

 Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. Senate Bill 1330, a

 Bill for an Act to amend the Interest Act. Senate Bill

 1368, a Bill for an Act to enlarge corporate limits of

 Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Senate

 Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking

 Act. Senate Bill 1537, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Revenue Act. Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act to amend

 the Revenue Act. Senate Bill 1591, a Bill for an Act to

 amend an Act in relation to state contracts for fuel.

 Senate Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil

 Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of these

 Bills."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?'.

 Hold on. Hold on. We have been asked for a division...a

 division of the question on some of these Bills.

 Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Hr. Speaker, I'd ask for a division of the guestion on Senate Bill 1526."

Speaker Peters: "Is that the only one, Sir?"

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Getty: "That's correct."

Speaker Peters: "Alright. Mr. Clerk, the Consent Calendar minus Senate Bill 1526. Okay? The que.. Alright? The question is. 'Shall these Bills pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. wish? On this question there are 141 voting 'aye', Clerk. 11 voting 'present'. These Bills, having 'nay', received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared Mr. Clerk, add Catania 'present'. Catania. passed. question now is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1526 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have Have all voted who wish? Take the all voted who wish? record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 voting none voting 'nay', 31 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1526, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Third Reading, page two of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1247, Representative Friedrich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Peters: "47."

Clerk O'Brien: ".. 1247, a Bill for an Act to amend the 1981

Combined Revisory Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the annual or biannual revisionary Bill by the Legislative Reference Bureau. Representative Getty's staff has gone over it, and so has the staff on this side. There is nothing substantive in it. It's the revisionary Bill, and I move to its adoption... move it to be adopted."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1247 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 157 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pullen. Do you want to go with 1685? Representative Barkhausen, 1588. Getty, 1387. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1005, McCormick; 1006, Griffin; 1007, Mulcahey; 1008, Vinson; 1009, Van Duyne; 1010, Woodyard; 1011, Mulcahey; 1012, Mulcahey; 1013, Bianco; 1014, Steczo; 1015, R. J. Meyer; and, House Joint Resolution 94, Reed and 95, DiPrima."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Joint Resolution 94, Reed - et al. It has come to the attention of the Members of the this chamber that Frank Kudrna, Ph.D. will retire as Director of the Illinois Division of Water Resources in July of 1982. House Resolution 95, DiPrima - et al. The 47th Premier Boys State was held at Eastern Illinois University in Charleston on June 5 through June 12, 1982. House Resolution 1005, McCormick, Winchester, Rea and Alstat: Thomas E. Cox, a Pireman Apprentice in the United States Navy has received a Letter of Appreciation for the performance of his duties as a maintenance assistant aboard the USS Fahrion, 22-25. 1982. House Resolution 1006, that we commend the reporting date of the Subcommittee of the House Transportation Committee created by House Resolution 134 will be January 1, 1983. House Resolution 1007, Mulcahey. The Village of Davis is celebrating its 125th Anniversary.

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

House Resolution 1008, Vinson, that the reporting date of the recommendations of the Department of Public Health relating to House Resolution 120 be January 1, 1983. Resolution 1009, by Van Duyne. Carol Shaddelee was the Illinois Teacher of the Year at the 8th Annual. whose excellent Education Award ceremony held in Americana Congress Hotel in Chicago. House Resolution 1010, that the Agriculture Building in the State Fairgrounds Springfield, Illinois be designated as the John W. House Resolution 1011, that Delbert F. Cox and his lovely wife, Viola, celebrated their Golden Wedding Anniversary , and they are renewing their vows on Sunday, June 13th, the father-in-law of the Sponsor of the Mulcahey. House Resolution 1012, Mulcahey. Resolution, The House is proud to recognize the excellence of one of most outstanding high school athletes, Piper, of Durand High School, the Class of '82 State High Association for 400 Meter Champion. House Resolution 1013, Bianco - et al. The Reverend John A. Ward recently celebrated his 50th Anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood at the special Jubilee Mass. House Resolution 1014, Steczo and Jack Dunn. Wilbert H. Tinley Park police officer, will leave the office... leave the police force on July 17, 1982. House Resolution 1015, Meyer, Macdonald and Chapman. That's R. J. Meyer. Elk Grove recently capped an outstanding by advancing to the men's quarter finals of the Illinois High School Association's State Baseball Tournament. exciting and explosive team coached by Larry Peddy, Dan Crivellone, and Bob Huber and Bob Staub, posted excellent record of 17 and 9 during the season. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move for the of the Resolutions."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

Representative McClain, what purpose do you seek
recognition?"

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would object to the Resolution where we named the new Agricultural Building after John Lewis. So, I ask you to withdraw that Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "Resolution 1010."

McClain: "So, Resolution 1010 which names the Ag. Building after

John Lewis is withdrawn. Is that correct?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Yes, I question the Resolution, too. It was approved by your side of the aisle, and it's not worth the paper it was written on, but it's sending somebody a message."

McClain: "Well, then you won't mind withdrawing it, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I beg your pardon?"

McClain: "Then, you won't mind withdrawing it."

Conti: "I don't mind withdrawing it. It was approved by your side of the aisle."

Speaker Peters: "Withdraw Resolution 1010. Committee on Assignments. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion on the Resolutions. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolutions are adopted. Representative Wolf, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Wolf: "For the purpose of an announcement."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed. Proceed."

Wolf: "Yes, there will be a meeting of the House Appropriations

Committee tonight at the designated place. It's a very

important meeting. We hope you'll all be there on time,

and for some strange reason, even the Leadership is

invited."

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The Chair wishes... Is it... The Chair wishes to announce, for the 'Anglo' files, that Princess Di today brought into the world a princeling. Seven pounds, one and Long live the Prince. one-half ounces. The Chair also wishes to announce that Count... that Count 'Viashowski' had a son.... ... live forever. God bless you. you. Are we ready for the Motion to adjourn, Mr. On... On 16... Senate Bill 1656. Yes. Senate Bill 1656. Senate Bill 1566 (sic - 1656), a fiscal note. Robbin and Batman, I'm getting confused here. Senate Bill 1656, a fiscal note has now been filed. Rep... Who? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, who signed the fiscal note?"

Speaker Peters: "Tyrone C. Pahner."

Darrow: "I don't believe he's the proper person to have signed it. I believe that Local Government is the one that has to file the fiscal note."

Speaker Peters: "That, I am informed, is part of the mand...

State Mandates Act, not the Fiscal Note Act."

Darrow: "The Fiscal Note Act has not yet been filed."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, it has."

Darrow: "And Tyrone Fahner signed it?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes."

Darrow: "Would you read it to the Membership please?"

Speaker Peters: "Sure. Pursuant to Section 2 of, quote, 'an Act requiring fiscal notes in relation to certain Bills', unquote, the Attorney General has been requested to prepare a fiscal note on Senate Bill 1656 as amended by House Amendments numbers 1 and 4, period. Paragraph, 'Senate Bill 1656, as amended, provides for the impaneling of statewide grand juries for the purpose of investigation of prosecution of narcotics trafficking', period. Paragraph, 'because it is unknown as to the number of statewide grand

127th Legislative Day

June 21, 1982

juries which may be created, it is not possible to determine the exact cost, period. Paragraph, 'however, at the current time, I am estimating the cost will not exceed 32,000 dollars for the Fiscal Year '83 and 64,000 dollars for each year thereafter. Tyrone C. Pahner, Attorney General, State of Illinois.' Done this day, before God and man. Third Reading. Yes, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's fine for the impact on the State of Illinois, but the fiscal note that I filed also pertained to the fiscal impact on local counties, since the counties will have to pick up the cost of this program.

Now, I don't believe Tyrone Fahner is the proper one to file the fiscal note on behalf of the counties. The Department of Local Government Affairs is the one that is responsible for filing a fiscal note with regard to the impact on counties, and I would ask that it be held on Second Reading until they do file the fiscal note. This is going to create quite a financial burden on a number of counties."

Speaker Peters: "On this question, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, what the Gentleman requests is not part of the Act. You properly noted that the request has been filed, and you moved the Bill to Third Reading where it now, in my opinion, properly resides."

Speaker Peters: "That's true. Any other business, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further business."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I now move the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 2:00 p.m."

Speaker Peters: "2:00 p.m. tomorrow. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The House is adjourned."

PAGE 1

JUNE 21, 1982

		JUNE 21, 1982		
	HB-2461	RECALLED	PAGE	119
	SB-1247	THIRD READING	PAGE	123
	SB-1285	SECOND READING	PAGE	36
	SB-1298	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1330	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1352	SECOND READING	PAGE	52
	SB-1353	SECOND READING	PAGE	36
	SB-1354	SECOND READING	PAGE	38
	SB-1355	SECOND READING	PAGE	45
	SB-1356	SECOND READING	PAGE	46 46
	SB-1357 SB-1362	SECOND READING SECOND BEADING	PAGE PAGE	47
	SB-1364	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
	SB-1367	RECALLED	PAGE	4
	SB-1368	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1374	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
	SB-1374	SECOND READING	PAGE	120
	SB-1375	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
	SB-1383	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
	SB-1386	SECOND READING	PAGE	49
	SB-1399	SECOND READING	PAGE	49
	SB-1401	THIRD READING	PAGE	17
	SB-1402	SECOND READING	PAGE	50
	SB-1403	SECOND READING	PAGE	53
	SB-1404	SECOND READING	PAGE	53
	SB-1405	SECOND READING	PAGE	56
	SB-1407	SECOND READING	PAGE	57 58
	SB-1408 SB-1409	SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	58
	SB-1411	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
	SB-1411	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
	SB-1413	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
	SB-1415	SECOND READING	PAGE	60
	SB-1416	SECOND READING	PAGE	61
	SB-1418	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
	SB-1419	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
	SB-1421	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
	SB-1423	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
	SB-1424	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
	SB-1425	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
	SB-1426	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
	SB- 1427	SECOND READING	PAGE	65
	SB-1445	SECOND READING	PAGE	66
	SB-1452 SB-1492	THIRD READING RECALLED	PAGE PAGE	2 29
	SB-1492 SB-1498	SECOND READING	PAGE	66
ı.	SB-1436	SECOND READING	PAGE	67
Ì	SB-1516	SECOND READING	PAGE	80
	SB- 1526	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
1	SB-1532	SECOND READING	PAGE	80
	SB-1537	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1538	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1549	THIRD READING	PAGE	32
	SB-1566	SECOND READING	PAGE	117
	SB-1579	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
	SB-1591	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SB-1614	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
	SB-1627	SECOND READING	PAGE	99 34
	SB-1652	SECOND READING	PAGE	34 99
	SB-1656 SB-1656	SECOND READING OTHER	PAGE PAGE	127
	SB- 1668		PAGE	122
	סטטו עני	THE THE PROPERTY		

SB13

09/09/82 08:20

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

PAGE 2

JUNE 21, 1982

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - FATHER HUGH CASSIDY	PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1	
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	40	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	124	
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	117	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	128	