68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order. The Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend John Warton from the Winnetka Bible School of the Church located in Winnetka, Illinois. Reverend."

Reverend Warton: "I thank you for the privilege of praying on your behalf this week. Today I would like to lead you in prayer on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois. Almighty God, the Creator and Will you pray with me? Sustainer of Life, we pause at the outset of this Session today to give Thee thanks for this wonderful land in which we live. Surely one of the most blessed states in the earth, rich in natural resources and minerals, an assemblage of people today with many talents and abilities. And we join together as lawmakers in this state to pray for them. We ask that Your blessing would be upon them for Your word reveals that You are good to all. The eyes of all turn to Thee and Thou dost fulfill the desires of every living thing. And we pray, Oh, God, that You would bring economic well-being to the people of this state. families are affected by inflation today. Many businesses are hurt by the interest rates. Many farms are devastated by floods today. And we pray for the relief and the solution of these problems. We would pray for the families in this state that in this summertime You would give parents and children more time together: You would husbands and wives the spirit of communication and love that marriages might be strengthened throughout our state pray for the individuals of our state, men, women and we and children that that well-being which no material political system can give, but which prosperity and no comes only from Thee, might reign in the hearts as from God. And now for this Session, we ask for courage,

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

for wisdom and the spirit of statesmanship and we ask it in the name of the only one who is blessed and the one who is most blessing to all. Amen."

- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. Representative Klemm will lead the Pledge."
- Klemm: "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. 170 answering the Roll. A Quorum of the House is present. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary;
  Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of
  Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the
  House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill, the
  following titles to wit: House Bill 590, together with
  attached Amendments hereto and the adoption of which I'm
  instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate
  Amendments 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, passed the Senate as
  amended June 19th, 1981. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "Committee reports."

Clerk Leone: "Representative J.J.Wolf, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 19th, 1981, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' Senate Bills 230, 320 and 381; 'Do pass as amended' Senate Bills 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 271, 310, 339 and 1157."

Speaker Ryan: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "Agreed Resolutions: House Resolution 398, Johnson.
399, Wikoff. 402, O'Brien. 403, Cullerton."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House 398 by Johnson where Ed Mass and each of his six sons, Phil, Eric, Kim, Dan, Alan and Jeff have gone through the Boy Scouts and attained the highest rank of House Resolution 399, Jack Seymore Eagle Scout. Champaign, Illinois was recently elected President of the American Bowling Congress. That's by Wikoff. Resolution 402 by O'Brien, The Golden Rocks Restaurant, one Chicago's oldest restaurants celebrating its 60th anniversary of May this year. House Resolution 403 by Cullerton, the Legislature recommends that the Board of Directors of Chicago Cubs National League Ball Club Stockholders take into consideration the history relationship which have characterized this franchise. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Resolutions."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolutions are passed. Death Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 397, Ronan, in respect to the memory of Stanley W. Whitebloom, House Resolution 400, Ronan, in respect to the memory of Orland C. Nickols, House Resolution 401, Oblinger-Kane-Irv Smith, in respect to the memory of Rita Murphy Howell."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move for the adoption of the Resolutions."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Death Resolution (sic, Resolutions are) is adopted. On page two of the Calendar under the Order of Senate Bills, Third

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Reading. Short Debate. appears Senate Bill Representative Schneider. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? We'll go back to it when he gets here. Out of the record. House Bill 546, Representative Schuneman. Representative Representative Yourell, should Schuneman? have heen House Bill 546...er..Senate Bill 546. Out of Yourell. Senate Bill 697, Representative Wolf. Want to the record. hear the Bill. Representative? Representative Robbins, your would YOU take seat please so we can see Representative Wolf? Representative...er...Senate Bill Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 697, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 697."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 697 will allow for retired Members ...participating Member of the General Assembly's Retirement System who is eligible for the annuity under that system to participate in the State Employees Group Health and Life Insurance Plan if he is otherwise ineligible to participate. This is...There are one or two Members out who have had difficulty in securing public health insurance and ...and this would allow them to participate in that particular system until they reach the age of retirement."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Kelly,
  Dick Kelly?"
- Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask Representative if this...I have received several calls from constituents concerned about some proposal that's come across from the Senate which gives free types of insurance or benefits to retired Members of the General Assembly. Is this that proposal?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Wolf: "I'm not quite sure I understand your question."

Kelly: "Well, I'm not sure I understand my constituents, but I have had about three telephone calls from constituents saying that there is certain benefits...there was a Bill that passed from the Senate coming to the House which after retirement it would be free insurance benefits to retired Members of the General Assembly and even those that have spent time in the state penitentiary and so forth."

Wolf: "Well, this was not for persons who ..."

Kelly: "I was just advised by my colleague, Representative ..."

Wolf: "... Have put time in the penitentiary...."

Kelly: "...That this doesn't apply...."

Wolf: "...What it is, in particular, there was brought to my attention that there was in particularly a Member of the General Assembly who has had some health problems and had difficulty in getting insurance. If it does...It would affect all of them. I understand that the total number is about 160. I'm not too sure how many would use it. But that's the number of people it would totally affect."

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

Frederick: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Frederick: "Representative Wolf, would this mean that retired General Assembly Members would make a payment for his or her benefit?"

Wolf: "Originally that was my understanding. Someone pointed out to me that they are...if they are, in fact, an annuitant that it may not require that. But I say, if that's the case, there's a total of about 160 and that's what we're talking about. So whatever the cost is times 160, that's what it would be, which would be very negligible."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Frederick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he'll yield."

Schuneman: "Representative, does this Bill or does it not provide that the state will pay the cost of hospital insurance for former Members of the Legislature?"

Wolf: "Well, when you reach your retirement age, you know, you are automatically in the system which is like any other state employee. You currently receive your hospitalization coverage the same as any other state employee. reaching retirement age, you are an annuitant in As I understand this, this would allow those who system. are somewhere in between that particular time. Let's say, for example, you retired from the General Assembly at age, just to grab one out of here, let's say 50 or 51, you would have to wait a few years before you would become an annuitant and therefore are again covered under hospitalization plan and if you had difficulty in securing hospitalization because of health reasons, this would enable you to participate and your answer is yes."

Schuneman: "Okay. The answer is yes then that this Bill would provide free hospital insurance for anyone who, at some time, served in the State Legislature. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we should know what we're voting on here. We're going to have a lot of Members of the House of Representatives who will retire this year, either voluntarily or involuntarily and none of us know at this time who that might be. But I think, if I understand this Bill correctly, that what the Bill proposes that we do is provide free hospital insurance coverage for anyone who has at any time served as a Member of the Legislature and that that coverage will be provided for the rest of that

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

person's life, regardless of whether they've reached retirement age. I think it's a bad concept and is one that we should not pass at this time."

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

Beatty: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Beatty: "At the present time, if a Member of the General Assembly retires does he not...is he not given health insurance or hospitalization insurance? Or is he only eligible to buy some through the system?"

Wolf: "My understanding, Mr. Beatty, is that you are eligible
while you are a Member and again, you are reinstated upon
retirement."

Beatty: "So that this Bill will not change that concept. It only extends it perhaps a little further, is that it? Or what?"

Wolf: "Yes, as I tried to explain. So ... "

Beatty: "I was late. I'm sorry."

Wolf: "Okay. If ...It would affect those who are no longer Members until they become annuitants."

Beatty: "Thank you."

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

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Yes."

Leverenz: "How many... How many people right now would be covered by this?"

Wolf: "I understand from one of our outstanding freshman Legislators the number would be 160 persons."

Leverenz: "And then we would add 59 possible Members after the cut back?"

Wolf: "Beg your pardon?"

Leverenz: "We would probably add some part of 69...er..59 after the implementation of the cut back?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Wolf: "Some portion I would imagine. I would assume that a large number will probably be employed elsewhere as state employees in other areas so I would not think ... The whole total number would probably not exceed maybe 200 at best."
- Leverenz: "Would the individual pay for his own coverage?"
- Wolf: "My original understanding was that they would. It was pointed out to me that that may not be correct. And I say, if that assumption is correct then I say, then it would be without coverage. Originally when I sponsored the Bill I thought it would be something in there and I say I was advised from someone that they thought that the language would preclude that and if that's the case, like I say, the most it could possibly be would be roughly 200 people."
- Leverenz: "The individual cost would run, I understand, either 580 or 680 a month..er a year rather? \$680.00 a year?"
- Wolf: "I would think that would probably be a reasonable figure.

  I'm not dead set... If they all use it and I'm not too sure
  they all would."
- Leverenz: "When did the House Sponsorship of the Bill change from Representative Telcser to yourself?"
- Wolf: "When his mother passed away."
- Leverenz: "I see. The Amendment that was filed the same day the Bill moved to Third Reading would provide for the individual to pay for his own insurance. And the Senate Sponsor indicated, apparently, to a number of reporters that talked to him that this was a normal course of affairs or business for any corporation or union that they provide insurance coverage after a person severs their employment. Without the Amendment, as the Bill stands now, the state would pay for the insurance of a person no longer in the employ. Is that correct?"
- Wolf: "Well, Mr. Leverenz, I wasn't aware the Amendment had been filed until this particular point, right now, when you told

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

me and, you know, I always appreciate Members mentioning to me they're going to have an Amendment and also I'd like to have mention...Members mention to me when I like to take things off of Short Debate and a few other things, but.."

Leverenz: "I don't think I filed to take it off Short Debate. If
I did, I will..."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker?"

Leverenz: ".. Gracefully admit it."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, could we take this from the record please?"

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf?"

Wolf: "Could we take this from the record please?"

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 731. Representative White. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 864. Representative Out οf the record. Senate Bill 889. Representative Smith, Irv Smith. Out of the record. Senate Bill 930, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 955, Representative Hoffman? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 955, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, I'd like to have leave to take 955 back to the Order
of Second Reading for Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 955 to the Order of Second Reading. Are there objections?

Hearing none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 955 is now on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #3, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 955

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

as amended."

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

Hoffman: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoffman on Amendment #4."

- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 deals with the issue of hearings for teachers who have been dismissed or removed from contractual continual service. Ιt changes existing law to provide that a hearing will be held if the teacher requests the hearing within 20 days after receipt of the notification of the notice of dismissal. At the present time, the hearing is automatic. There have been two problems with this particular present procedure. One is, in some cases they've been unable to even locate the teacher with .. for the hearing and secondly, the automatic hearing..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Mr. Hoffman. Your colleague,
  Representative Schneider, seeks to interrupt for a
  question."
- Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, would you check that Amendment? I think
  it's out of order as the Bill is amended and I don't
  believe there's a proper reference in Amendment 4 to the
  Bill as it was amended."
- Speaker Ryan: "I'll be glad to check it out. Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "I don't believe the Amendment #4 includes the reference to Amendment #1, therefore, it appeared to be out of order."
- Speaker Ryan: "Mr. Clerk, take Senate Bill 955 out of the record.

  Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Mr. Speaker, now that we have again reached a the House. Bill that's on Second Reading, I have an inquiry of Last week when Representative Daniels was in the Chair. Chair a Bill was on Second Reading and an Amendment been filed but not printed and distributed. It was a ruling them by Representative Daniels that the Bill had to remain on Second Reading or there had to be a Motion to table. Then, when Representative Telcser was later in his ruling was that as long as an Amendment was Chair, filed, but not printed and distributed, that it, the Bill could be moved to Third Reading as long as the Sponsor gave the Chair that permission. Now the only reason why I inquire is because we have approximately six pages Second Reading. I just simply want to know what the procedure is going to be for the rest of the Second Readings..."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, Representative Cullerton, your comments are out of order. It's not timely and you weren't recognized for that purpose. Senate Bill 1119, Representative Hoffman. No, we just took that out of the record. Senate Bill 1119, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1146, Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock here? Out of the record. We will now take Senate Bills, Third Reading, appropriation Bills. On page three of the Calendar, under Senate Bills, Third Reading the first appropriation Bill that appears is Senate Bill 274. Representative Madigan. Care to have your Bill read, Representative? Representative Madigan? Want to have your Bill read?"

Madigan: "Could you give me just 30 seconds?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "How much?"

Madigan: "Thirty seconds."

Speaker Ryan: "You bet. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I am not prepared to move ahead with this Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "I didn't understand you, Representative."

Madigan: "At this time, I am not prepared to move ahead with this

Speaker Ryan: "You want this Bill out of the record?"

Madigan: "That would be my request."

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 316,
Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 316, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Facilities Finance Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 316."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the annual appropriation for the Environmental Facilities Finance Authority. This is ... The Financing Authority sells revenue bonds on behalf of the private companies so they can purchase pollution control equipment. The type of equipment which is purchased of course include scrubbers that remove sulfur and stack gases from coal burning power plants. Their appropriation for FY '82 is 126 point.. \$126,200 which is 2.8% above previous year and they still have a head count of two and I would ask your favorable votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 316 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 3 voting

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

\*present\*. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 318, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Their request this year is \$257,800 which is a decrease of 1.3 thousand dollars over the FY '81 appropriation. They have a total head count of six employees and I would ask your favorable votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich on Senate Bill 318."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to rise to in any way speak against this Bill. However, I do want to remind the Membership that this is the one that some of our staff and some of the Members I remember reading, I believe Eugenia Chapman was one of them, who raised a lot of heck with this agency because they were meeting behind closed doors. And I think on something as important as the matter of health care services, that it ought to be done in the open, that they ought to comply with the Open Meetings Act. I did mention it in the Committee and I thought that the Membership ought to be aware of that also on the floor of the House."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf to close."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the agency that reviews and approves the allowable costs for special education related services and room and board at non-public facilities where some of the local districts have placed

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

handicapped children. I think it's an agency that needs to be funded and would ask your favorable votes."

- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 318 pass?'.

  All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Macdonald to explain her vote."
- Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to vote very reluctantly for this appropriation. happen to have been one of the Legislators that was kept out of one of the Review Boards when it was very, important to my district. However, because of the urgency of special education and what we are trying to do here, I will wote for this Bill only because of the children that need the help. But I would like to send a warning to Governor and to the Purchase Care Review Board that if they are not more responsive and if they are not more communicative with the Legislators than they have been in the past, that I will not be voting for this appropriation again."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Levin, one minute to explain your vote."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, because I have litigation pending against this Body which gives me a conflict of interest, a potential conflict of interest, I must vote 'present'."
- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Oh, excuse me. Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "I'm sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. I know the count is high, but I do want to point out in part that this is probably the most unresponsive Board in the State of Illinois and they probably carry one of the heaviest responsibilities of any of the agencies or departments or divisions involved in education. They make approvals related to special ed kids. They have been, in my

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

judgement, a disgrace in terms of dealing with behavioral disordered kids. They have not been in the forefront of trying to improve the circumstances under which kids of Illinois can be deal with in behavioral disorder matters. And I think until they do that and until..."

- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', 18 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 321, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

- you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Wolf: "Thank is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the General Assembly Retirement System. This also includes benefits, not only to retired State Legislators, but also elected And it provides the survivors statewide officials. annuities and lump sum death benefits and administers the state employees group insurance program for members as The total amount is \$2,324,000.00 which is 4.1% over the previous year's appropriation. Their head count remains at five employees as it has been for the past several years. And I would solicit your vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 321 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Peters, one minute to explain your vote."
- Peters: "Mr. Speaker, a potential conflict of interest, but nevertheless, I'm going to vote my conscience."
- Speaker Ryan: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

there are 148 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 9 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 322, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judges Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Judges Retirement System provides similar benefits for Judges and Associate Judges in the Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Court and the Court of Claims. The system provides the survivors annuities and lump sum death benefits...and administers the state employees group insurance program for the Judges as well. And it's \$10,712,000.00, an increase of 9.3% over the previous year. Again the head count is five, which that has been for the past several years as well."

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

Schraeder: "Just a question, Mr. Speaker. Did he say state employees and Judges? Did I hear him right?"

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "No."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf, do you care to close?"

Wolf: "Yes. No, all I said was it was the state employees group insurance program which applies only to the Judiciary."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 322 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 132 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 323, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 323, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Teacher's Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates six and a half million dollars from the General Revenue Fund and 3.4 million dollars from the State Pension Fund for a total of 9.914 million to the Teacher's Retirement System. This appropriation will fund the supplementary benefits pursuant to law for FY '82. I'll ask your favorable votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 323 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', none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 324 (sic, Senate Bill 324), Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 324, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain retirement benefits for teachers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. This is similar to the last Bill. In 1975 the General Assembly passed an Amendatory Pension Bill providing supplemental benefits to retired teachers. This is for the Chicago teachers. The last Bill, of course, was for the downstate teachers. This appropriates in supplemental appropriations \$700,000.00 in General Revenue Funds to the Public School Teachers' Pensions and Retirement Fund of Chicago. And the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

appropriation will fund the obligations to certain retired teachers drawing less than the minimum annual pension pursuant to the Pension Code. And I would ask your favorable votes."

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

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

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

Tuerk: "Representative Wolf, there is a normal retirement pay—out
Bill, appropriation Bill. Now we come along with these two
supplemental appropriations for supplemental benefits. Why
aren't all three of those Bills put into one in order to
expedite matters and save the time of both Houses and so
forth? Do you know?"

Wolf: "Yes, because they are different laws passed. This was an additional benefit for certain categories of teachers which we enacted in 1975. This provides a supplemental payment. For example, this one, which would be the difference of a pension less the \$4,500.00 and a payment of \$100.00 per year up to 45 years of service. It is under a separate Section. That's why we have the separate Bills."

Tuerk: "I see. Thank you."

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

Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 324 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 153 voting 'aye',
none voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 325, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 325, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the State Employees Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This is the ordinary...the State Employees Retirement System 182 appropriation. The appropriation for FY is \$1,304,400.00 which is 48.4% less than the previous year. The head count in this operation remains at six. a reduction because of the diminished amount of the State Properties Act for which brings extra money to help fund the pensions of the state employees. And I would ask for your favorable votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 325 pass?'. All in favor 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 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 328, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill ..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf .. "

Clerk Leone: "...328..."

Wolf: "Could you take this one out of the record, please?"

Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 333,

Representative Wolf. Want this one heard, Representative?

Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 333, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

is the OC for the Department of Human Rights. The amount is three billion (sic?), four hundred and twenty-eight thousand, eight hundred dollars which is an increase of 3.4% over the previous year. The head count at this agency is 138. If there are additional questions, I would defer to Representative Reilly, who was Chairman of the Subcommittee which heard this particular appropriation."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 333 pass? . All those 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 109 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 334 (sic, Senate Bill 334), Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 334, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Rights Commission was created along Department of Human Rights with the passage of the Illinois Human Rights Act a few years ago. This a nine member Body which functions autonomously from the Department. Their principle responsibility is to adjudicate the cases which are referred to it by the Department. Their annual appropriation is \$368,600.00. That's an increase of 2.5% over the previous year. Their head count has increased by one from nine to ten employees. Again, if there are any questions on this one, I would defer to Representative Reilly. who was the Chairman of the Subcommittee who heard this particular appropriation."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor or Representative Reilly would give me some idea what kind of things we're adjudicating around here with this nine man Board and nine person Committee (sic, Commission)?"

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf. Representative Reilly.."

Wolf: "...Please ask the Gentleman from Morgan."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Reilly."

- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the...by Statute, which we passed a couple of years ago, in effect, the appeal Body from decisions that the Department makes. The theory behind the Human Rights Act when we passed it was that we were going to try to keep as many of these matters out of federal court as we possibly could and what happens is people are dealt with by the Department. If they're not satisfied with that they have an appeal hearing by the Human Rights Commission."
- Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we only have nine men on the Supreme Court of the United States. I don't know why we need nine people for this kind of an operation."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Representative Reilly."
- Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he'll yield."
- Miller: "Representative, how many cases did this Commission adjudicate in the past year?"
- Reilly: "It's in the neighborhood of 400. I can't give you the exact number but it's something like that. What they do is work in panels of three rather than the whole group meeting. But it's in the neighborhood of 400 that were actually contested. They also have to approve settlements that are reached within the department, but usually those

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- are routine and there would be a great number of those.

  But, the contested cases was in the neighborhood of 400.
- Miller: "Do you know how many of the contested cases were sustained or reversed?"
- Reilly: "Sustained or reversed? You mean, by the Commission itself?"
- Miller: "That's correct."
- Reilly: "I do not know. I'll be glad to get that information but
  I just don't know."
- Miller: "I'd appreciate that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Who's going to close, Representative Wolf?"
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as pointed out, the department is the one that receives the complaint and it was thought when we created these two agencies back some time that it would not be proper for the agency that took the complaints to also hear and try the cases and that's why we have this Human Rights Commission. So they are separate. I think they compliment one another and I would ask your favorable votes."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 334 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 99 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no' and 8 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 335, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 335, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Pollution Control Board is a five member Board responsible for the adjudication of the state

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

environmental regulations. The Board passes and modifies the regulations, rules, on violations of existing law and hears various permit appeal cases. The budget for this year is \$723,600.00 which is an increase, a change of ..increase of 1.5% over the FY '81 appropriation. Again, Mr. Reilly was the Chairman of the Subcommittee on this. If there are any further questions, I would defer to him. Oh, Bower. I beg your pardon. Mr. Bower."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Tuerk?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "I notice by the book here that the Senate reduced the appropriation. Apparently the House restored it. Why is that?"

Wolf: "I would defer to Mr. Bower on this."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was to fund what had been some vacant positions but are now filled. And I might say that on this particular appropriation an agency that is considered the foe of business. that the representatives of the various business groups around the state actually approached the Members of the Committee and appeared before the Committee urging that these positions be filled and that the budget be funded at the full level recommended by the Governor."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf, do you want to close?"

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When a citizen or business or a community is agreed by a decision, the Environmental Protection Agency, they can then go to the Board for an appeal. Without this Board they would have to go through the court systems which are much most costly. It would

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

take much longer in time and therefore, this agency pays a very important role in balancing the environment and business interests combined. And I would ask your favorable support."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there...the question is, "Shall Senate Bill 335 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 122 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 336. Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 336, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Thank Speaker. The Office of you, Mr. the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies supervises state banking and trust company industry. In order to insure the solvency of these banking industries while maintaining a competitive environment, the Office of the Commissioners' performs a number of functions such charters, examines and regulates state banks and trust companies. They examine and regulate foreign banks, that is ...and the banks that are located in the downtown central business district of Chicago and supervises electronic fund transfer network. The Office of the Commissioner is funded entirely on a break even basis by the banks the Commission supervises. The dollar amount here is \$4,323,400.00, which is 3.1% above the previous Their head count in this agency is 131, which is five additional from the previous year. If there are Mr. Vinson was the Subcommittee further questions,

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Chairman. I would defer further questions to Representative Vinson."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative O'Brien on Senate Bill 336."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Member...Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

O'Brien: "Representative Vinson, I believe. Last year the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies indicated to us that he was not able to perform a review and an audit of all of the banks that are licensed and chartered in the State of Illinois. And I was wondering if those five employees, that were extra employees that were hired, were hired to provide those additional audits so that all banks in Illinois can be audited like they are supposed to be by Statute?"

Vinson: "Yes, Representative. As a matter of fact, we added \$183,000.00 into the budget for that purpose so that we could comply with the examination Statutes. It's a recommendation of the Auditor General and with this amount of money the Commissioner believes that he can perform that Statutory duty thoroughly."

O'Brien: "Thank you very much. I'd like to speak to the Bill just briefly. I will support this measure and hope that everybody on the floor will support it. But I would like to point out that this will be the last time that I will support an appropriation unless all banks and trust companies are audited by this department. And if we have to give the Director additional money to do that, I think that we should do that. In the inflationary and economic times that we presently have, we owe it to the people of the State of Illinois to see that all banks and trust companies are audited annually. Thank you very much. I support the Bill."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Byan: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very critical time in the year of banking and savings and loans and so on. Now, are you giving the Commissioner the amount of money he requested so that he can do a good job?

This is the total amount of his request?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz on Senate Bill 336."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "For the 50% or 290 banks that were unaudited, what would the appropriation have to increase to fully fund the operation and make sure that all of those banks do get audited? Because the banks, trust companies, they are the ones that pay the money in to perform that.."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir. That's exactly correct. It's not General Revenue Funds and the answer is that the Commissioner told me personally, said that with this amount of money he could fully perform his Statutory duties. And it was for that purpose that we added that 182,000 in."

Leverenz: "Was there something about a ghost employee in the Appropriations Committee? I was in and out of the meeting that day."

Vinson: "Not to the best of my knowledge. I was not in the meeting that...the Appropriation Committee meeting that day, Representative, so I did not hear it..."

Leverenz: "...It's a public information officer at about \$24,000.00?"

Vinson: "I'm not aware of that. Now, as I say, I was not in the Committee meeting that day."

Leverenz: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "Let me make part of the record two experiences that I had with the Commissioner of Banks. In response to a constituent request, working out a problem on a trust which came from a will, it took me in excess of six or eight months to finally get a response from the Commissioner and the problem still exists today. And the bank that was involved, coincidently, was the Harris Bank. The bank officer is the one that actually drafted the letter for Commissioner Harris' signature and that letter was sent to and the Commissioner had no knowledge of the problem within the bank, the Harris Bank. The second, quite interestingly, was my own son and his savings account where the bank took off money that was owed on one account out of my son's savings account to cover an overdraft because of a change in checking account numbers. Interestingly enough, the Chairman...er..Director Harris put a little pressure on the President of the bank and the President of the came forward with a check. And the check was for the amount that they took out of my son's savings account. And I met with the bank President and I asked him why he did He said because the Director Harris asked him for it it. so he could solve a problem. I returned the cashier's check to the bank. I think that's a horrible way to conduct this office. But those are two and the only two personal involvements I had with this Gentleman. I will support the budget. But I would hope that something more than what is going on, over and above the fact that we're only auditing 50% of the banks, would happen to correct the Otherwise, I think you might find that the banks problems. run the Director rather than Director running the operation. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Bullock on Senate Bill 336."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Will Representative Vinson yield for a question or
two?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

- Bullock: "Representative Vinson, are you familiar with any legislation that's presently alive that will have a positive effect on the State Bank Pund in terms of allowing the Bank Commissioner to have greater use of the funds?"
- Vinson: "There is a Bill currently alive. I'm not sure if this is what you're referring to, Representative. But there is a Bill currently alive that would give express authority to the Commissioner to audit electronic fund transfers."
- Bullock: "That is exactly what I'm referring to. Also, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to cite for the record that I think the Commissioner of Banks has done an outstanding job during his tenure. I have personal experiences in my area where we've had at least two banks that had to be closed or sold because those banks were, in fact, sick banks and in trouble. On each of those occasions, the Banking Commissioner for the State of Illinois was not only in touch with the officials of the board and the community, but was in touch with the elected officials in those areas so that once the decision was made to close the sick banks, that the community could be .. rest easy knowing that the assets were indeed protected and that the Banking Commissioner had discharged his Statutory obligation. I'm delighted to see that Representative Vinson has included in this legislation increased appropriation for the department in order that the department can fulfill its Statutory responsibilities. For that reason, I would urge an "aye" vote. I think it's a fine Bill and I think that we obviously are in good hands

- 68th Legislative Day

  June 22, 1981

  with the present Commissioner of Banks in the State of
  Illinois."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf, do you close? Or, Representative Vinson? Representative Wolf."
- J.J.Wolf: "I would just ask the votes of the Membership, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 336 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 146 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 337, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 337, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Representative Wolf.

  Representative Darrow, do you seek recognition?"
- Darrow: "No, I have a question for him."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Alexander, do you seek recognition?

  Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 337."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Clerk read the Bill?
  Okay..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Yes, he has."
- Wolf: "This is the appropriation for the Court of Claims. Pardon me. The Court of Claims, as most of you know, is an advisory Body to the General Assembly, not a Court of the Judicial Branch of Illinois. The Court of Claims is sort of a hybrid governmental entity whose functions are divided among the Court of Claims, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State. Their Statutory responsibilities include the hearing claims filed against the state and

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

directing appropriate payments to be made for them. Some of the types of claims that they would have would be all the claims against the state founded upon any state law or regulation other than workmens comp. claims, all contract claims against the state, claims for recoupment made by the State of Illinois against any particular claimant and claims under the Crime Victims Compensation Act. The total appropriation is \$4,041,200.00 which is 1.2% higher than last year's appropriation. The Representative Davis is the Subcommittee Chairman on the Court of Claims. If there are any questions that you wish to ask of Representative Davis or myself, we'd be happy to answer."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Darrow on 337."
- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor...er..Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."
- Darrow: "Representative Davis, where are the offices of the Court of Claims?"
- Davis: "Well, they are right here in Springfield, Sir."
- Darrow: "Then why do we have an appropriation for a terminal at

  Rochelle, Illinois and a terminal, computer terminal in

  Chicago if their offices are here?"
- Davis: "Well, I suppose it's...and I really can't answer that question totally, Representative Darrow. But I suppose it's because the Chief Justice is in Rochelle."
- Darrow: "And we're spending \$4,200.00 so he can have a computer terminal in his living room?"
- Davis: "Well, as you know, the Justices of the Supreme Court... (of the Supreme Court)... of the Court of Claims do not sit full time in Springfield and it was felt that since he is the Chief Administrative Officer of the court that his reviewal of pending cases, his reviewal and

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- associations with other Justices and the paper work flow that is required in the Court of Claims, it would save a great deal of travel money back and forth to Springfield or to Chicago if, indeed, he had a computer terminal in his...I guess in his living room. I don't know where..."
- Darrow: "Is he the first Chief to ever have a computer in his living room?"
- Davis: "I can't answer that. You know, I don't know. I've only been down here five years, Representative Darrow. I really don't know."
- Darrow: "Another item that is of interest in our analysis is that they're unaware of the hiring freeze other than the fact that they heard it on the radio. Now, are they aware that there is a hiring freeze and are they abiding by the Governor's hiring freeze?"
- Davis: "To my knowledge, yes that's the case."
- Darrow: "They hadn't been prior to the time we had our analysis.

  They indicated they were..."
- Davis: "Well,...elucidate, Representative Darrow. I'm totally unaware of what you're talking about. But I'll try to answer."
- Darrow: "I'm talking about the Governor's hiring freeze that's taken place. Since then they've hired one law clerk and one commissioner. These folks had resigned. They hired two people to take their place."
- Davis: "Well, they're a legislative agency, Representative
  Darrow, and I assume because of that, (they are) exempt
  from the hiring freeze and the Court of Claims caseload
  continues to increase and I assume that's the particular
  reason, although I haven't discussed it with their Chief
  Fiscal Officer on that basis."
- Darrow: "Going back to the computer terminal. Do you know whose home the computer terminal is located in in Chicago?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Davis: "No, I certainly do not, Representative Darrow. I'm sorry to say, I do not."

Darrow: "Would you be able to get me that information?"

Davis: "I certainly will. I'll have it for you later today."

Darrow: "I think Representative Getty, if he has a case in the Court of Claims, would like to rush over to this person's house in Chicago and just get it right off the computer.

Thank you."

Davis: "Okay."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Just a comment. The last Gentleman's comment about
Representative Getty, there's a direct Statutory provision
against Representative Getty having a case before the Court
of Claims, so I would assume that he will turn it over to
someone else."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my name was used improperly twice in debate. I rise to say, I have no matters pending before this Court of Claims. I never have had any matters pending before the Court of Claims and as long as I am a Member of this Body, I do not intend to have any Member...any matters pending before the Court of Claims."

Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate, Representative.

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, only to rise because there was the exchange relative to Chief Justice's role. All of us know him when he served in the Senate, a very conscientious Gentleman, does a good job as Chief Justice and I would hope that we all support this Bill for the Court of Claims."

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

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I just would like to add that it's probably a lot cheaper to have a terminal for \$4200.00 than paying additional travel expenses for the Chief Judge and I would just ask the support of the House for this fine Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 337 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 141 voting 'aye', 13

voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 338, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 338, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. The Department of Financial Institutions works for the citizens Illinois through regulation of consumer finance companies, credit unions and currency exchanges. agency also administers the Unclaimed Property Act. In its regulatory role the Department conducts investigations of the applicants, performs periodic and spot examinations of licensees, investigates citizens' complaints and prescribes operating procedures. In addition, the Department assists citizens to regain unclaimed assets held by the financial organizations. corporations and utilities. The appropriation for this year is \$2,972,600.00. count remains at 102, which it has for the past three fiscal years. And the total increase over last year's appropriation is 4.1%. If there are any additional questions, I would defer to our financial in-House wizard,

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Representative Vinson, who is Chairman of the Subcommittee."

- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any questions? Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 338 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 148 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 341, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 341, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Mines and Minerals regulates the development and operation of our mines and wells in the State of Illinois. The Department issues permits for the redevelopment of surface mines, coal test holes, oil and gas and water wells. Safety inspections are conducted in all operating mines to ensure the health safety of coal and metal miners. The environmental integrity of the state's coal mined lands are protected through the regulation supplied by this Department under \*Brad Eblesizer\*. Director The appropriation is \$13,837,500.00 which îs 12.1% over last appropriation. Representative Bower was the Chairman of the Subcommittee and I'm sure he could answer any technical questions which any of the Members may care to pose."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 341."
- Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't hear who Representative Wolf said was answering

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

technical questions. You are, Glen? Okay. Glen, I've got...May I address a question to Representative Bower?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he'll yield."

- Mautino: "Glen, Mines and Minerals has been up in Whiteside

  County addressing a concern up there of a pipeline that

  busted and I think they re taking out about six or seven

  hundred gallons, a piece of fuel...some type of fuel oil up

  there and prior to this, they said there were no leaks in

  that area after doing extensive research and study. Would

  you...Could you possibly tell me if anyone has addressed

  that in the Department of Mines and Minerals lately?"
- Bower: "We are unaware of that situation. I will certainly make certain that the Department is made aware of it though."
- Mautino: "Well, one other question. Are you aware that when a pipeline goes across the State of Illinois that's headquarters out of state, that they cannot get the records of where those lines are, what's going through those pipelines and the Department has been very negligent in that regard? Are you aware of that?"
- Bower: "I am not aware of it. I'm not certain that I understand your question. Are you saying that they cannot or that they will not?"
- Mautino: "Well, they haven't been able to. Let me put it that way. And I'd like to know why. Before I vote for any appropriation for Mines and Minerals, I think it's time that we got some results, especially as it pertains to gas lines coming to...gas and oil lines coming underground from other states. And since they can't get the information for us, because it does cause a health hazard in not only that specific area, but a couple of areas in the state, I think that we should hang on to this for a while."
- Bower: "I would think that the Commerce Commission would probably be the agency that would be responsible for the pipeline."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Mautino: "No, Sir. No, Sir. Under Public Health and Water Wells, the only people that can address that question is Mines and Minerals. That's the Statute."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Hastert: "Mr. Sponsor, I see in an Amendment offered by you in Committee that under the annotation in the Amendment there was some million, four hundred seventy thousand dollars in federal funds that are dropped which caused the elimination of 13 new positions and seven vacancies. Is that correct?"

Bower: "That is correct."

Hastert: "There's no way that these people will be replaced?"

Bower: "I'm not saying that there's no way. It was..The
Amendment was offered and accepted in anticipation that
federal money is going to be deleted in this area..."

Hastert: "What did these people do?"

Bower: "The Federal Government....These people would deal with the Mine Reclamation Program..."

Hastert: "Doing what?"

Bower: "But the Federal Government has not yet delegated the authority to the state for which these people would be responsible. If the authority is granted by the Federal Government, we can add a supplemental in the fall."

Hastert: "This says...It says here seven vacancies. These people who are vacancies must have done something."

Bower: "They are authorized positions. They are not positions that ...for which anybody had been...."

Hastert: "In addition to 13 new positions?"

Bower: "Yes."

Hastert: "Let me ask you a question. It seems to me that the Bureau of Mines and Minerals has a number of people

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

traveling around this state having hearings. And actually...in actuality, these hearings have nothing to do with the actual implemation (sic, implementation) of reclamation projects. Are those people eliminated through this project?"

Bower: "No."

Hastert: "What are the purposes of these people?"

Bower: "You mean what their job title is?"

Hastert: "Yes. What do they do?"

Bower: "Are you referring the vacancy..."

Hastert: "The hearing officers I'm referring to and the attorneys that go along with them that are in the Department."

Bower: "I am not aware."

Hastert: "You're not aware? Meaning that there are no hearing officers that go around the state with the Department?"

Bower: "I didn't say that. I said, I wasn't aware of what they do."

Hastert: "Well maybe somebody from the Department there is aware?

He's not aware either?"

Bower: "He's not from the Department. He's from our House Republican staff."

Hastert: "I see. Okay. I'm sorry. It seems to me that there's some legislation that eliminates some of these hearings and I just would like to know if there's an appropriation in this package that funds those people."

Bower: "I am not aware of precisely what program you're speaking of and therefore I don't know if there's an appropriation to cover it in here."

Hastert: "Well the question specifically, Representative, is that there are a number of people from the Bureau that go around and hold hearings throughout the state for placement of mines, different types of aggregate mines, I assume coal mines. They have public hearings and in essence these

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- public hearings have no deciding factor whether these mines are going to be placed or not and I want to know why do we do this?"
- Bower: "I wouldn't know. I suggest that you discuss this with your seatmate, Representative Winchester, who is very well connected with the Department of Mines and Minerals."
- Hastert: "I would appreciate maybe this being taken out of the record until I do get an answer."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf to close. Representative O'Brien, do you seek recognition on Senate Bill 341?"
- O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as Representative Hastert indicated and Representative Mautino, I think it might be appropriate at this time to take this out of the record until some of those questions have been answered that those Representatives raised."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf to close. Representative Friedrich, do you seek recognition?"
- Friedrich: "Well, I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this is a very vital Department in the State of Illinois right now. The oil business has been revitalized and they're issuing as many as 50 new permits a month, believe it or not. The oil industry has really come back. And this involves not only the drilling permits, it also involves salt water disposal and a number of other things. And I hope you won't cripple this Department right at a time when it's contributing so much to the energy problem in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Ryan: "Now Representative Wolf to close."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I may be able to answer the question, if it deals with the ...with the Surface Mine and Reclamation. In FY '81, the Department had expected to be delegated authority under the Federal Surface Mine

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

control and Reclamation Act of 1977 and because the change in the federal administration and certain problems in meeting the earlier administration's requirement, this delegation of authority has not yet occurred. In this coming year, FY '82, the Department expects to receive jurisdiction from the ...for this program in Illinois as discussed earlier and currently the Department is under a court injunction not to implement the program until June of 1981 when the new federal guidelines are issued. I hope that answers your question. And if that does, I would then, Mr. Speaker, move the passage of Senate Bill 341."

- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 341 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 127 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 15 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 342, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 342, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate Bill 342 appropriates \$916,561.00 from the Dram Shop Fund for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission. There's no GRF dollars involved in this budget. The Liquor control Commission regulates the alcoholic beverage sales of some 23,000 licensed retail, wholesale and manufacturing outlets in this state. The Commission issues the licenses, holds hearings on the violations detected by its investigative staff and hears the appeals from retailers as a result of any actions of approximately 1500 local liquor

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

commissioners. The increase is only 2.2% above last year's appropriation. The head count is down by two from forty-two to forty. Representative Vinson was Chairman of that Subcommittee and rightfully so and I think Mr. Vinson, the Gentleman from DeWitt, agrees with the Commission and their prime objective, they hope to continue with sobering regulatory affects on the abuses in the liquor industry." Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 342 pass? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Nr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page three of the Calendar, returning to Senate Bill 274, Representative Madigan. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 274, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Office of the Comptroller. The request, as submitted to the Senate, was for \$28,293,661.00. That was reduced by the Senate to \$27,000,000.00 and there were no changes made in the House Committee or on the House floor."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 274......Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Klemm: "What is that percentage? Is it an increase, the same, or a decrease from last year?"

Madigan: "It's a decrease from last year."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Mr. Clerk."

Klemm: "What percentage would you estimate?"

Madigan: "I don't have the increase, but I'm told that it's approximately a two million dollar decrease."

Klemm: "Fine. Thank you."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 274 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 167 voting voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On page eight of the Calendar under Senate Bills, Second Reading, appropriation Bills without Amendments, appears Senate Bill 311. Representative

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 311, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Reilly. Representative Wolf? Read the Bill,

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 314, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 314, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

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

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 315, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses.."

Speaker Byan: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. There's an Amendment filed to that. Senate Bill 319. Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 319, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2,3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 1.2.3 or 4?"

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 329, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 329, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- Speaker Byan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 340, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf says out of the record.

  Senate Bill 343, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 343, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capitol Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill.

  No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "None."
- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 344, Representative Wolf. Out of the record? Out of the record. On page eight of the Calendar under Senate Bills, Second Reading, appropriation Bills with Amendments. Senate Bill 308, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 308, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Committee Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion: I move to table Amendment \$8 to Senate

  Bill 308. Representative Hoxsey."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoxsey on Amendment #8, Motion on Amendment #8."
- Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #8 in Committee restored the funding for the
  state custom meat inspection program after the Senate had
  taken it out. The custom meat inspection program is
  not...not any longer being funded by the Federal

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

Government, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for a program that we don't need. The Governor is in agreement with me on this issue and we are only one of two states that has continued to have this program after the funding was denied. And I would ask your favorable support on tabling the Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ropp." Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an Amendment that was offered in Committee and was passed and the reason for that is in the State of Illinois, down through the last ten or fifteen years, the Government and the State of Illinois have conducted their meat inspection program on a 50-50 basis. In the State of Illinois we have a program which is called, Class 1 and Class 2 locker plants, which slaughters meat for a..let's say, an individual farmer or anybody who may go to an auction market and buy a steer or a hog and take it to that plant. And what this Amendment is to do is to provide funds for continuing to have that individual slaughtered meat that is owned by a farmer or anyone in the State of Illinois that takes their particular meat to get slaughtered. The reason for that is, if this Amendment is not in there, many of these custom slaughtering facilities will have to build a brand new freezer, a brand new cutting operation because under the current law, custom meat that is not inspected cannot commingle or even be kept in the same cooler. And I'm saying that this is going to be a sizable expense if this amount of money is not restored to those plants that kill and slaughter beef or pork or any kind of facility. What is happening is, other if people...it's not my opinion....or it is my opinion that meat that I take to the slaughterhouse ought to be inspected just as much to maintain the health of the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

individual that might buy....that I use my own meat compared to someone who goes to the local grocery store and buys meat right across the counter. If it's not enough for me why should it be good enough for the rest of the State of Illinois to have their meat inspected? In addition to the sizable amount of cost that would be incurred in every facility where these kinds of plants are in operation, they are going to increase the amount of cost there. The Department of Agriculture, I'm sure, since last October have been in a position to continue this inspection and that's what this Amendment does. It continues to permit those plants to continue inspecting meat and I urge the defeat of this Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Representative Hoxsey, yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "She indicates she will."

Leverenz: "Perhaps you know a little better than I, not having too many farms and packing houses in my District. What does an individual pay when they go in for the custom inspections?"

Hoxsey: "They pay for the processing, whatever the rate....going rate is, wrapping, packaging and wrapping and slaughter..."

Leverenz: "Do they pay a fee for the actual inspection or the inspector? Is there some sort of fee included? Because we're talking about custom inspection."

Hoxsey: "No. This meat is not meat to be sold over the counter.

The Federal Inspection Program will still continue as far as meat that is sold over the counter. This is simply the inspection involving meat for private use."

Leverenz: "The Senate cut it out?"

Hoxsey: "The Senate cut it out."

Leverenz: "Do you know what their rationale was for deleting it?"
Hoxsey: "Well, I would assume their rationale is that we really

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

don't need to spend \$250,000.00 in state funds on a program that's not necessary. Porty-eight of the fifty states don't have this state meat inspection program and that's got to tell you something."

- Leverenz: "Okay. Are there people actually employed currently doing this?"
- Hoxsey: "I'm sure there is. My analysis indicates that there would be approximately fifteen lay-offs with the elimination of this program. I don't know what they're going to do with the rest of the people, but basically that's what this analysis says."
- Leverenz: "I'd certainly support...Mr. Speaker, to the Motion, to take this Amendment off that re-puts in money the Senate took out. They were right when they said we don't need it. They were right when they said that, in fact, we were duplicating something or for the fact that it is going to be for the individual's personal use, that they're asking for something and certainly we can see with the state budget and the federal budget that there is no room for free rides anymore. And since there is no fee, the person is paying for the custom processing inspection part of it, I think, for sure. The Motion to table should be successful."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I supported this Amendment in Committee for one reason and one reason only and that is that the Department of Corrections is expanding its prison industry system and one of the things that they're doing is raising cattle. They have a slaughterhouse. The cattle are slaughtered and it's distributed to the other institutions throughout the State of Illinois. It's a way of saving dollars. It's a lot cheaper than buying meat

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

processed and off the open market. But in the past and now, I believe state inspectors have been making those inspections and I would question now who's going to be responsible for inspecting that cattle which is going to be fed to some fifteen to twenty-five thousand residents of our penal institutions? For that reason I would be opposing this Motion."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Robbins."
- Robbins: "I rise in support of the keeping of the slaughter inspection. Maybe I'm talking a little slow, but you would you knew that half the meat that would be eaten in your community would not be inspected if this is done away This is a statewide program which turns over the with. program to the Federal Government, which leaves practically all of the meat that goes from the farmer back to his deep freeze uninspected. Now, he may think he knows exactly how everything is and he may try to keep the best animal for himself, but he may be wrong. We have trained inspectors. We're doing the job. If it has to have a fee, if it has to have a fee, put a fee on. But keep the department of inspection and operation and vote 'no' on this Amendment (sic, Motion)."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bower. Just a minute,

  Representative Bower. Let me go to Representative

  Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Motion. I think it's a giant step backwards. We know that our meat that has been inspected is safe for us to eat and we know that if this passes that we will not have that satisfaction in knowing that. I've talked to several packing plant..locker plant operators in my area and they're very concerned about

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

this issue and they claim that even with their knowledge of the industry that they can't tell without an inspection just how dangerous...or whether an animal is diseased. And I think, as I say, it's a step backwards. I think certainly this Motion to table ought to be defeated."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Bower." Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The Sponsor of this Amendment is certainly one of House. the grandest Members of this Assembly and I have nothing but the greatest respect for her. But I would beg to differ with her on this Amendment. We beat it I think that you should listen well to the comments made by Representative Robbins and Representative Ropp, both who are active farmers and Representative Ropp a former Director of the Department of Agriculture. certainly know the feeling in the agricultural community in this state. I represent a rural area, of course, the same one as Representative Robbins. The custom meat inspection program in this state prevents a tremendous amount of meat from getting into..getting to the consumer. course it's supposedly not for resale, but it's know, those of us in rural areas, certainly when butchering is that it's often meat is given to friends and family I know that members. And so it's distributed that way. those who are concerned about bad meat being resold to nursing homes and to other places where it could be sold at a low price, are certainly in favor of keeping custom meat inspection. Sometimes when we want to support a position we say that Illinois is one of the few or one of the great in number and participate in a program. I think the fact that Illinois may be one of the few states in the nation that's doing this is certainly no reason to condemn a fine

program. I think when Illinois does things right we ought

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

to be proud of it and we ought to continue it. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment (sic, Motion)."

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

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates she will."

Hastert: "Just a very simple question. I know we've discussed this a great deal. But I just want to know, those locker plants that work in my community and your community, would they allow....be allowed to still stay open and butcher meat and sell meat? They would. Thank you."

Hoxsey: "Yes."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoxsey, do you want to respond to that?"

Hoxsey: "Yes, I answered him."

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

Bradley: "I have a question."

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

Hoxsey: "Go ahead."

Bradley: "I've got one question."

Hoxsey: "Yes."

Bradley: "Are these locker plants, are they inspected by the Pederal Government?"

Hoxsey: "Yes."

Bradley: "And then they're also inspected by the state inspectors?"

Hoxsey: "Yes."

Bradley: "So what we're doing really is eliminating one of the inspections."

Hoxsey: "That's right."

Bradley: "Thank you."

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

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Oblinger: "I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question if I may."

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

Oblinger: "Representative Hoxsey, is it true that only the state inspects? The Federal Government doesn't inspect it..custom..."

Hoxsey: "Yes, they do."

Oblinger: "All of us over here are of the opinion that they don't."

Hoxsey: "Well I'm afraid you and I have a different opinion. At least the locker plants in my area are federally inspected and state inspected."

Oblinger: "Our aren't and that's why I wanted to ask a question."

Hoxsey: "Yes. At least that's my observation. I've seen both
inspectors there so I assume that they're inspected by

both."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems like the more questions we get the more we're confused. Let me just try to clarify if I can to help...I'm in support of Representative Hoxsey who happens to be a farmer by the way. All meat that is for sale is federally inspected. What custom meat processing is is that if an individual has an animal slaughtered for their own consumption, not for the purpose of resale, it is required under existing law to have it state inspected. It's a cost of a quarter million dollars. There's only two other states have this. I think the state could do without it and I would urge support for Mrs. Hoxsey's Amendment (sic, Motion)."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hoxsey to close on your Motion."

Hoxsey: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, actually we're eliminating a program we just don't need.

Other states have corrections. Other states have institutions and I don't believe it's been any big

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

catastrophe that they didn't have the state custom meat inspection program. Now I would suggest to you the way to go on this issue is to vote 'aye' on a Motion to table."

- Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from LaSalle has moved to table Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 308. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. Well, clearly, Representative, you lost the issue. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be tabled?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Mautino, one minute to explain your vote."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. ....exactly what the inspection is at state level? They come into to a locker shop and basically they make sure that the packages are marked 'not for resale. That's the basic duties of those people who come and inspect that meat. They are not there when it's slaughtered. They don't examine the meat. They make sure it says 'not for resale' on the package. It's a ridiculous program that the Federal Government has eliminated totally. Yet the state wants to go into it. Who are we trying to protect? About five patronage workers who basically don't have anything to do but go to the same locker plants five days a week in any small city? It's crazy. A green vote is the right vote to have on this one."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Huskey, one minute to explain your vote."
- Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm voting

  'yes' for the simple reason that these agricultural

  inspectors have come into my auto parts store to inspect

  oil filters and all they do is inspect the labels on the

  boxes to see if the proper names are on the labels and the

  boxes. And if that isn't...if anyone wants proof, stop by

  my office and I have some boxes of oil filters that I

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

called the Director of the Department of Agricultural in to show to try to find out what his inspectors were doing in my auto parts store to inspect oil filters. Now, if an inspector is good enough to inspect oil filters, he probably is good enough to look at packages on meat. But I would suggest you vote 'no' (sic, 'yes') because we certainly don't need these kinds of inspectors."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Darrow, one minute to explain your vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to explain this, what you're voting on is a situation where the fellow buys a steer and takes it over to have it dressed. He picks the own..his own slaughter, his own butcher and that's where he goes with it. If he doesn't think it's clean, if he thinks it needs inspection, he doesn't have to go there. It's a slaughterhouse of his own choice. He takes his own steer there and there's no need for any inspection. I can't understand why there's so many red lights against this good Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Neff, one minute."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'yes' vote, this is regulations that Representative Hoxsey's Amendment (sic, Motion) does away with that there's no call for. If we believe that we should cut down some of the state and government regulations, this is an opportunity. And I was just sorry to see that we don't have more green votes up there. And I believe if we all stop and think of what we're voting on here, we will have the green votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Christensen, one minute."

Christensen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say something in regards to meat inspection. I had for many years had meat inspection myself and for years I worked as a meat inspector. And it's a very, very important part of our

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

whole meat packing industry in the State of Illinois. Without it, you are going to see animals that should have been condemned being slaughtered by your number two slaughterhouses and the only way to keep this from happening is to keep meat inspection in force. We can not get along without it if you want a wholesome product in the State of Illinois. And I would certainly encourage a red vote on this."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 65 voting 'aye', 86 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the Lady's Motion fails. Are there any further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Winchester, amends Senate Bill 308 as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester on Amendment #9."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a technical Amendment. There was an error made in the figures. It says one million, three hundred and eleven. It should have been one million, one hundred and thirty—one. It would be a reduction of one hundred and thirty—six thousand, nine hundred. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment #9. Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10, Ropp, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp, Amendment #10."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

"Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. A lot of people are concerned about paramutual betting and the Ag Premium Fund. That is a result of good health care for They are the animals that make this whole fund horses. At the Illinois State Fairgrounds there are a number of race horses that train year round and in order to do that effectively their feet have to be in pretty good shape and they do that by proper shoeing. There is a little building out there that is a sad disgrace to the State of Illinois. The fellow that shoes these horses in case of inclement weather, as they do often, it's just like being outside and he kind of frowns on being so wet and being exposed to the elements. The roof is in terrible The sides are in bad shape. He has, the last time I was out there, just a canvas trying to keep the elements off of him. This is a \$20,000.00 appropriation to restore in a block-type structure a building in which he can operate and conduct his horse shoeing operation year round on the fairgrounds. I'll be glad to answer any questions or ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Henry."

Henry: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Henry: "Representative Ropp, as I read it this is \$20,000.00 for the construction of a cement block blacksmith's shop at the Illinois State Fair. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "Yes."

Henry: "Why do we need a blacksmith's shop at the State Fair, that State Fair here in Springfield? Why? What's the use? What's the reason for it?"

Ropp: "Okay, you have blacksmith's shop in there because in there you have forges and material that is needed for shaping and

# 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

forming the horse shoe. You'll put a horse shoe in there in the hot coals and shape it, whatever you need, and put it on the old ..the foot or hoof of the horse and that's normally what it's called, a blacksmith's shop that he conducts his line of work in."

- Henry: "Who owns the horses that the blacksmith will be treating?"
- Ropp: "Well, any person in the State of Illinois that would buy a horse and want to train him at the fairgrounds would own the horse."
- Henry: "Why couldn't the private owner use a private blacksmith?

  Why are we spending \$20,000.00 of state taxpayers' money

  for the use of private industry to use on State fairgrounds

  which is paid for by the people of the State of Illinois?"
- Ropp: "I guess one of the reasons is that it's kind of inconvenience to take your horses to the blacksmith and in this case it's easier to bring the blacksmiths to the horses. The horses are on the fairgrounds and I'm not sure where the closest blacksmith would be in which you could take a horse to get shoed (sic, shod)."
- Henry: "Is this in the Governor's budget? Is this the Governor's plan to spend state taxpayers' money for a blacksmith in the State fairgrounds? Is this in the budget?"
- Ropp: "It would be if we'd pass it and he signs it. It's the only thing....This is an attempt, I think, to continue to provide quality horses that have been trained very well at the State fairgrounds and other facilities throughout the state so that they can generate dollars for the state ultimately their General Revenue Fund, Ag Premium Fund, Fair and Exposition Fund or whatever the case might be."
- Henry: "How much is charged by this blacksmith to those private horse owners to repair or do whatever's necessary for their horses? How much? What is the charge?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Ropp: "Honestly, I don't know what the charge is. I'd be more than happy to take you with me and we'd go out and see that operation in the next day or two."

Henry: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Henry: "Here we have an Amendment that will provide free care for horse owners. It is my understanding that they might be some of the richest people in the State of Illinois. We cannot get \$10,000.00 for a study to improve the lot of youngsters in the Chicago area or some other areas of minority and the poor, but here is the Sponsor of an Amendment that asks the taxpayers from the State of Illinois, from Chicago, from Danville, from Rockford, from East St. Louis to provide \$20,000.00 free to horse owners to repair their horse shoes to put a blacksmith to work and then, Ladies and Gentlemen, do not charge the private horse owner one quarter. It's a bad Amendment, a good Sponsor, and I urge the defeat of Amendment #10."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J.Wolf."

Wolf: "Just a question of the Sponsor,"

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

Wolf: "Now I'm just curious as to why you didn't offer this one in Committee. You had several other kind of private Amendments there. Why didn't you bring it before the Committee?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Representative Wolf, I was not aware that the horse people were wanting this at the time the Committee was being held and as soon as the Committee was over then they came to me, we'd like this introduced."

Wolf: "This hasn't got the one for your rabbit barn in there, is it?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Ropp: "There's no rabbit barn in there. They don't need their feet, hoofs trimmed."

Wolf: "What happens to ag premium dollars if they're not spent?"

Ropp: "They go into the General Revenue Fund."

Wolf: "What was that?"

Ropp: "They go into the General Revenue Fund."

Wolf: "Thank you."

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

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Could you explain to me again what is the condition of the present facility out there at the State Fair?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp?"

Ropp: "The present facility is in miserable condition, miserable condition."

Cullerton: "Miserable condition. Now, who works in that particular facility?"

Ropp: "A farrier."

Cullerton: "And what is his name?"

Ropp: "I have no idea."

Cullerton: "You don't know what Legislative District he comes from?"

Ropp: "He's not from mine, I can assure you."

Cullerton: "Who is he paid by?"

Ropp: "Honestly I don't know who he's paid by."

Cullerton: "Okay. This isn't money for his salary. This is just money for a new building."

Ropp: "That's right. This is for a new building and I am not sure, but I know what the previous Speaker, a couple of time before....I know the horse people out there did not get this service free."

Cullerton: "Now, just...Did you come up with this \$20,000.00

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

figure yourself or is this..."

Ropp: "No, this was provided to me by the people out there who had done some research and I had checked also with Representative Wikoff who's in the kind of construction business and I said, 'What would a 20 by 24 foot concrete block building cost?'. And surprisingly enough, it was right at 18 to 20 thousand dollars."

Cullerton: "Will that include air-conditioning?"

Ropp: "I hope not."

Cullerton: "Well, where I come from on the north side of Chicago,
we got an expression. It says, 'If it ain't broke, it
don't need fixing'."

Ropp: "I think you got that expression down here."

Cullerton: "Yes. And, if that's true, then the building that
we've got now that's in miserable condition, it ain't
broke, is it?"

Ropp: "It very definitely is. This is one of the 'brokest' building you've ever seen."

Cullerton: "Well, why don't we fix it rather than build a new one?"

Ropp: "Well, we could, but in this case you'd almost have to tear the whole thing down and it would be cheaper really to just put a concrete block structure again. It does have a concrete floor now and all you need would be the concrete blocks."

Cullerton: "Well, I would suggest if we can get Representative
Wikoff to do the work we can get it done for about
\$10,000.00."

Ropp: "We could if he wouldn't have to go through the union procedure out there and some of those things cost a little more."

Cullerton: "No further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Fauell."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Pawell: "I call for the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved for the previous question.

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

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a structure and I normally don't ask for money for buildings, but then, if you've been out there it's in sad shape. These horses are the horses that actually provide a lot of money to the State of Illinois through the races that go on throughout the state. It's in very serious condition and I'd welcome the opportunity to take any of you out there to see it and urge your favorable support on this Amendment."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman...Your light's not on, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that my light went off. I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question and since I didn't have an opportunity, Representative Ropp, you can just nod yes or no on this. This blacksmith's shop, that in no way is intended to reflect the pedigree of the person that works in the store is it? And you would not be objecting to leave to amend this on its face to strike 'black' would you?"
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey, to explain her vote. The timer's on."
- Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Sponsor of this

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Amendment has in mind, but I can only tell you that I've had a lot of horses shod with a cross tie in the cement floor alleyway of a crib or a barn and I would oppose this \$20,000.00 appropriation."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, to explain his vote.

  Timer's on, Sir."
- Winchester: "Well, all right. I rise in support of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the money is coming from the Ag Premium Fund and the Ag Premium Fund is money collected through horse racing throughout the State of Illinois and the State Fair does attract, not just the State Fair, but the fairgrounds, attracts people who spend hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in this community and in these surrounding counties. And I would urge that more people vote green. If Representative Ropp's Amendment is not successful I would suggest they look forward to an Amendment on the Capitol Development Board's Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, to explain his vote. Timer's on, Sir."
- Bradley: "I just wanted...I just wanted to suggest to Representative Ropp, looks like the brick (sic, block) building is not going to go down. He referred to doing it with some canvas. Maybe we'd better consider doing it...covering it with canvas. And I think that would be a pretty good idea."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 37 'aye', 90 'nay', 1 'present'. Amendment #10, having failed to receive the necessary votes, is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 309. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 309, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Health Finance Authority. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed with respect to Amendments 2, 3 or  $\mu_*\pi$ 

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, McClain..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, Amendment #5.

Representative McClain? Is the Gentleman in the chambers?

You're holding up the State of Illinois, Representative

McClain and the RTA. Amendment #5, Representative

McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 309 would reduce the Health Finance Authority by \$53,300.00. As you know, the Health Finance Authority has been significantly reduced previously and all this would reduce some...are some furniture and equipment now that will not be necessary because of the Senate reductions. I would urge your passage."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would certainly support the Gentleman's Amendment in this respect. The Amendment takes a chunk out of equipment and I would simply point out that one of the purposes for the equipment, additional equipment money that they're asking for, is to purchase additional calculators. At one point where we reviewed their calculator situation, they had 13 calculators for 17..for

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

seven employees. I can't see why they need additional calculators. For those seven employees they have 67 chairs and they're asking to buy an additional 53. I don't see why they need that additional 53 chairs. So I would support the Gentleman's Amendment and urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz to close. I'm sorry.

Representative McClain to close."

McClain: "I take great personal offence at that."

Speaker Daniels: "Sorry about that. You all look alike on that side of the aisle. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 312."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendments #1 and 2 failed in Committee. Floor
Amendment #3, McMaster-Neff-McGrew, amends Senate Bill
312."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMasters Amendment #3?"

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #Bill...#3 to House Bill...Senate Bill 312 is to put in some 31,000 I believe it is and some odd dollars to pay for the scholarships for

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

veterans at Carl Sandburg College that were not paid for by the state as the state is supposed to do. The colleges are required by state law to give scholarships to these veterans. The Department of Veterans Affairs in allocating its money paid the scholarships for those schools, junior colleges, that were on the semester system and when those that came in for their payments on the last quarter of those that were on the quarter system, the Department of Veterans Affairs was out of money. For this reason we do need that money in..at Carl Sandburg College in Galesburg." Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out to the Members of the House that, you know, Amendment was offered in Committee. It was defeated substantially in Committee. The veterans are, of course, entitled to their...to their scholarship program which they do get. The additional funding is made by the schools and not the veteran and I would ask the defeat of this Amendment."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with Representative Wolf that this Amendment was defeated by a voice vote in Committee and I oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, only to repeat what the Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee has said. We are singling out one community college for reimbursement and this would be discriminatory and that is why the Committee, by a substantial vote defeated this Amendment as Committee #1 and I would urge the Members to also defeat this Floor

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Amendment #3."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."
- Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is a good Amendment. It's needed very badly at the Carl Sandburg College and these veterans are students, were planning on this money to go to college with. They were given indication they would have it and now to cut it off at this time is going to work a real hardship on those young folks and I think we should support this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster to close. Oops, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "I wonder if the Sponsor of the appropriation would answer a question."
- Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Schraeder: "Representative Wolf, as I understand it, there were quite a number of colleges that fell in the same category and didn't get their share of the money because the appropriation ran out. Have you addressed that situation in any other appropriation Bills for that total package of colleges?"
- Wolf: "No. I understand there is another Amendment, but as .. The veteran of course is entitled to their four year tuition scholarship. My understanding is that the shortfall was less than a one percent average and that was only due to the fact that the schools have increased their tuitions. The veterans get their scholarship regardless of whether the additional money is forthcoming or not."
- Schraeder: "Do you address in that same Amendment or a different

  Amendment those that are covered under the scholarship for
  the militia that were given incentives to join to serve the
  militia or the reserve corps for scholarships?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Wolf: "I believe the same situation exists there. Those members of the militia and the National Guard are of course entitled to the scholarship, I believe."

Schraeder: "And are they covered under a different appropriation?"

Wolf: "I believe they are..."

Schraeder: "Thank you very much."

Wolf: "...We're not totally certain."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp. Representative Deuster.

Representative McMaster to close."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little bit concerned that Larry DiPrima, who is the strong upholder of veterans, would say that he doesn't think that the college should be paid for these giving veterans their scholarships. I'm a little bit ashamed of you, Larry, because you've always been wholeheartedly for the veterans and seeing that they get their money. I'm surprised at you, Larry. 90 ф see from the discussion Representative Wolf that it's alright to go ahead and fund the National Guard and militia men, people such as that, but the veterans are the ones who served in Nam, who were the ones that are getting the use of these scholarships now, are to be denied the money. I thought I made it clear in my presentation of the Amendment in the first place that those schools that were on semesters did get their money or the greater share of it. Those that are on the quarters are the ones that are hurting the worst. That's why I this Amendment in for Carl Sandburg. I would like to see the Amendment put on. In the event that all of the schools are given their money, then of course, it's unnecessary. But I'm staring out with Carl Sandburg College and I would urge a 'yes' vote on this and by the way, I think we should have a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.

Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you arise,
Sir?"

DiPrima: "Well, yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in response to McMaster's statement that I'm opposing the veterans' legislation. I think, the veterans are paid by the Department of Veterans' Affairs for their schooling. This is over and above what the kids get. This goes to ... The school wants this on their own for reimbursement purposes or whatever.."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 39 'ayes', 100 'nay', 2 'present'. Amendment #3, having received the necessary votes, is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Rea-Winchester-McCormick, et al..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea, Amendment #4?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 addresses the same problem but not on a piece-meal basis. What I propose to do with Amendment #5 is to increase the line item appropriation for military veterans scholarships by a million, eight hundred and thirty-four thousand, two hundred and seventy-six dollars which will cover the shortfall of all of the state institutions in the State of Illinois. Now, I do not propose to make a supplemental appropriation or a specific line item appropriation by university and college and

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

community college. I merely propose to increase the funding level for the next fiscal year by the amount of the shortfall this year. By Amendment on a previous Bill I provided that those funds would be...those schools would be paid the funds first out of next year's appropriation. Representative McGrew has a similar Amendment on another Bill. Now let me make a couple of points in reference to things that have been said on the floor. Number one, the veterans receives no money from these scholarships. receives from the university a tuition waiver. An Attorney General's opinion in the past has indicated that the veteran has an absolute right to that tuition waiver shortfall any must be absorbed by the particular What my Amendment does is prevent those university. universities from being forced to absorb those shortfalls. Now let me point out two or three items. One, there is tremendous uneveness in the amount different schools will have to absorb. For example, it's estimated that Northern Illinois University will have to absorb \$78.00 while Southern Illinois University at one of their campuses at will have to absorb \$275,000.00. Illinois is going to absorb \$395,000.00 and Western is going to have to eat \$64,000.00. The junior colleges are all going to have to eat some; Lincoln Trails \$1,800, community college is projected to have to eat \$81,000.00. Now, there is absolutely no equity. There is no pro-ration involved in this. They paid the money until they ran out according to Statute. And therefore, there is great uneveness and inequity across the state. My Amendment would eliminate this inequity, would put it in the next year's budget and would, by Amendment on other legislation, would provide that these people would be paid first and any shortfall in the future would be pro-rated.

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

I would ask for your support of Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, here we go back to the same thing as the one before this. This is once again, you know, the kids' schooling is paid for and this is over and above taking care of the veterans. So I oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative J.J.Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Illinois Veterans Scholarship Program provides that honorably discharged Illinois veterans to obtain a four year tuition free scholarship at any state controlled university, college or community college. The veteran has, of course, 12 years to complete the studies from the time he or she enrolls in the program. I would oppose this supplemental appropriation Amendment which is nearly 1.9 million dollars because additional funding, as we said in the previous Amendment, would provide payment to schools and not to the veteran. The veteran can't be held responsible for any payment of the tuition or fees. And as the Sponsor of the Amendment did point out that was upheld by a recent Attorney General's opinion. It said it is the institution's responsibility. Now there is some shortfall, as I mentioned. I think it averages to less that 1% and that is due to the fact that the schools have increased their tuitions. I think the dollars, as far as the absorption or the shortfall, may be a little inflated because I'm not convinced that if you have an extra two or three veterans in a class that it really adds additional expenses on. That class is going to go on whether you have three or four veterans sitting in the class or not. It's computed on an average tuition charge and on that ... the basis of the dollars estimated is correct. But I believe that that is not totally the proper way to apply

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

and to determine the amount of dollars. I would ask for a \*no\* vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, your kind indulgence. We have here one of our greatest guys from the 11th Ward visiting us. He's going to celebrate with us tomorrow at the Richard J. Daley statute. Our former Senator, Edward Nile."

Speaker Daniels: "Welcome back to Springfield, Senator.

Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the Sponsor of the Amendment the same question I asked Representative Wolf.

Does this go into the shortfall for the reserve group that are not being paid?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "To the best of my knowledge, no."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Schraeder: "Even if it isn't covering all the veterans, I think the Great White Pather of the veterans organization... the veterans have really made a mistake on his opposition to this. I think this is going to be a disservice to the veterans in the future who will want to go to college. And I can't understand his position not wanting to protect the veterans. I think he's absolutely wrong. This is a must Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hallock: "What does this do for Rock Valley College in Rockford,
Illinois?"

Hoffman: "I thought you might ask. They...it's estimated that they have a shortfall of \$2400."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Hallock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker Daniels. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1 rise in support of Representative Hoffman's Amendment. And I think that all of you should take a close look at Representative Hoffman's Amendment because I think one of the earlier Amendments were miscontrued. If you believe that state universities should receive funds for every student who enrolls and consequently have revenue to pay teachers and other types of fixed costs, you will vote "aye" on this Amendment. you think that anyone should go to school free, free, you'll vote 'no' on this Amendment. I think mу distinguished colleague, Representative DiPrima, agrees with me that if you support veterans, you vote 'aye' on this Amendment because this Amendment, in effect, will help the veteran and if you are opposed to veterans you vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman to close."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand before you today holding in my so you can all see a document given to me by the Department of Veterans Affairs. And in this document they list al the institutions, indicate their actual anticipated claims, their claims that have been processed and the shortfall. Now. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is no insignificant document. This lists all of the universities that are going to receive shortfalls and the junior colleges. And by the way, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are only three junior colleges that aren't going to have a shortfall. Pray, pray that it's not one of yours and that you be recorded on the Roll Call Roll which I'm going to ask for as not voting for your constituents. Only three, only

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

three junior colleges. Now I don't want to embarrass anyone by naming them. Might lose your vote, too. want you to know that those of you who are graduates of major universities in the state, your universities are also going to be affected. Now I'm not here to tell you that the veteran isn't going to get his tuition waiver because he is. He has an absolute right to it. But universities, your universities, Ladies and Gentlemen, are all going to be hurt. Do you want to be responsible for that? I think not. The only responsible vote then, Ladies and Gentlemen, is an 'aye' vote. And I ask for it, please. please, in the interests of higher education in this state. Let's have an 'aye' vote. I want a Roll Call on that, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos'....the Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative DiPrima, I think you spoke in debate. Representative DiPrima? Your mic's on, Sir."
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, those of you that have been in this House for any lengths of years know how many times the previous speaker ever supported veterans legislation. I want you to know. He opposed me on many issues. Now all of sudden his pro-veteran stance amazes me. I still say vote 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Representative Hoffman to explain his vote."
- Hoffman: "I merely rise to register my shock and my chagrin at the comments made by the previous speaker because certainly this Bill isn't personal unless you mean it's personal for the universities and the young people who attend those

- 68th Legislative Day

  June 22, 1981

  universities and for them, for them, I would ask for more
  'aye' votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? The Gentleman,

  Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote. Timer's on,

  Sir."
- Leverenz: "Well, simply stated, a green vote covers the shortfalls that have already been occurred in universities, the colleges, the community colleges. A red vote takes care of the Governor and protects his budget."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 67 'aye', 84 'nay', 1 'present'. Amendment #5, having failed to receive the necessary votes, is hereby declare lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, McGrew, amends Senate Bill..."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew, Amendment #6?

  Representative McGrew? Is the Gentleman on the floor?

  Representative Wolf, your pleasure, Sir?"
- Wolf: "I move to table the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #6.

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

  The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6 is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Rea-Winchester-McCormick, et al, amends Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea, Amendment #7."
- Rea: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #7."
- Speaker Daniels: "Number seven is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 315."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Delinquency Prevention. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

- Clerk Leone: "Motion; 'I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 315°, filed by Representatives Kane and Representative
  Bullock and Karpiel."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane. Motion to table Amendment #1."
- Kane: "I would withdraw that Motion in favor of Representative
  Bullock's."

Speaker Daniels: "You withdraw the Motion?"

Kane: "In favor of Representative Bullock's Motion."

- Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Representative Kane's Notion to table is withdrawn. Any further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion. 'I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate
  Bill 315', Representative Bullock and Karpiel."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, Motion to table

  Amendment #1."
- Bullock: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to table House Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 315. This Amendment deals with the appropriation for the Commission on Delinquency Prevention. Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order because I think this is a very important discussion that we are about to undertake? Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order? I think this is a very important discussion that we're about to undertake."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman would like a little order."

Bullock: "And the Speaker's attention perhaps."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman have a little order, please?"

Bullock: "Most of you in the House are familiar with the discussion that we had approximately a month ago on the Governor's Executive Order #1 which attempted to

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

consolidate services into the Department of Children and Family Services. Amendment #1, which was adopted in the House Committee, in fact, reallocated in excess of 250,000 dollars from Personal Services to Contractual Services. This Amendment, in my estimation and the estimation of the persons who support me in this Motion to table, was a retaliatory action against employees who assisted with the defeat of Executive Order #1 in the Senate with a negative vote. One could only speculate that the single operational divisions that this Amendment seeks to create will also dilute the effectiveness of community service programs with eye upon, ultimately, consolidating and necessitating the re-organization of the Department of Children Pamily Services which was, in fact, defeated in the defeat of Executive Order #1. For this reason and because many Commission members and staff actively supported the defeat of Executive Order #1, I stand in strong opposition to House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 315, and I respectfully urge an 'aye' vote on Motion #1. Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to answer any questions anyone has regarding the Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly." Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the prior speaker said that Amendment #1, which was my Amendment in Committee, was somehow in retaliation for some members of the staff of the Commission opposing Executive Order #1. That is flatly not true. That is absolutely incorrect. I know that Representative sincerely thinks that to be true and I don't mean to imply anything different, but that is absolutely not true. don't know who on the staff supported or opposed the Executive Order though a question, I guess, could be raised as to whether the staff of an organization ought to be

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

lobbying against the position taken officially by the But that is not the reason for the Amendment at all. I think most of you know me in this House and know that if that were involved, I would be honest enough with you to admit that that was involved. That is just not the case. What we have here is a good faith effort to reorganize the Commission. The Amendment was supported in Committee by the Executive Director of the Commission. We. had the Commission come to us in the form of the Executive Director and the person of the Executive Director. She met with me before hand. We were discussing the fact that we needed more money for the grant line so that we could put direct money into care of kids out in the communities. the kids for which the Commission exists and that the way we could get that was to cut some positions. Now, let me explain and I know we don't, perhaps, want anymore details than we need. The Commission has been operating through two different divisions, Community Services and Operations and each one in each region has had its own administrative structure. All we did with Amendment #1 was consolidate those and eliminate unnecessary administrators and take that money and put it into the grants lines. There is no truth, absolutely none, to the thought that this was in retaliation for anything. This is a legitimate money-saving attempt by the Commission. The Commission came to us and supported this before the Committee. It was on that basis that I put forward the Amendment and it's on that basis that I ask that you oppose the tabling Motion and that we continue Amendment #1 on the Bill. I ask you Amendment, or excuse me, on this to vote 'no' on this Motion and to support the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechovicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

all due respect to the fine House Sponsor, Jim Reilly, I know that he wouldn't have anything to do personally till possibly eliminate the people that came in and worked the House and the Senate against Executive Order #1. unfortunately, with the adoption of Senate(sic) Amendment #1, that's exactly what happens, and it also breaks out the division into four regions, reduces personal services and related items by using the 8% solution. And in turn in discussing this proposed House Amendment to Senate Bill 315, there was a question in reference by a number of Senators who are vitally interested in keeping this Bill in tact and in some semblance of the order that it passed the I personally believe that this is an improper approach. It was an item devised maybe by some of our staff members without really thinking the entire solution totally out, but I think it's totally inadequate that we proceed with this Amendment at this time when you're trying to be windictive to people that were expressing their own rights as residents of this state in the way the items are situated in their respective agencies. For this reason, I strongly support Representative Bullock's Motion to table this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me try to shed some light on what the appropriations Committee was trying to do. This had nothing to do with Executive Order #1 as pointed out by the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee, Mr. Reilly. What we've done is follow the lead of the Democrats and the Democrat Staff who've been saying all the time, 'Cut the bureaucracy and put the money into grants and put it in for the kids' and, finally, we did exactly that and now you want to reverse the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

The administrative re-organization had, the Commission had five program divisions, four community service regions, and during FY '81 the agency collapsed these five into a single one. And all we're doing here is taking out positions as supervisors. There's two, six, eight, nine, nine supervising positions so we'd have more money to put in for grants and direct care for the We asked them in a 90% exercise, we asked the agency which positions. We had a 90% exercise which said if you had to cut your budget 10%, what would be the that you would like to have cut and rather than cutting the direct services and the grants to the children, they came up and came up with this. It eliminates some of these community service supervisors and these 15 positions which came to some 326,000 dollars. Now, we didn't trim quite that much out. I think it was 244,500. So we didn't even go as far as the agency said we should go with it, and if they are going to collapse these five divisions into a single one, you don't have need for these bureaucrats. I think that the Committee action was sound. I think well thought out, and I think this Motion to table Amendment #1 should be soundly defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I opposed this Amendment in Committee and I had heard about the rumors about retribution against those who worked for Executive Order #1, and that played a part, probably, in my own mind that I didn't want to see anybody penalized for what they really believe in that is right. As you know, the Senate, by a majority, believed it was right too. Whether that's an issue or not, the fact of the matter is that in their ISL forms this Commission in no way gave any indication of this re-organization. This mysteriously came

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

about after the Bill came out of the Senate. I had posed the question to the Director, 'What are you going to do with these 15 personnel that you choose now to eliminate? .. She said, 'Well, we're going to phase them out by October, but we're going to look for other positions for them'. Now, how are we saving any monies if the Director admits that they're looking for other positions in state government for these 15 people. So you're really not saving anything and all this does is transfer, it sends 15 people out on the street and now transfers it into grant items but, by admission of the Director, those 15 aren't going to be thrown on the street. I kind of believe that they'd like to throw them out on the street really. think before we do anything on this Amendment, we'd have to quarantee that those 15 people who evidently are doing a good job ought to stay in state government. So therefore, I don't think this is a good Amendment at all. I don't like, I've often said on the floor of the House that I don't believe that we, as a Legislature, ought to write any substantive law that is retribution against anybody for anything. I surely don't think we ought to write it into our appropriations law by cutting somebody out just because they may have worked actively against some thing or another. You know, you can stand here on the floor of the House and say Executive Order #1 had nothing to do about it, but let me believe you, it sure smells to high heaven I, therefore, vote... urge your support against Committee Amendment #1 and to table it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of Mr. Bullock's Motion. I'd like to read to you, please if I may, a memorandum dated June 16, 1981 at 4:00 p.m. to Ann Kane,

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the person on the Commission of Delinquency Prevention signed by Richard A. Garber talking about budgetary responsibilities. 'As of this date and time, you are hereby notified to cease and desist with any action involving the fiscal year 1982 budget for the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention. Specifically, one, you are not to provide any person, staff member or otherwise with any information you have available on the ICDP fiscal \*82 budget. Two, you are not to contact or receive contact from any political entity or departmental in regard to the fiscal 1982 ICDP budget. all requests for budget information regarding appropriations or expenditures for fiscal '80, '81, '82 must be cleared with Mr. Klem Smith, Fiscal Officer, or Budget information prepared by this office is myself. considered privileged information until it is signed into law by the Governor. Failure to comply with this directive will result in disciplinary action. CC Johnne Mill..Mitchel, Barbara..somebody and Klem Smith. and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure Mr. Reilly and Mr. Wolf have no knowledge of this but the Amendment that they perpetrating on this Body is a vile Amendment. That Amendment should be defeated heartily and Mr. Bullock's Motion should be supported by all of us. And if Mr. Wolf and Mr. Reilly feel they have some more obligation to Amendment because they have ultimate faith ín bureaucracy and met Bob Mandeville and everybody, let But for the rest of us, this is a vile, vile Amendment and the Motion should succeed. The issue here is that there is specifically and unalterably political retribution on those people that oppose Executive Order #1. people who understand the Juvenile for those Delinquency Prevention Commission, you know that the

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- \*Clifford Shaw\* approach to handling community affairs is a good...
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Reilly: "On a point of personal privilege. Both Representative McClain..."
- Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."
- Reilly: ".. and Representative Matijevich have made the same point. I am here. I offered the Amendment. You either think I'm lying or you don't. I did not offer this Amendment as a matter of retribution. I did not offer this Amendment because it smells to high heaven or for any other reasons. I offered this Amendment, voted up or down on the basis of what I've done. I presented logical arguments for why the Amendment should be. The Gentlemen should either ought to apologize or shut up. I am not offering this because it's political retribution or anything else. The Amendment is a good Amendment and it ought to be upheld."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's point is well taken.

  Representative McClain, you will limit your remarks to the

  Amendment."
- McClain: "Mr. Speaker and Mr. Reilly, I would suggest both of you listen to what I'm saying instead of any paranoia reigning.."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

McClain: "I specifically ... Excuse me, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment."

McClain: "To the Amendment. I specifically did not challenge anyone's motives. I specifically released anybody from any motives either from Mr. Wolf or Mr. Reilly. The Amendment is a vile Amendment and should be defeated. The Commission on Delinquency Prevention is a very necessary Commission and handles a very appropriate function on community self

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

help. It is the kind of thing that if you have it in your you\*re AstA proud to have it community, your neighborhood and your community. It is the kind of Commission that we spend our money very wisely, be it in Springfield or Decatur or Rockford or Quincy or throughout the State of Illinois. It's the kind of Commission with the kind of people that should be supported. On those grounds, I stand in support of Mr. Bullock's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas. One second, Sir. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Speaker, because my name was mentioned. I think Jim Reilly knows the high regard that I hold him in. I think he does a hell of a job in the Appropriations Committee process. My remarks were not intended against him. I know he's handling the Amendment for the Commission. My remarks were what I think the Amendment to be but certainly should not be interpreted, in any way, what I think Jim Reilly to be."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know what the record of the Department of Children and Family Services is. Do you want the troubled kids in your area to be ignored by a bunch of bureaucrats who couldn't care less what happens to that kid? Because all that troubled kid to them is a number, a number which is something to be looked at and then discarded, or do you want the children in your neighborhoods to get the personal and attentive care which they need to get them through their troubled times. I have had the pleasure, Ladies and Gentlemen, of working with and seeing how the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention has worked in my legislative district. They have done things with these

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

kids which I thought were impossible, and the reason they are successful is because they care and they can relate to these kids at the local level. I would urge each and everyone of you Ladies and Gentlemen to vote 'yes' on this Motion to table Amendment \$1. An affirmative vote is a vote for the future citizens of the State of Illinois. A negative vote is a vote for the bureaucrats who don't care and can't even do a good job with their present responsibilities."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Dunn."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Previous question is moved. Gentleman, Representative Bullock, on his Motion to table Amendment #1."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a Roll Call vote on the Motion after I've completed my closing remarks. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the phasing out of the employees in House Amendment #1 does not, and I repeat, does not save any dollars to the State of Illinois. It transfers it from one Section to the other. This Amendment is the worst type of politics that could be played in the State of Illinois. This Amendment is intended to punish conscientious individuals who sought to work cooperatively with this Body and were so successful the Senate, in its wisdom, defeated a heinous Order which was fragmented, Executive If you believe in fair play, if you believe misintended. in due process, you will vote affirmatively on the Motion #1 to table Committee Amendment #1 in order that the State of Illinois and this Body maintain its rightful integrity and say to the administration that we determine by voting

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

down Executive Orders what we believe to be in the best interest of the citizens of the State of Illinois. I respectfully urge an 'aye' vote on Motion \$1."

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Chapman."
- Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when we counted the votes for Executive Order #1 on which this House was never permitted to vote, we had 94 votes..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Chapman. Excuse me.

  Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Wolf (J. J.): "Mr. Speaker, a number of times we've been talking about Executive Order #1. This is not Executive Order #1. This is an Amendment to a Bill. I wish the speaker and others coming up to speak will confine their remarks to the issue at hand."
- Speaker Daniels: "To the Bill... To the Motion, Representative Chapman."
- Chapman: "I hope that we would see at least 94 votes up on the board to table Amendment number whatever it is. One."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 89 'ayes', 68 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Motion to table prevails. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Lechowicz: "Out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

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

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

Amendment #3 is a small Amendment of ten thousand...to fund

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

a Committee in the 30th District which has done vital and over the years in the community of important work 'Hegwish'. the 'Hequish Community Two years ago, Committee' ran into the crunch of closing hours of the Session and paid the consequences of losing their state funding for their work within the community. Somehow they have continued to survive and work with the children of the community in spite of the fact that they did lose the \$10,000.00, but it hasn't been easy and they do need the money. This is a Committee with which I have first-hand experience and one that has done terrific work with the children of the area, both in the fields of community services, in drug programs, in immunization programs. an important community Committee along with so many of the others that function throughout the State of Illinois. I say, it's a small item but it's large to the people of this community and I would solicit the support of the Members of this House."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Collins, how has this program been funded in the past year?"

Collins: "The people of the community have scraped money to keep the program going. They haven't been able to hire any employees. The one that they did have they managed to keep on by private solicitation which they always have done and will continue again. But it hasn't been easy. This is \$10,000.00 that they have always received in the past up till the last biennieum and this is an effort to restore them to their former position."

Darrow: "What is their total budget?"

Collins: "I don't recall. I think it would be at least twice

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

this."

Darrow: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Darrow: "I can recall vividly last year when the Senator from Representative Collins' District stood on this House floor as a House Member and indicated the abuses and the wastes of funds and the political activity that had taken place in this community and in this center. And he articulated all the problems that they were having and the abuses of the program and it was at that time that we ..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Darrow.

Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise,
Sir?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Nobody has ever stood on this floor and enumerated any abuses in this program. I don't know whom the Gentleman is talking about or what program he's talking about but there was never any insinuation by any Member on the House...on this House floor that there was any abuse within this program. Now, if he would like to enumerate the abuses and the Member who is supposed to have said this, I would like to hear it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow, to the Amendment, Sir." Darrow: "I apologize, I recall that it was not Representative Dawson that said that, in fact, Representative Dawson joined in the Amendment with Representative Collins, so I hope that's corrected. I was ill informed about that. However, last year this same appropriation came up and at and with wisdom of the House of that time the Representatives we voted to take this ten thousand dollars out and not to fund this program. This money is not in the Governor's budget, this is over and above what is needed. The community has been able to substain itself without the help of the state. There's no sense in funding it again

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

this year and I would solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "How much would be appropriated by this Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Ten thousand dollars."

Leverenz: "Well, if it's not in the Governor's budget, I've got
an Amendment that will delete twelve thousand. So, I will
certainly support your Amendment for ten and we'll just
share the money and put it in the right direction in the
community agency. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to echo the remarks of my running mate, Representative Collins, and I'm sure Representative Balanoff. This pertains to our district and this community center got catch in the switches two years back and a measly ten thousand dollars was taken out of the budget for their community work in that particular area. And every other community in the City of Chicago gets money except this one and what we're asking for is to put this ten thousand dollars back compared to the other amounts of monies that are in the other communities and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say that this Hegwish community committee is the only group in the community that have a program for young people. It has a record of success, it has an extremely small budget and they utilize every dollar very carefully. Not only would they spend state dollars very well but in fact they will save the state money because they will keep these young people out of the court system. So please, please appropriate this very small amount for a very good

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

successful committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I would like to thank my colleagues in the 30th District for their support. I would like to just correct one thing that Representative Darrow brought up. In the wisdom of this House two years ago we did not take the money out, it was this House that put it back in. And it was only in the switches, in Conference Connittee that the ten thousand dollars was lost at the last hour. As I say, it's a small amount, ten thousand dollars but it's of emence importance to the people of the community known as Hegwish which for those of you who don't know, on the southeast side of the City of Chicago in the 30th District. These people have done marvelous work, they have straggled to keep their heads above water in spite of the fact that they lost state funding. But it has been a straggle, this is not...it is not affluent community, it's a working man's community. The money that these people raise is...comes out of their pay checks and is hard earned. They need our help and they need our help badly, the children of that community need help and they have done great work with the children of that community. Work that would make anyone proud and I would earnestly solicit the support of this entire House for this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved 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: "Floor Amendment #4, Leverenz."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have two Amendments here, could the Clerk at least read the first line so that I

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

could distinguish between the two?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4 on page 1, line 16, by deleting fifty-four thousand, four hundred and inserting in lieu thereof, forty-one thousand, nine hundred."

Leverenz: "And the next two lines."

Clerk O'Brien: "And in Section 2 by deleting for contractural services."

Leverenz: "Thank you. This is the ... I had it drawn both ways depending upon what happened to the motion on the first Let me explain Amendment #4 by saying that, we Amendment. just put ten thousand dollars in for community We have an opportunity and a responsibility to delete that which does not work. Based on a community organization that was cut off in funds, I asked to see a copy of the contract for that agency that was now denied funds for the new fiscal year. I also asked to see the new contract for the new agency that will replace that agency that is currently located apparently, the new agency in residental neighborhood and know no organization that could ever provide services from The Amendment would delete an assistant legal council or part time legal council to this agency to the tune twelve thousand, five hundred dollars. Further, they went and extended the reach of their agency and they now have three locations. One in Chicago, one in Springfield and the Legislative Liaison and a secretary operate out of office in Lincoln Tower. It would delete the Lincoln Tower appropriation for the office space over there of about two thousand dollars. For a total of about fourteen or fifteen thousand dollars I ask you to delete the money here because we have just put it in Representative Collins Amendment where it will do the most good in the community agencies. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Any questions? Representative Wolf, J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Yes, I was just wondering if this is technically correct? Could we get an opinion from the Parliamentarian?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Clerk to read the Amendment so that we had the correct one. If Representative Wolf will also look at Amendment #5, I think what we have to do based on the two Amendment is withdraw 4 and 5, is the one, the real one that will fit with the budget or the Bill as we have now amended it."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn, is that your request, Sir?:

Leverenz: "That's correct."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn #4. Amendment #....further
Amendments, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5...."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 5, is the one that will eliminate the assistant or the part time legal council to the agency which has apparently told us that we don't have an opportunity to look at legal contracts, state contracts and we were denied access to public record by the attorney. It would also delete funding for the Lincoln Towers office that houses the Legislative Liaison and a secretary for a total of about fourteen or fifteen thousand, and we have just put that money were it properly goes, into a community operating grant for Representative Collins on a previous Amendment. I'd ask for your 'aye' on Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Amendment #5. Representative J. J. Wolf."

- Wolf, J.J.: "I would ask an opinion on this Amendment as well, if it is technically correct. It talks on page 2, line 31, by deleting thirteen thousand dollars and inserting in lieu thereof, one thousand, one hundred. That line already says, ten thousand, one hundred. There is no thirteen thousand. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that maybe, you know, he delete lines 4 and 5, I think the first parts okay, I think he's got a problem with the second half."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, your Amendment is out of order in the sense that page 2, line 31, provision in the original Bill refers to the amount, ten thousand, one hundred. Your Amendment refers to the amount of thirteen thousand. What's your pleasure?"
- Leverenz: "Delete line 4 and 5 and go with the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman ask leave to delete lines to amend Amendment #5, by deleting lines 4 and 5, on its face.

  Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5, absent lines 4 and 5, which have been deleted on its face. On that motion, is there any discussion? Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, I missed the Gentleman's explanation now of what he is trying to do. Would he repeat that?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Would the Gentleman please repeat his explanation."
- Leverenz: "This is the part time, legal staff to this agency.

  Specifically, relating to the contract...two contracts as a matter of fact, which the legal council told the executive director that we were not entitled to the information and we had to get leave first from the agency. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 330. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 330, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

Winchester: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment \$5 withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 331. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 331, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Macdonald on Amendment #2.

Representative Macdonald, is the Lady on the floor?

Representative Macdonald, Amendment #2, Senate Bill 331,

68th Legislative Day

appropriation to the Department of Registration,

Education."

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

Amendment #2 adds forty-five thousand, four hundred and eighty dollars, all from the General Revenue Fund to the Personal Services. Related to the Department of Registration and Education. I have to withdraw Amendment #3 and go with Amendment #2...or Amendment #2 and go with Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further
Amendments?"

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

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

Macdonald: "Yes, I'm sorry, the Amendment I discribed Amendment #3. This Amendment has come to my attention because of two really very sensational cases of misued of escrow funds in the northwest suburban area. When I began investigating with the Department of Registration I find that there are only thirty-four employees, statewide assigned to audit and regulate about twenty-five thousand real estate brokers and forty-two thousand salesmen. That just simply isn't adequate and I think for the consumer protection at a time when real estate is such a crisis, that it would be advisable for us to at least put two accountant II's in position to help with this work. So, they are not auditors, they accountant II positions and I would ask for your approval of this particular Amendment. I think it is absolutely necessary for what has come to light particularly in the northwest suburban area. And I'm sure if it's true there, it would be true in many other places in this state."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Any discussion? Being none, the question

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted.' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

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

Amendment #4 restores eight thousand, eight hundred dollars
in the contractural services line item for electronic data
processing that was taken out of the Bill by the Senate.

This will restore the eight thousand, eight hundred
dollars. I cleared it with the Chairman of the
Appropriations and he said, it was okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates that he will."

Darrow: "What was the purpose in removing this money, what was the rational behind the Senate's actions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "To be truthful, Representative, I'm not quiet sure. What they did, they had an electronic data processing line item and what they in turn did, was reduce their head count by five. Figuring that this could covered in by....their work would be covered by the electronic data processing. In turn, they turned around and reduced it by eight thousand, eight hundred dollars. And...it's sort of the better of two world, either you can have one or you can have the other but you cann't reduce the head count. Or and the electronic data processing or both of them, you've got to either do one or the other and that is basically what this returning it to its original line item figure."

Darrow: "Who do we have the contract with?"

Piel: "That I couldn't tell you, I don't know."

Darrow: "Have you discussed this with ... "

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Piel: "One second, hold on. This is just for the rental of the time with DAS and 'OMEC"."

Darrow: "I have no further questions, 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', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 332. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Personnel. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Matijevich-McBroom..."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 332 is the Amendment which Representative McBroom has referred to on the floor of the House, where in we are trying to do something about the matter of reduced benefits for the group state employees and the increase group insurance premiums. The Amendment #7 would allow the department to retain the current benefits structure of the state employees group insurance program and would be an added appropriation of eight million, six hundred thousand dollars to appropriation. If you ask, were can we get this money, remember last week when I talked about the Illinois Building Authority and the changes that we had made in that through Amendment, we have more than enough from doing that

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

particular change in allowing for the state employees to have a insurance program that at least, does not go backwards and it keeps all the benefit structure that we have in the present program. Representative McBroom, as I said, is a co-chief sponsor of this Amendment. All of you I'm sure have heard from state employees who have been up in arms over the change that the group insurance structure, we think they have reason to complain about it and we believe that we have a responsibility as a Legislator, as the employer to keep the benefits at that level. And I would urge your support of Amendment #7."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$7. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment \$7 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment \$7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #8, J. J. Wolf..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. Amendment #8,
  Representative Wolf."
- Wolf, J.J.: "I was just trying to get hold of the Clerk, maybe we should take this out of the record a little while. May we do that, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Take the Bill out of the record, Sir?" Wolf, J.J.: "Yes."
- Speaker Daniels: "You are the Sponsor of the Bill, we'll take this out of the record momentarily. Senate Bill 340. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower, Amendment #1.

  Representative Bower, is the Gentleman on the floor?

  Representative Wolf."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Mr. Bower asked me if I would handle this if he didn't get back. Is he back."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J.J.: "He's back here now, okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower, Amendment #1, Sir."

- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment adds a hundred and ninety-two thousand, eight hundred dollars in USEPA funds and sixty-one thousand, two hundred dollars in GRF funds to the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 344. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 344, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State and Southern Illinois University for permanent improvements, grants and related purposes. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 332. Any Amendments from the floor?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, this Bill was read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #8, J. J. Wolf..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf, Amendment #8."

- Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This restores four hundred and seventy—five thousand and one hundred dollars to the division of the executive recruit, the director has informed me and other members of the Committee that is a very essential program and this would restore the money, it may not all hold up in Conference Committee but I think we should offer this Amendment at this time and see if we can negotiate somewhere on that. I would move the adoption of Amendment #8."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm not sure if

we're through with appropriation matters for the day and I

know we're a long way from through from appropriation

matters in both Houses. However, as Minority Spokesman, I

know our Committee work is done and I want to take this

opportunity to thank publicly, Jake Wolf as Chairman of

that Appropriation Committee for all of his corporation

with me. And particularly both the Democrat and Republican

staff who did such a yeoman's duty, worked so hard, I know

tomorrow we're all going to get together and sort of

celebrate all of our work for the year. But I want them to

know publicly that I thank them and I know Jake does too.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf, at Representative

So, thank you for a good job from both staffs."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Reilly's...Bowers desk."

- Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to offer my words of thanks also to the distinguish Minority Spokesman and the staff on both sides, both Democrat and Republican who have worked many many hours as well as the Members of the Committee to work on the Appropriation process. It was greatly appreciated and John, I think we've got one of the most terrfic staffs I've seen down here in many a year. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Your comments are well made, the House of Representative congraduates the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle. Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could you enlighten the Membership as to what the schedule for the rest of the day will be?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kulas, one of the problems that
  we've had to this point in time is that you have stood up
  before the House and told the House that you represent the
  mushrooms. We all know that mushrooms are spores. They do
  not possess chlorophyll, which is converted to energy by
  light. And since they do not possess that, they grow by
  spores. Spores grow in the dark and therefore, if we were
  to inform you of that, we would take you out of the dark
  and stunt your growth. So, we intend to keep you there.
  Representative O'Brien."
- O'Brien: "Would you repeat that for the benefit of the Membership, please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "I just wanted to say, you know, this morning the minister asked us to pray for all the poor farmers who have been inundated by rain in the last few weeks and I have a solution to that problem. I think this started about a month ago and in order to solve this problem, I would move to reconsider the vote by which Representative Ropp's



68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

weather modification Bills passed this House. I mean, you know, mushrooms like rain, but it's been ridiculous."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pierce"

- Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during some of the excitement last Thursday night close to midnight on the Second Reading of a Bill I think dealt with reapportionment, there was a certain amount of excitement in the chamber, and I know Representative Telcser, not yourself..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative. Gentlemen please have your attention?"
- Pierce: "Representative Telcser, not yourself, was acting as Speaker that time and you recall we had a little bit excitement that now is already last week's excitement. During all that, apparently, there was filming by television crew from Champaign at a time the light wasn't on and there was a feeling by some of the Members that that was a violation of the rules and they shouldn't be doing There was a lot of confusion on the floor here. looked like there was some kind of scuffling up there, and I got up and spoke about that. Since then, on further investigation because it's hard to see from down here, I've newspapers around noticed in the state unfairly characterized Representative Joe Ebbesen as having pushed or shoved or moved a camera or done something and, reviewing the matter including with the cameraman and those who could see what was going on, I want to report that Representative Ebbesen has been falsely accused of actions in the press gallery that he was not responsible for. was hard to see and I know that's because most of the press wasn't here at that time. The press was back home in We were working. Most of the reporters were either getting a last round or last call in some of the local watering

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

spots or they were already asleep or filing their stories. Television cameras weren't there except for Channel 3. reviewing the matter carefully, I'm convinced, in my own mind, that Representative Joe Ebbesen did nothing other than try to make it clear what the rules of the House and that they were filming at a time they shouldn't have been filming, and that was his purpose for going to And to those newspapers and radio stations that gallery. abused his name on any matter of pushing or shoving, I understand the cameraman from Channel 3 will be glad to tell just what happened and, when he tells what happened, Representative Ebbesen will be completely exoterated from anything we would need to apologize for. And, I wanted to make that clear as a matter of record at this time and a matter of personal privilege because I raised that matter last Thursday night. And anyone that wants to talk to me from the press or the Channel 3 cameraman, it will be made clear at this time that Representative Ebbesen was not in violation of the rules."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill, Second Reading Short Debate Calendar, page 6, Senate Bill 202. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 202, a Bill for an Act to amend the state..."

Speaker Daniels: "Page 7, I'm sorry."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code.

Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 423."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 423, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Printing Contracts Act. Second Reading of the Bill...."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Is the Gentleman, Representative Ebbesen on the floor? Representative Ebbesen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 568, Representative Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 730, Representative Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 853, Representative Woodyard. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 853, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the definition of gasohol. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$3, Kane."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane, Amendment #3. Senate Bill 853, in relation to the definition of gasohol. Amendment #3."

Kane: "I would withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #3, withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Excuse me, Representative Getty."

Getty: "I would just like to go back and clear up. I may have misunderstood. What was the Amendment that the Clerk read that we adopted in Committee?"

Speaker Daniels: "On Senate Bill 853, Sir?"

Getty: "Right."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor previously."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir, adopted on the floor."

Getty: "Alright. Now, how about Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "It was tabled."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Getty: "On the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment, it was tabled on the House floor."

Getty: "Thank you. I just want to clear up the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Sir? Okay. Senate Bill 853 is on
Third Reading. Senate Bill 1111, Representative Deuchler.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1201, Representative Tuerk. Senate Bill 1201, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

Keane: :"Leave to withdraw or table Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Keane: "Yes, this...Amendment #2 just specifies, I've spoken with the Sponsor of the Amendment, I don't think there is any opposition to it. It specifies that what we are talking about in this legislation is the Pederal Higher Education Act of 1965, those federally guaranteed loans programs and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' 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, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1201 on page..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk, Amendment #3."
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, excuse me. This Amendment was requested by the State Scholarship Commission to raise the interest rate to finance proceed of tax exempt revenue bonds issued by the Commission. The Commission in consultation with bond council and financial experts, has determined that they have to have a higher ceiling on the interest rate in order to finance the sale of the bonds. It raises the rate from 8%, which is now in effect of 14%. I would move for the adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that question, Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Has the Amendment been distributed?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Has the Amendment been printed and distributed,

  Mr. Clerk? #3. No, it has not. You're the Sponsor of the

  Bill, Sir, what's your pleasure?"
- Tuerk: "Well, I would certainly....maybe what we ought to do, is
  move it on to Third and then I will talk to Mr. Getty about
  the Amendment and then we could pull it back to Second for
  an Amendment. Would that be alright?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."
- Getty: "I haven't had an opportunity to see the Amendment.

  Possibly if he takes it out of the record, I would withdraw
  my objections."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Sponsor, Representative Tuerk, you may..."

  Tuerk: "That would be fine, you can take the Bill out of the record."

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- Speaker Daniels: "Take the Bill out of the record or you may withdraw Amendment #3 and move it Third. Whatever your pleasure."
- Tuerk: "Well, why don't we take it out of the record and I'll talk with Mr. Getty."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 423,
  Representative Ebbesen. Is the Gentleman on the floor?
  Out of the record. Senate Bill 568, excuse me. Agreed
  Resolutions. Representative Conti."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank
  you, I would like to go back to the Order of Agreed
  Resolutions due to the fact that this is an emergency."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 408."
- Conti: "House Resolution 408 by Katz, is congratulating a Mr.

  Phoebe Boas Solomon of Glencoe, to be installed as

  President of the Auxiliary to the American Optometric

  Association on Saturday, June 27, at the Hilton Hotel in

  Las Vegas, Nevada. I move for the adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolution 408. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted."
- Conti: "Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 568, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 568."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 568, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating sanitary districts. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Terzich. Amends Senate Bill 568 on page 1, line 1..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #1, Representative Terzich."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Terzich: "Amendment \$1 amends the code. It increases the maximum working cash fund from 40% to a maximum of 90%. And it provides that bonds be issued by the district to bear interest at a rate not to exceed 9% per annum or 70% of the prime rate in effect at the time of issuance. This Bill would allow the district to gradually build up the working cash fund to a point were borrowing will become mimimal resulting in a considerable savings and interest cost. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "This would increase...Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this would increase bonding for a unit of government tied closely to the City of Chicago whose bonds are already potentially shakey in the financial markets. I would oppose the Amendment, if the Gentleman presists in the Amendment, I would ask for a verification of the Amendment and I would urge everybody to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 568.

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is opened. Have all those voted who wish? Representative Terzich to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."

Terzich: "Well again, Mr. Speaker, this is a very very It allows the district to provide construction Amendment. and also in their working cash fund. At the present time the bonds that they have to purchase are an exorbitant amount. it is шy understanding that all large municipalities have this, it's a taxpayers benefit. allows the district to gradually build up the fund, I don't believe there's any increase in the tax rate. Under the existing statute they are authorized to level a corporate working cash tax in the amount of 1/2 of cent per

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

hundred dollars of assessed valuation. The limit is 40%, this is simply changing it to 90% so that they can operate their part of government at at savings to the taxpayers and not have to pay exorbitant interest rate at the current bond rate. I understand that most municipalities have it, it's a good Amendment and I certainly would appreciate your support."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle to explain his vote.

  The timer is on, Sir."
- Stuffle: "Yes, I hesitate to get up on this Amendment as a downstater but Representative Vinson did so in the opposite position. It's true there's an increase in the allowable interest rate of bonds or necessarily issued. The attempt in this particular Amendment is to preclude the need to continue to issue bonds. The exact opposite reasons to what Representative Vinson stated, are good reasons to vote for this particular Amendment in the hopes that there will not be the need to issue additional working cash bonds but rather that need would be obviated and that the credit rating particular entity involved here would strengthen. For those reasons, this particular Amendment deserves an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Robbins, 'no'. Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

  This Amendment there are 78 'aye', 79 'no'....the Gentleman, Representative Terzich requests a poll of the absentees."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative

68th Legislative Day

10

- June 22, 1981
- Sandquist. Record Representative Sandquist as 'aye'.

  Representative Bradley. Record Representative Bradley as
  'aye'. Continue with the poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Brummer.

  Donovan. John Dunn. Fawell. Garmisa. Giglio. Jackson.

  Kane. Klemm. Margalus. McBroom. Redmond. Robbins. Irv

  Smith. Van Duyne. Yourell and Zwick."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Du yne, 'aye'. Representative Smith, 'no'. Representative Klemm, 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Robbins, 'no'. Representative Dunn, 'no'. Change Dunn from 'aye' to 'no'. I'm sorry, Jack Dunn. Representative Jack Dunn from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 81 'aye', 82 'no'. This Amendment having failed to receive the necessary votes....the Gentleman, Representative Terzich. Representative Conti."
- Terzich: "Yes, could I have a verification of the negative vote."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich requests a verification.

  The Clerk will poll the affirmative...or the negative roll."
- O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alstat. Balanoff. Clerk Barkhausen. Barnes. Bartulis. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Daniels. Boucek. Bower. Collins. Conti. Davis. Deuchler. Deuster. Jack Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Findley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Ewing. Griffin. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hastert. Hoffman. Hudson. Huskey. Jackson. Karpiel. Jim Kociolko. Koehler. Kucharski. Macdonald. Mays. McAuliffe. Leinenweber. McMaster. Ted Meyer. R. J. Meyer. Miller. Nelson. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Ropp. Schuneman. Irv Smith. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. C. M. Stiehl. Stanley. E. G. Steele. Stewart.

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Swanstrom. Tate. Telcser. Topinka. Tuerk. Turner. Vinson. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell."

Fawell: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as not voting."

Fawell: "Will you please record me as 'no'."

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

Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower has leave to be verified?

May be verified, Representative Terzich? Representative

Bower, has leave to be verified, leave is granted.

Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Barnes: "I just noticed my county chairman is voting 'aye', so I want to change my 'no' vote to 'aye', please."

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

Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Would....for Bob Terzich, will you change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Huskey from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J.J.: "'No' to 'aye'."

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

Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "From 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "From 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Giglio: "Would please vote me 'aye'."

- Speaker Daniels: "Vote him 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. There are 86 'ayes', 79 'no', this Amendment having received the necessary votes is hereby declared passed.
  - Further Amendments? Adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Vinson. Amends Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson...withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Vinson."
- Daniels: "Representative Vinson...withdrawn. Speaker Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Vinson."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson....withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Vinson..."
- Speaker Daniels: :Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Vinson."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson. #6 withdrawn. Purther Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 730, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act to amend the Purchasing Act for the Metropolitan Samitary District of Greater Chicago. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. take the same roll call on this Amendment. What it does is, it permits the Director of Personnel of the district to

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

substitute the categories and put it in the same position as the State Personnel Code and this Amendment does also, endorsed by the National Civil Service League and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, screaming."

Bowman: "Thank you, yes. I could have sworn you were about to overlook me. By the way, I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman indicates he will yield."

Bowman: "Representative Terzich, did we defeat a similar proposal on the floor in the last week or so?"

Terzich: "No. We had a similar Bill postponed consideration."

Bowman: "Oh, we have it on postponed consideration, so it failed to get 89 votes."

Terzich: "But it wasn't agreed upon."

Bowman: "I see."

Terzich: "We were caught in the traps as the last Bill, but hopefully we have we have that resolved.

Bowman: "Well, Representative Terzich, I don't know whose agreeing to this particular proposal, but don't include me, please."

Terzich: "Oh, no, you're not included." Bowman: "Thank you.

Speaking to the Amendment..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Bowman: "Thank you. Basically what this Amendment would do, be to open up the hiring system to political considerations. If it is the same proposal that we heard before. This would include in the various categories that lists are prepared for, lists by geographic areas, which would presumely mean wards. And there by, I assume that every

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

ward in the City of Chicago would have its own allocation. Now maybe that's what we're doing now subrosa, but we shouldn't sanction this under cover law. The method of categorizing the performance, good, bad, indifferent, simply substitutes a much courser screen for the finer one that's now in use and seems to me, provides the kind of protections to the public that we need to provide in order to avoid the use of political considerations in the hiring process. This Amendment is a bad Amendment and I think would take us back to the 19th Century."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Terzich to close."
- Terzich: "Well, this is...I cannot agree with the previous It puts the Bill in the same position that the state...it does allow the departments to select from a list of qualified people who took the test. This has the approval, like I say, of the National Service League and it provides the flexability of making sure that the people that are hired are qualified personnel that have completed test and also will furnished the Department of Personnel to select people that meet these type of requirement to perform the job in the satisfacty manner. The state has had this operating for over a hundred forty thousand of its personnel and I'm certain that this provision has been workable and will provide a greater flexibility and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 423, Representative Ebbesen."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 423, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Printing Contracts Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen. Excuse me. Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

- Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 423 amends the State Purchasing Act to repeal the Section requiring a seller to certify to the Department That goods, merchandise, wares or Administrative Services. services of value of twenty-five hundred dollars, which are supplied meet the standards of the purchasing contract. DAS feels that this change should reduce duplicate certification and will allow ventors to deal with the state without the impetiment of costly and time consuming duplication. Additionally the Amendment insures a proper competitive bidding balance between and precurement practices by raising the dollar thrash hold the Purchasing Act at which formal competitive bidding is required, from twenty-five hundred to five dollars. As a related item, it also raises ownership disclosure from fifteen hundred to five thousand dollars. I move for the adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Representative Kane."
- Kane: "I would question the germaneness of this Amendment.

  Question the germaneness of this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk can we see the Bill and the Amendment. Representative Kane."
- Kane: "I would point out that the Amendment amends an entirely different Act and the subject is entirely different also."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The Parliamantarian has ruled that it is germane. Sir, that is the ruling of the Chair."
- Kane: "Could you elaborate under what...what context do you find an Amendment that amends a different Act and is an entirely different subject matter, is germane."
- Speaker Daniels: "The title of the Act has been amended to include the State Printing Contracts Act. The title was amended to add the Illinois Purchasing Act but more importantly, the substantance of the Amendment deals totally with the Purchasing Act and Acts of the State of Illinois. So, the ruling of the Chair is that it is germane. Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Do I take it from your ruling that anything is germane to anything else as long as it amends the revised statute."
- Speaker Daniels: "No, Sir. Each Amendment will stand on its own face. In this case this particular Amendment is germane to the Bill."

Kane: "As a single subject. What is the single subject?"

Speaker Daniels: "That is the ruling of the Chair."

Kane: "I...just for clarification. What is the single subject?"

Speaker Daniels: "As Amended the title, contains the subject matter dealing with purchasing. That's the ruling of the Chair, Sir. Representative Kane."

Kane: "If this wasn't a serious subject, I would chuckle. But since that is your ruling, I would ask that if this Amendment is put on under the rules of the House, I would ask that the Bill be returned to Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "That being the case....how many days do we have left...with the consideration.?"

Speaker Daniels: "Deadline is Friday night, midnight."

Ebbesen: "Alright, fine."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. We will proceed, Sir? Your request is appropriate. Alright, should the Amendment be adopted.

Any further discussion? Amendment #1. If not all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. Representative Kane."

Kane: "I would ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. All those in favor will signify by voting "aye", oppose by voting "no". The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Findley to explain his vote."

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Germaneness aside, I think this is a reasonable Bill and it's the feeling of the Department of Administrative Services that this Bill would receive wide support among state agencies and it would also be supported by vendors who do business with the state. I think adoption of this Amendment would be consistent with good government. And I would request a few more green votes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester to explain his vote."
Winchester: "Well, I think the Representative explained it there.

It is an important Bill to the Department of Administrative
Services, it was caught in the deadline in Committee, it
wasn't able to get a hearing in Committee. Representative
Ebbesen, so graciously allowed us to offer the Amendment to
this Bill. It is something that the Department of
Administrative Services needs and I would ask for a
favorable Roll Call vote. As many green votes on this side
of the aisle as possible for this administration Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Well in explaining my vote, I am the Sponsor of the

Bill but I did agree to allow this Amendment and what

Representative Winchester said, is absolutely true. That

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the Bill....the Department Administrative Services and it didn't get a chance for a hearing based on the circumstances and I would certainly would appreciate if some of those red votes would go back over to green and allow this become a part of this Bill because it is good legislation."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I sponsored legislation earlier this Session to do basically the same thing for school districts and community college districts. With the change in the value of the dollar and the length of time which has expired since we set these levels. It only seems to me to be

consistant with intent of the original legislation to keep these numbers moving so that they are relatively to what everything cost. And I would encourage an "aye" vote on this on both sides of the aisle. This is good government."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman to explain his vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman requests, the Gentleman Representative Findley requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Topinka."
- Topinka: "Yes...yes. Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my vote please if I may, from 'no' to 'yes'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Topinka from 'aye'. Representative Everett Steele. 'aye'. Representative Leon, 'no'. Representative Van Duyne, 'no'. Representative Peters, 'aye'. Representative Huskey, from 'ave'. 'aye'. to Representative Klemm, Representative Reilly, 'aye'. What's the count? On this Amendment there are 80 'ayes', 74 'no'. This Amendment having received the necessary votes, it's hereby declared adopted. Further Amendments?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

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

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

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 423 changes the process by which annual and biannual reports are submitted by the Department, Directors and Secretary of Transportation. Amendment provides that all such reports shall be drafted, submitted upon the Governor's specific request. The attempt of this Amendment is to reduce cost by eliminating printing reports which are deflective of unnecessary. Right now, I can, speaking for myself, I received about three feet of reports, well I have since the beginning of the Session that I will never read. provides only that those reports be printed that are requested by the Governor or are mandated within the Constitution. I would request a favorable vote on this

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Being none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "This Bill will be returned to Second Reading,
First Legislative Day. Senate Bill 1201. Read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk. Representative Tuerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1201, this Bill was read a second time previously and held on Second Reading. Floor Amendment #3, Tuerk."

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

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to withdraw that Amendment #3 and I have..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn."

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- Tuerk: "...Amendment #4 coming. And I will be filing that,
  I.....hold it on Second...yeah just hold it on Second
  and..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdraw Amendment \$3, hold the Bill on Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 17, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 17, 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?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative
  Cullerton."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, motion to table
  Amendment #1. Representative Cullerton, Gentleman on the
  floor? Representative Deuster."
- Deuster: "I would move that that motion lie on the table."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves the motion to table lie upon the table. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion to table lies upon the table. Further Amendments? Further motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further motions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 was tabled, 3 was withdrawn, floor
  Amendment#4, Ewing. Amends Senate Bill 17 as amended...."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing, Amendment #4."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would hope that everybody would pay close attention to this because Amendment #4 if adopted will put this Bill into shape as a tax limitation measure for the next two years. It's a two year property tax limitation on levies for the tax year 1981 and 1982, for taxes payable in 1982 and '83. Now this levy has been designed to serve our taxpayer

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

constituents and yet not injure local government. It is a two year limitation of 13% plus growth within the taxing district. For instance, the 1981 levy paid in '82, 7% growth plus growth of up to 3% or a 10% could have a maximum. This would allow you then to have a growth in your levy in the second year of 6% with again the average growth rate of 3% or 9% and a total over the two year period of 19%. There are a number of different situations that are not covered by this limitation. You can extend high....you can have higher taxes and the limitation can be held in advance, if by referendum held after January 1, Property tax is extended for debt service on indebtedness is not limited by this measure. Levies for least obligations under the Public Building Commission Act are excluded. Levy's for the first year of new districts created by referendum, increase in levies which do not result in the tax rate increase because they are off set by increase in tax based resulting from construction, improvements or annexation. This is the 3% average that I was taking about earlier. Levy's to pay on judgments and settlements, levies paying interest and principle on notes levies to pay refunding bonds. This Amendment also excludes homerule units. I would be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that question, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

McPike: "I wonder if...Rich Brummer, could you sit down please.

There are....there are approximately fifteen towns in
Illinois....Mr. Speaker, could I have a little bit of quiet
here?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has requested order. Would all the people between Representative McPike and Representative Ewing, in the center aisle, please remove themselves."

McPike: "Tom, after the new census, I understand that there are approximately fifteen towns in Illinois that prior to the census were under five thousand population and after the census were over five thousand population. This means that for the first time in the history of these towns they will come underneath the Illinois Fire and Police Pension Act.

And they will have to levy accordingly. For example, Chatham, Illinois last year had a total levy of fifty-five thousand dollars and this coming year they will have to levy for an excess of that just to cover police pensions alone. This is manatory under law. Since you've put on a artifical 7% limit on their extention, how could they pay for their police and fire...police and fire pensions?"

Ewing: "It could be done by referendum."

McPike: "Well, what if the referendum failed, how could they comply with law?"

Ewing: "Well...I'm questioning how...you saying that they come under this now, you know we have...when do they owe their first payment, Representative? On this police and fire pension, is it retroactive?"

McPike: "No, it's once they exceed population of five thousand which the new census indicates that they now have exceeded.

Ewing: "What was the effective date of that?"

McPike: "I don't know the effective date off hand."

Ewing: "Well, maybe they have a period down the road to meet that obligation then."

McPike: "Let me present a second example to you then. There are numerous taxing districts in Illinois, for example there is one here in Springfield which levies a tax for fire protection purposes. They have no fire department, they'd

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

have no fire equipment, they contract with the City of Springfield. Given the fact that we'll probably have a 10 to 12% inflation this year and if the City of Springfield increases their contract price by 12% and you put an auto fiscal limit on at 7%. How is this fire protection district supposed to provide fire protection for its residents?"

Ewing: "I think Representative, that with your example you're missing the point. Maybe you didn't go home over the weekend but I did and my people got their tax bills. And the purpose of this Amendment is to limit taxes, not to feed inflation and labor rates at 10 or 12 or 13%. We're not even running on inflation now, it's just about 10% at the maximum. I would think that it would be ridiclous to increase fireman's salaries by 13%."

McPike: "Did you say that you eliminated a homerule unit from this?"

Ewing: "Yes we did."

McPike: "You eliminated the City of Chicago and the eighty-five or ninety other municipalities of Illinois from this that are homerule units?"

Ewing: "Yes, now that doesn't..."

McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

McPike: "Alright. Here we have an example, of state government trying to tell local government that we know how to run their affairs better than they do. But we're not going to tell that to the big cities in Illinois, we're not going to tell that to Rockford or Springfield or Peoria or Decatur or Champaign, Urbana or Chicago. We're going to tell it to all the small towns in the other taxing districts in Illinois, to sum of six thousand municipalities, park

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

districts, school districts, that we in the State Capitol, we sitting here on the House floor are a lot closer to the elected....we are a lot closer to those people who elect local officials than they are. We're going to tell someone that's running a park district or a fire district or we're going to tell the school board that we know more about their affairs than they do. We're going to tell them that they may have more students to educate but, in fact they may have more teachers to pay but we really don't care where they have more students, more teachers or we really care what the rate of inflation is. artifically going to say that, no matter conditions are locally, we going to put a 7% cap on what you can levy. But regardless of what your bills regardless of what your responsibilities are, regardless of who elected you and who gave you those responsibilities. Regardless of how responsive you are to the electorate, how close you are to them. We think we know your business better than you do. We think that we have a right in the State of Illinois to tell you at the local level what can spend on libraries or what you can spend on fire protection or what you can spend on police protection what you can spend to educate your children. This is a....this is the State of Illinois taking away power local units of government. We don't have the courage to take away that power from people like the City of Chicago, we're going to pick on small units of local government all throughout the state. We don't have the courage to stand up against the large cities, we do have the courage to stand up against the small towns, the small fire districts, the park districts, the school boards in this state. We're going to tell them, regardless of what your expenses we're going to tie your hands we're going to prevent you

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

from delivering the services that you were elected to We're going to make sure you can't give your employees the pay raise that they need to match the rate of inflation. We're going to make sure that you can't provide the services that are necessary to....for the constituents that represented and elected you. We have no right to do this, we would say that it was an infringement that the Federal Government came to Illinois and said that we couldn't levy beyond 7% in our various departments. We. couldn't increase our road programs by 7%, we couldn't increase the mental health budget by 7%. We in the State of Illinois don't know how to run our business, but the Federal Government knows how to run it for us. We wouldn't tolerate that and the people at the local level should not have to tolerate this artificial lid placed on them by the State of Illinois. I think its a bad Amendment, I think its a bad concept, a bad idea and ask you to vote against it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. there every was a stupid proposal, this is it. homerule municipalities are the ones who are guilty, anyone, in...the over extention of taxes, the over taxation of the people. Yet, they're exempted under this Amendment. The non homerule communities though who are already limited by statute in just about everything they levy for, except pensions and there is no limitation on pensions, that's They're the ones we attempt now to put a mandated. limitation upon. The non homerule units of government are already at a disadvantage with homerule, they're not competitive because of the fact that they đo have limitations on their taxing ability while non...homerule units have none. At a time when the Federal Government is

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

cut back to a point where this state is already considering passing additional tax upon the taxpayer, we have the same situation, the same problem in local government. the grants are withdrawn, many of the money is no longer available and so local government has to finance the worthwhile programs themselves and yet you say, put a tax limitation on them so they can't do it. This is ridiculous. Ι would urge you to vote against the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you a Gentleman who you all know very well, former State Representative a former Senator and now the Alderman of the 44th Ward, John Merlo."

Speaker Daniels: "Welcome Alterman Merlo. Representative
Brunner."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Tom, could you explain briefy again, I know you've gone through this, what the limitation is without the exceptions. Is it a straight 107% the first year and a total of 113% the second year are was there....you mention something about 3%?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "That's the average for new growth, Rich. So, if you have more growth you would get it...."

Brummer: "Well, by new growth you're referring to annexation and new construction?"

Ewing: "It's...the first year a maximum growth of 7% plus new growth, a new access valuation. Second year, it's 13% minus whatever you used the first year, if you use the 7, then you've got 6 left. If you use 5, you would have 8

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

left."

Brummer: "You don't take off the new growth though, the second year?"

Ewing: "No."

- Brummer: "Okay. With regard to new growth. I see you refer to annexation or as a result of construction of new improvements. Now, if there is an undeveloped forty acre field that had been farmed, the prior year and then is suddenly developed plated, streets are put in, inplated into lots. Does that come within the definition of new improvements as long as there are no building on there?"
- Ewing: "I'm advised that it would probably depend on if the assessor gets it picked up and differentiates between the farm land value and the improved value. And if it is done by the assessor in that case then there is a chance that it would be new growth."
- Brummer: "A final question, and this change really offends me although it's realative minor, I suppose. I see you've changed the payment date for the first installment of taxes from the first day of June, to my birthday, which happens to be the 5th day of June. Now, why did you want to change the first installment of taxes to my birthday?"
- Ewing: "This was in an effort to help those people who get social security checks who don't have them on the first of the month and would have them by your birthday."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Hoffman." Hoffman: "Thank you, very much. Would the Sponsor yield to a

question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Was there any particular reason why you chose to limit
the tax extentions rather than limit the growth and assess
valuation?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Ewing: "When you have the assess valuations can be adjusted upward by the assessing officials. Extentions of course, you are not subject to inflationary growth either and if you're going to limit taxes then you've got to limit extentions, you can't do it with assess valuation."

Hoffman: "But the fact of the matter is, that by exempting homerule units, as Representative Bluthardt, pointed out. You are not limiting the worse offenders, if you want to call them that, of increased extentions. In fact, I think that studies would indicate that the greatest growth in tax extention has been by homerule units. If you were to take the assess valuation and limit its growth, would it not have the same effect on the individuals tax bill and would have in fact, if you applied it universally, also have an impact on homerule units?"

Ewing: "Well, it could possibly have the same effect on tax bills depending on how you limited. But it would definitely be temporary, the real....what we believe is the best way to see that you really have a limitation is to limit the amount they can collect, the extentions. Then they have the local assessors may have chance to work on assessments and get them into order while we hold the amount of taxes down."

Hoffman: "Is this not a temporary measure in that it is a two
year limitation?"

Ewing: "That would be temporary, yes."

Hoffman: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Hoffman: "I would like to address the Bill and I would just like amplify a couple of points which have been made. Number one..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley for what purpose do you

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

rise, Sir?"

Bradley: "I hate to interrupt the Gentleman but, let's don't debate the Bill, let's abate the Amendment. We'll debate the Bill on Third Reading. Is that, Okay?"

Speaker Daniels: "I think we understand, the Gentleman is referring to the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Okay ... "

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Bradley: "The Amendment on homerule, I think .... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, to the Amendment, Sir." Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. the edification of the previous Member who spoke it's my understanding that, for all practical purposes this Amendment is the Bill. And let me address one of the aspects of this Amendment and that is, the fact that we exempted from the Bill homerule units. I will not use the same terms used by the previous speaker but I think we are being, at best, somewhat surreptitious in our honesty when we suggest that this Property Tax Extention Bill is going to have any kind of universal application. If we exempt all the homerule units you're going to find some Legislator, such as my self, placed in the position of where this is applicable to some of our constituents and not applicable to others. I don't think we should be put in that particular position. Also, it seems to me that one of quickest ways to get at the increase in the tax rate extention is to address the question of the assessed valuation. By merely moving back one year, the three years that we use in the sales ratios study would have the effect of holding assessments of where they are at the present I believe that this merely complicates the and for that reason, I must oppose this procedures Amendment."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek."

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

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

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put.' All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye' opposed 'no'. The
main question is put. The Gentleman, Representative Ewing
to close."

Ewing: "Yes. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I indicated before, this is an extremely important Amendment. decision should be made about property tax limitations this year, locally property tax limitation. There has been talk about why we excluded homerule. I think many of you know, that of course a Bill that covers homerule takes a 107 votes. But even beyond the political reality of that, we have not limited the power of homerule units to tax. Therefore, we're not trying to limit them with this Amendment. But I would indicate to you when talking about who's close to the people and who's reading the people, refer back to Governor Thompson's tax referendum. And 80% of the people said, they wanted limitation on real estate Most of you now are receiving some talk, some calls, some complaints from your constituents who are receiving their tax bills. Tax bills are going up and they are going up a lot faster than this limitation Bill would allow. And yet, any of us who realistically approach it, how can we expect our taxpayers to pay more than 13% over the next two years or with the average growth and many the units of local government will have more than that, 19% growth in taxes. Enough is enough. We should act now to limit taxes for our constituents, this is the best way we've devised and I would certainly encourage a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Ewing has moved

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

for the adoption of Amendment #4. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted.' All those in favor will signfy by voting 'aye' opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is opened. The Gentleman, Representative Bowman to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."

- Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just point out that no school district, no matter how large it is, is a homerule unit. And so, although the Sponsor of this particular Amendment attempted to gain additional votes for his proposal by exempting homerule units, I wanted to point out that school districts are still in the Bill. Every school district in this state, Chicago, Rockford, Springfield, everyone of them are still in the Bill as a result of this Amendment. I urge a 'no' vote."

  Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Deuster to
- Deuster: "This is....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Amendment, this is what our people have been asking us to do. It's reasonable and fair. If any local units of government or schools have particular problems, they can always go to the people with a referendum. This is pretty flexable, I would urge more 'aye' votes."

explain his vote. The timer is on."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Pierce to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Pierce: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment, the next Amendment which would include homerule units. The only reason for not including homerule units in this Amendment is that it is really political cowardice. They are the ones who are not limited and they are the ones that if tax limitation mean anything, should be in the Bill. I might point out that this Bill is opposed by 'ed read' because it knocks out all referendum approved by the voters up to

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

January 1, \*82, calling for an increase in taxes. They're gone to the voters, they secured a referendum, they haven't levied up to the maximum because they are responsible and now this Amendment would knock out that right. Any tax limitation Bill should acknowledge prior...should acknowledge prior limitations, prior referendum in which the voters have authorized increases and in which the tax embodied..."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 70 'aye', 92 'nay', 3 voting 'present'.

  The Amendment fails. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$5, Pierce..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pierce, Amendment #5. Excuse

  me, Representative Denster for what purpose do you rise,

  Sir."
- Deuster: "Yes, as Sponsor of this Bill, at this time I request
  that the Bill be taken out of the record and held on the
  Order of Second Reading where it is."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Representative Pierce."
- Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was recognized on my Amendment, that was your order of business and I don't know if a Sponsor can pop up in the middle of someone's Amendment..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pierce, it is his Bill, it's under his control, it was taken out of the record. You will be able to call your Amendment when he brings it up. Senate Bill 59, Representative Lechowicz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 59, a Bill for an Act making certain revisions in the law relating to certain forest preserve districts. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

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

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

- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the What this Bill does is to remedy a fatal oversight House. in current statutory construction. What the Amendment will do is provide for the language for a referendum in the event that there is a unilateral effort and annexation of new territory into the forest preserve district. This will give the voters of the district, proposed to be annexed, the opportunity to vote on whether or not they wish to be It will...sits out the boiler plate language required for the referendum for putting the question on the ballot and it sets up at least a one year period of repose during which time there can be no further submission of the question. So that there can not repetitive effort to put such a referendum on the ballot during the course of a year. It's a good Amendment for the people, it gives people a chance to vote, it gives the ... it provides for proper statutory constuction and it provides for the period of repose. I would urge adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment
  #1. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
  Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I question the germaneness of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Amendment is germane, Sir. On the Amendment, Representative Lechovicz."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Then I will have to oppose this Senate Amendment#1 to Senate Bill 59...House Amendment #1, offered by Representative Vinson. Because really the intent and purpose of Senate Bill 59 is to validate certain appropriation and tax levy ordinances of forest preserve

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

district for the area of Cook County. To include fiscal year 1979 and to establish and...were presently now we have and actually we're asking for an a working cash fund increase in the working cash fund. What this Amendment does, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it totally emasculates the Bill and provides the referendum provision if and when a territory is to be annexed to the forest preserve district. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, normally if a territory wants to be annexed in to a forest preserve district, what they will do is, they ll come in and petition the County Board where they membership of both parties to listen to the plea and ask whether they want to be next to the county and their property brought into the forest perserve district. This Amendment is totally inappropriate to Senate Bill 59 and should be defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that the Gentleman offering this Amendment is indeed offering the people of Illinois an opportunity to have some say in their fate under the law. And this Amendment is perfectly proper and just and ought to be It gives people the opportunity to vote by adopted. referendum whether the will be annexed to an area or not. So, that the majority of voters in that area would determine whether they area is being annexed to a forest preserve district or whether the County Board would be taking in that forest preserve district on its own. this Amendment is not adopted, the people will be robbed of their opportunity to have a say in their own destiny. It is certainly an Amendment that fosters democracy and I believe that it should definitely adopted. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson to close."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would solicit your 'aye' vote on this Amendment.

  The Amendment converts the Bill from a Bill to validate illegal activities into a Bill for citizen democracy. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Roll Call? The Gentleman, Representative Lechowicz, requests a Roll Call on this Amendment. Sir. Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not only do I request a Roll

  Call but I totally resent the Gentleman's remarks in

  reference to what's contained in this Bill as it is

  presently before this House."
- Speaker Daniels: "On the Roll Call, Sir. On the Amendment. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Lechowicz to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that if a Bill is before this Body, it should be debated upon its merits. I totally resent the Gentleman's remarks as far as what the intent of Senate Bill 59 is, and what his Amendment supposedly do. All it really does, it guts the Bill and provides for a provision that the Gentleman might be sightly interested in. But in all reality, it's a terrible Amendment and it should be defeated."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Vinson to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Vinson: "Well, I certainly would not wish to offend

# 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Representative Lechowicz. And I had no doubt but what his intention are honorable. But the in point of fact that it is precisely what the Bill, by its own language would do. And what this does is to simply substitute a provision for citizen democracy in the event of annexations. And I would please...I would urgently request an "aye" vote on the Bill."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Zito to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Zito: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Not only is the Amendment an attempt to gut the Bill, the Amendment provides for voters to say whether or not they would like to be annexed. No where in the Amendment does it allow for an industrial area, with no voters to be considered. So an municipality or any area, any government that would like to annex would be unable to do so because the lack of voters. For those reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would request a poll of the absentees."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Alexander. Bowman.
  Brummer. Donovan. John Dunn..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Griffin. Record the Gentleman as 'aye', Representative Griffin. Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Virginia Frederick. Garmisa. Huff. Jackson..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Virginia Frederick as 'aye'. Representative...okay, proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Margalus. McBroom. Pouncey. Redmond.

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- Sandquist. Schraeder and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pouncey. Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Bowman. Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I require...request a verification of the Negative Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentlemen has request a verification of the Negative Roll. Proceed with the verification, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty.

  Bluthardt. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock.

  Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Chapman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, Representative Jaffe asks leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Leave is granted, Sir. Only those people that must leave the chambers. Representative Ewell. Representative Ewell asks leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Representative O'Brien for what purpose do you rise, Sir."
- O'Brien: "To go to the Senate."
- Speaker Daniels: "To go to the Senate. Okay, you can go.

  Representative O'Brien asks leave to be verified. Leave is
  granted. Proceed. Representative McBroom."
- McBroom: "Record me 'aye', please."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative McBroom as 'aye'.

  Proceed with a Poll of the Negative Roll."
- O'Brien: "Christensen. Clerk Cullerton. Currie. Domico. Doyle. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. DiPrima. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane\_ Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Madigan. Lechovicz. Martire. McAuliffe. McClain. Matijevich. Mautino. McGrew. McMaster. McPike."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Mr. Loftis. The Gentleman up in the gallery, Mr. Loftis, is one of the few Democrats of DuPage County and we always like to see your face in Springfield on occasion. Mr. Loftis. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Connell. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Margaret Smith. Stearney. Steczo. Slape. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Topinka. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Zito."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What's the count that we're starting with?"

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk. 77 'aye', 88 'no'."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "I would just like to be verified, please."

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

Verify, Representative Getty. Getty, leave is granted.

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun. Is the Lady in the chambers, Representative Braun? She's in the center aisle."

Vinson: "Representative Currie."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie. In her chair."

Vinson: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow. Representative Darrow.

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Farley."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Farley. Right here on my right."

Vinson: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hanahan. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski is in his chair."

Vinson: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Krska is in his chair."

Vinson: "Representative Levin."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin, standing up there.

Representative Capparelli is discussing strategy with his

catcher, Representative Chapman, for the baseball game."

Vinson: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew. Representative McGrew, is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Ozella."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ozella. The Gentleman is in the rear of the chambers."

Vinson: "Representative Preston."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Preston. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea. The Gentleman is in his seat. Return Representative Darrow to the negative roll."

68th Legislative Day June 22, 1981

Vinson: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Richmond is in his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Margaret Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Margaret Smith, in her seat."

Vinson: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Remove him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle. Representative Stuffle, is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Return Steczo to the roll, remove Representative Stuffle."

Vinson: "Representative...."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle has returned, return him to the negative roll. Further questions, Sir?"

Vinson: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner, he is in the back."

Vinson: "Representative Yourell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Mc...Representative Abramson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson. The Gentleman's over

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

here on your left...or your right, my left."

Vinson: "Representative Martire."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Martire. In the rear."

Vinson: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Slape. Over here in his chair."

Vinson: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain. Representative McClain, is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentlemen recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Return Representative McClain to the roll. On this question there are 77 'aye', 83 'no'. The Amendment having failed to receive the necessary votes it is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1201.

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1201, this Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor? No floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 60, Representative Krska. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 60, a Bill for an Act to legalize and validate appropriation Bills and tax levy ordinances of certain counties, and to make legal and valid the levy of taxes thereunder. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, Amendment #1.

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 would correct one minor problem in Senate Bill 60. Senate Bill 60 is a validation ordinance for the county, for Cook County. Amendment would do, would be to preserve the right of a taxpayer to protest his taxes when he believes there is an error in computing his property tax bill. It would in effect, validate neglect errors, nuisance objections and so But it would not rob the citizen of his right to protest a fundamental error in the tax bill. I believe it is an Amendment which achieves the fundamental purpose of tax validation but which does not, in the process, justify total violations of the law. A number of mistakes could occur in a tax process which I don't believe this Body would actually seek and want to validate. For example, tax ordinances, revenue ordinances entered in violation of the meetings act, could be validated by this kind of....validation Bill as it stands now. However, you could not validate that kind of an error or of an illegality with the Amendment on 'House Bill' 60. It's an Amendment which would substantially correct the purpose and go at the real cause for validation. Nuisance objections would still be...would still be validated but nothing that went to fundamental illegality would be validated if this Amendment I would urge adoption of the Amendment." is adopted.

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

Krska: "I oppose Amendment 1 to House...Senate Bill 60. What House....Senate Bill 59 does for the forest preserves, Senate Bill 60 does for the Cook County Commissioners and

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

in no way does it prohibit the taxpayer from protesting a tax levy. They actually have three means, they can either go to the Cook County Assessor, to the Board of Tax Appeals or if those two don't work they can go directly to the Circuit Court. And, therefore, I oppose the Amendment and would recommend a 'no' vote on Amendment 1, to Senate Bill 60."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Vinson to close."

Vinson: "I would solicit an 'aye' vote for this Amendment which

will serve the fundamental purpose of validation

ordinances. Which will deny total illegality in the taxing

process. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."

Johnson: "Why I don't need a minute to explain this. If you want to vote with Representative Krska in favor of illegal should vote 'no'. If you believe you government process has some integrity and that the processes that we set up for the taxation process ought to be validated rather than come back here every year with these silly Amendments to invalidate illegal practices, then you ought to vote 'yes'. And I urge a 'yes' vote on Representative Vinson's Amendment. Terrible. terrible Amendment, Representative Krska, should be ashamed of himself for even bringing this before us. This Bill before us is an insult to everybody in this chamber. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Clerk will

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

take the record. On this motion....Amendment there are 75 'ayes', 89 'no', the Amendment having failed to receive the necessary votes is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 62, Representative Stewart. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill,

Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted previously."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amend....any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 was tabled. Floor Amendment #4, Schneider, amends Senate Bill 62...."

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

Schneider: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #4 comes at the request of one of the Members who
felt that the requirement of marriage in order to reduce
time for taking....the age for taking GED was a violation
of the equal protection question or clause. Therefore, we
deleted that and leave the reduced age to the person who is
a mother or father of one or more children. I would move
its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Currie. Amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, floor Amendment #5."
Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- Amendment #5 corrects a technical problem the Department of Public Aid discovered in Amendment #2 which was earlier adopted...earlier adopted to this Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall...Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the proposer Amendment 5..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie indicates that she'll yield."
- Hoffman: "Indicate the reason for deleting the last two sentences in the subject section."
- Currie: "Yes. The reason, it was a proposal of the Department of They felt that there were problems with the Public Aid. last two sentences, they were not necessary in terms of establishing the intention of Amendment #2. And the drafting of those two sentences made possible the requirement for the Department Public Aid pick up financial responsibility for the entire program which was anybody's intention."
- Hoffman: "Is this an amendable..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Hoffman. Please have your attention. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Is this Amendment acceptable to the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative?"
- Currie: "The Sponsor of whom?"
- Hoffman: "By ... thank you, very much."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "It is a technical Amendment and it has the support of the Department of Public Aid, the State Board of Education and the Sponsor of the Bill and I would urge its adoption." Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves for the adotpion of Amendment

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

#5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed
'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment #5 is adopted.
Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Giglio-Steczo..."

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

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #6 does, it authorizes the School Boards of the elementary or high school districts to increase their annual tax levy for education purposes from a maximum rate of ninety-two cents to a dollar fifty and from twenty-five cents to forty cents for the operations, building and maintenance purposes. The purpose of the Amendment and what we're trying to do here, we've got a school district in my district that hasn't had a raise in their educational fund for over twenty-five years. And it pertains to this one that's....it permissive for the others if they want but we're trying to help this school district out. They haven't had any state money to help them and they haven't been able to pass a referendum to increase that spending for the education of those children in that one particular district."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. On that motion, Representative Ewing, the Gentleman from Livingston."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Giglio: "I'll try."

Ewing: "You say this increases the tax rate for...in the education fund?"

Giglio: "Right."

Ewing: "And what was the other fund?"

Giglio: "The operation..."

Ewing: "Operation."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Giglio: "Operations."

Ewing: "Right. Is this for unit or duel district?"

Giglio: "Well, it's primarily for this one district but I consider it duel district."

Ewing: "It would effect all duel districts, would it effect unit districts?"

Giglio: "No."

Ewing: "So, it only effect...duel district, I mean, duel districts."

Giglio: "Right."

Ewing: "What is the percentage increase?"

Giglio: "The percentage goes from a...from ninety-two to a dollar fifty, so you're talking fifty-eight cents."

Ewing: "All right. The district that you're trying to help,

Representative, have they had any referendums to increase
their tax rate?"

Giglio: "Oh, God, they've had, last year they had three the year before they had two. Truthfully what it is, it's a district that has become a district of homes and people that have moved on and still own the property and there's a lot of people that live in the district that are elderly. And the property owners have scared these people that if they get another...if they vote for a referendum that they are going to raise their rents. It's been more of a scare tactic and these children within that district and you can understand that over twenty-five years without an increase in that school funding, imagine what kind of school district that they have. With the rate of inflation and everything else that has gone up and you haven't raised that tax in twenty-five years. You can imagine where it's at."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Stewart for what purpose do you rise?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would question the The germaneness of this Amendment. Speaker....the Sponsor's did not consult with me, I....this particular Bill is directly aimed at the problem of pregnancies in the school. I don't want to confuse anti....I don't want to confuse the purpose of this Bill with any tax problems and I would ask for a ruling of germaneness from the Chair. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The ruling of the Chair is, the Amendment is germane. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes. I would like to speak to this Amendment but I'd ask one more question of the Sponsor."

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

Ewing: "Is there any referendum provision in regard to this increase in school taxation power?"

Giglio: "Excuse me. No."

Ewing: "So, you're saying that they can increase their rate for education by 58% and operation by 15% with no referendum."

Giglio: "I'm sorry, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "That's alright, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everybody should listen to this Amendment. It is a tax increase for unit districts, for duel districts, does not effect unit districts. And it increases the right to raise property taxes by 58% for education and 15% for operation and there is no referendum. Any of you who are concerned about your local real estate taxes should look at this very closely. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Hearing none. Excuse me, the Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Respectfully I request a 'no' vote on this Amendment. It aborts the original purpose of this Bill, it works against the intentions this Bill...the intentions of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

this Bill is to address a very serious problem of teenage pregnancy and how that effects the schools and the education of these young mothers...of these young parents. I would suggest that this Amendment would do nothing other than kill the Bill, I did not intend to get into a fight of whether or not we should increase the taxes, therefore, I ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

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

Giglio: "Go ahead."

Robbins: "In raising this Amend....in this Amendment raising the educational purposes from a ninety-two cent levy to a dollar and a half levy. What effect does this have on your state aid formula? Will the minimum levy be required to be a dollar and a half by this action?"

Giglio: "It would qualify them for the state aid formula and it keeps them in that range. For the first time."

Robbins: "To qualify for the state aid formula would be what?"

Giglio: "It would qualify the district to receive the state aid because their schedule, it was brought up to the minimum what the state requires."

Robbins: "In other....what is the minimum the state requires now?"

Giglio: "A dollar and a half. See, and we're down to ninety-two and we haven't been able to increase it through referendum and we're asking that it be put on so we don't have another referendum and...that the School Board will have enough money to qualify for the state aid formula."

Robbins: "When was it raised from ninety-two to a dollar and a half? To qualify."

Giglio: "Do you mean, when was it put on the books of the State of Illinois to a dollar and a half?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Robbins: "Yeah."

Giglio: "I think it goes back to the 50 s."

Robbins: "I would like to speak to the Bill then."

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

Robbins: "On this Amendment, if it increases the state aid require minimum taxing levy from ninety-two cents to a dollar and a half in qualifying for the state aid formula. This is a mandatory, local tax increase and I think the Amendment should be defeated and if the Amendment does go on the bill, I will ask for a fiscal note be filed because of the amount. This is a mandate, direct mandate. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio to close."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, if it is appropriate, I would like to yield to my cosponsor, Representative Steczo."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 62 was introduced at the request of the school officials in School District 156 in Calumet City. As a Member of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, last Session these same officials came to us to tell us of their plight of having twenty-five referendums or more since 1955, not having had an opportunity to pass any of them. Having constant rejection by the voters in their particular districts, has really put them in a very untendable situation. At the present time, with their current rate of ninety-two cents this district loses thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars in state aid money. And they only seek to reach the qualifying so they can receive state aid funds. And I would hazard to guess to say, that if all the money that spent on referendum in this district were to be used for

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

educational purposes, this Bill would probably wouldn't be necessary in the first place. So this Amendment probably wouldn't be necessary. As far as we can tell, it effects only one school district in the State of Illinois and I would ask for an affirmative vote on Amendment #6."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'no's' have it, Amendment #6 fails.

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 68, Representative McCornick. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 68, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act authorizing the public hospital...a public hospital to levy taxes and issue bonds therefor. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig, Amendment #2.

Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I ask to withdraw Amendment 2 to 7..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2, withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
Hannig: "2 through 7, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and7, are all Sponsored by Representative Hannig. All are withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, McMaster."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster, Amendment #8."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw Amendment #8 and go with Amendment #9."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #8 is withdrawn. Further Amendments,
Mr. Clerk?"

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

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster, Floor Amendment #9."
- McMaster: "Amendment #9 is a technical correction that puts in language in the proper place with the proper line numbering and I would move to adopt Amendment #9."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has move the adoption of Amendment #9. Is there any discussion? Being none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 88. Representative Beatty. Out of the record. Senate Bill 89. Representative Kornowicz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 115. Representative Greiman. Is the Gentleman on the floor, Representative Greiman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 137. Representative Bullock. Read the Bill, Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 137, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no
  Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Representative McBroom-Bullock and Leon."

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

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1 has been requested by the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts Companies. I will explain the Amendment but before doing that, I want to point out to the Members that I have cleared the Amendment with the Minority Spokesman on Pinancial Institutions, Representative Leon and the Sponsor

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

of the Bill, Representative Bullock. What the Amendment does, Mr. Speaker, provides for a supervisory examinations of bank holding companies, provides for written consent for bank facility home offices, indemnification of bank directors and so on. I will be glad to respond to any questions, otherwise, I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McBroom-Bullock and Leon."

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

McBroom: "Just a minute. Mr. Speaker..."

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

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is, Amendment #1 and Amendment #2 are substantially the same. There is a slight difference, I know what the difference is, I would like to move to table #1 and urge the adoption of..."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' 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 89, Representative Kornowicz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 89, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 89 says that an employee can continue his group insurance program after leaving the employee...of the employer. What the Amendment says is, if the employer offers a not for profit health service plan and the plan shall not be required to offer catastrophic insurance, major mental benefits or comprehensive medical expense benefits."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Representative Cullerton, as I read this Amendment, it looks to me as though you are seeking to exclude, Blue Cross, Blue Shield from this law. Is that true?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Any non for profit service plan."

Schuneman: "Which would include then, Blue Cross, Blue Shield."

Cullerton: "That's correct."

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

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Schuneman: "Or, to the Amendment. Senate Bill 89 was a Bill which was agreed upon by the insurance industry. Those companies that are writing group, health and accident insurance in this state. And many of the Members of this Legislature who have been trying to see to it that, when people are terminated from their jobs that they can continue their group insurance. And this Bill had agreement as it passed through the Senate, it was passed

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

out of the House Insurance Committee, now that it hits the floor of the House, Amendment #1 would seek to exclude from that agreement one of the largest writers of group insurance in the State of Illinois. That being Blue Cross and Blue Shield. Now if we're going to exclude one of the largest groups writing insurance then I don't think we ought to pass the Bill. My recommendation to the Members of the House is that we reject this Amendment and reject all other Amendments to Representative Kornowicz Bill and pass it out as it was originally intended."

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

Bowman: "A question of the Sponsor."

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

Bowman: "Representative Cullerton, will you withdraw this

travesty of an Amendment?"

Cullerton: "No."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Representative Cullerton refuses to withdraw. Bowman: "Since, Representative Schuneman and I who rarely agree on happen to be on the same side of this one. anything, It seems to me that the major health carrier in this state is, Blue Cross and if we exempt them from the provisions of this Bill then we have...we've gutted the Bill. This Amendment has the practical affect in my opinion of striking everything after the enacting clause. You might just as well strike the enacting clause, if this Amendment goes on it guts the Bill. There's no reason why Blue Cross should be treated any differently from any other health carrier just because they are the largest one. This is a terrible example of legislation that provides benefits to one and vertually, I believe the only such carrier in the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

state. I urge its defeat."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now you really have an unholy trio when you find, Schuneman, Bowman and Epton, all agreeing that our distinguish colleague for perhaps the first time in his career, has come up with a rather, shall we say, inept, innocuous, inefficient, irreparable, insignificant...no, it's significant. In other words, the Bill is quiet a stinker. And I would suggest that those of you who love the Representative as much as I do, help him from making this fatal mistake and defeat this Amendment. Which really, he doesn't have his heart in."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Stearney, who is that standing on your right?"

Stearney: "My number two son."

Speaker Daniels: "What's his name?"

Stearney: "Same as the Representative from the 20th District."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Ron Stearney, welcome to Springfield.

Raise your hand so we can all see it. The Gentleman indicates he will yield, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Considering everybody has said this Amendment is so bad. Can you tell me again what it does."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Not until you...not until you tell your son to take that cigar out of his mouth."

Stearney: "He's practicing."

Cullerton: "It says, that if an employer offers an not for profit health service plan and plan the shall not be required to offer catastrophic insurance, major medical benefit or comprehensive medical expense benefits."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Stearney: "Well, do other carriers have to provide that same coverage?"

Cullerton: "If they're for profit as oppose to not for profit, they would."

Stearney: "Does Blue Cross operate at a loss?"

Cullerton: "That's what I've been told."

Stearney: "Well, I think that perhaps, Mr. Epton, Mr. Schuneman and Mr. Bowman might be correct. Thank you."

Cullerton: "Well, I think when they all agree then maybe there's something wrong."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Amendment."

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

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

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

Laurino: "Thank you much, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is actually House Bill 9 that did not receive enough votes in Committee but I believe it's a good Bill, its good...or good Amendment. It's got a good interest at heart, deals with the peoples lives of this State of Illinois. What it basically does, it mandates that people that drive an automobile must carry automobile insurance. In effect, it's a protection for everybody, not just us chosen few. Chosen few being those that are determined to be progressive comprehensive people that initiate that protection for other people on their It's not working in this state because of the inflationary period that we are running into now. Ιf can afford an automobile, if you can afford a gallon of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

gasoline at the cost of that particular product today and if you can afford to keep an automobile in proper repair. It's been determined by, I think its Hertz or Avis, or both companies that it costs approximately four thousand dollars a year to operate an automobile. Ιf vou drive approximately ten thousand miles a year. Now, if you can do that you can certainly afford a minimum amount of coverage that it takes to protect ourselves. What this Bills asks for is a Class A, misdemeanor, if you don't prescribe to the contents of the Bill. And in effect all we're asking for is fair play because right now, we are up the brunt of those people who are irresponsible and not taking out that insurance to cover us. And all I ask for is somebody be responsible. It not any privilege or it's not any right to drive an automobile but it privilege and that privilege should be paid for. believe the only solution is this particular Amendment on this Bill and I urge its adoption."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the I question the germaneness Parliamentarian. of this Bill...of this Amendment, excuse me. The Bill relates to health insurance, the Amendment relates to automobile insurance. The Bill amends Chapter 73 and 32, of the Illinois Insurance Code where as the Amendment deals with Chapter 95 and a half of the Vehicle Code."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before you make your ruling. I

don't know how you're going to rule but I do believe that

the Amendment deals with the same subject matter as the

Bill, which is insurance and is a common subject matter and

I believe it's germane."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Laurino, the ruling of the Chair is that the Amendment is non germane. The Bill itself applies to Chapter 30, to elevating the hardships of economic resession....Gentlemen. The Amendment that you have proposed amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, Chapter 95 and a half. Not only does the Amendment itself, totally out of line with the original Bill but it also amends a different Chapter and Section of the Illinois Revised Statutes. Representative Laurino."
- Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, it is still a common subject dealing with
  the common...with the Insurance Code and the insurance
  industry and I believe it is germane. I can't believe
  you've made a ruling like this and leaving irresponsible
  drivers on the road. I'm very disappointed in you."
- Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry that you are, Sir, but that is the ruling of the Chair. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Greiman. Amends Senate Bill 89 on page 1, by deleting line 23 through 27 and so forth." Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 89 is very dear and close to my heart, it is a Bill that I sponsored originally, it was passed and had a self distruct provision a few years back. Or part of The Bill itself provides that...that if a person terminated from their employment they may for six months insurance....their continue to have their own group insurance, if they pay If they pay the the premium. premium. Originally the Bills were filed that said, they will have the same benefits as well. This Bill, however, says that they will pay the same premium but will have less benefits. Amendment #3 merely says, that if they pay the group premium, the get the same benefits that the group had before. No less, no more. It seems to me

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

that it would be absured to require them to pay the same premium benefits level, which is what the Bill provides that they do and then instead have them get less...less in the benefits that they were getting under the group policy. that's what Amendment 3 does, I think it's a sound Amendment and I ask that you accept it."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside,
Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will yield."

Schuneman: "Representative, I heard what you said but as I read your Amendment, that's not what your Amendment says. Your Amendment said, talks about the employer giving notice to the insurance company but no where in the Amendment do I see anything that remotely resembles what you just said and what you told me in private conversations before and I'm sorry I didn't have a chance to get back to you and talk to you about it. I don't think your Amendment does what you just told the House that it does."

Greiman: "Yes, it does. Indeed it does. What it does is to take out lines 3 through 6 on page 2 of the Bill. That's one of the ... you know, it's by deletion it does that. It takes out those lines....if you look there on the Amendment at line 7 on page 2, it says, by deleting lines 1 through 14, now when you delete lines 1 through 14, you take out that section which allows the insurance carrier to reduce It says here for example, continuation need not benefits. include dental, vision care, etc. And so, what we done is to require them to continue with the same policy benefits. But we've done it by exclusion, I would be make it more specific but this does the job, I think. The notice provision, Cal, is just to make it clearer. That's an addition to it."

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

Schuneman: "Alright. May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Schuneman: "I see what you are referring to now, Representative and I agree with you and I disagree at the same time. First of all, what this Bill seeks to do. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is to provide group hospital and surgical and major medical benefits to employees who have been terminated. And to provide it for at least six months at the expense of the employee, so that people would not be left in the lerch without any group insurance. means of this Amendment the Representative seeks to broaden scope of what was agreed upon by the industry in which they did not agree to extend coverage for dental, vision care or prescription drug benefits. And the Gentleman's Amendment would seek to put that back in. One of the things that would be accomplished by this Amendment, is a requirement that a notice would be given to the insurance company by the employer when an employee is terminated. Now that seems a perfectly logical thing to do except for one fact. The largest group plans in the State of Illinois are not administrated by the insurance companies. administered by the employers themselves, and in many....in most of those instances in fact, the employ...the insurance company does not even have a list of the names of the employees neither is the employer required to give any immediate notice of employees being added or employees detract...deducted being from the plan. What the Gentleman's Amendment would do, in my opinion, is require considerable increase in the expense of handling the largest group insurance plans in the state. And I think we should reject the Amendment, put Representative Kornowicz Bill back in its original posture and past it out of here because it was a good Bill and had the agreement of all

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

parties."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, could I the question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates that he will yield."

Terzich: "On your Amendment, are you saying that the employer is
to offer all the same benefits that the employee had under
the group insurance plan?"

Greiman: "I'm Saying that the Bill requires him, Section 5, requires him to pay the premiums that were paid by the employer or...or by him when he was working in other words, the premium level is the same. If the premium level is the same then the benefit level should be the same. There being no greater risk or no greater problem. So, that's all the Amendment says and it says, give him what he is paying for."

Terzich: "Does that...you mean to say that if it's an employer such as the state plan where the employer is paying the entire cost of the employee premium, that they are to continue that for six months?"

Greiman: "The employee has to pay for that."

Terzich: "Well, then I'm saying, but does that include all of the benefits they have such as life insurance or...."

Greiman: "No, it includes the ones under this...under this one.

It includes the benefits under the health insurance policy.

Under a major medical coverage police and not under the...not under insurance policy or any other insurance policy, or income deversion or anything else. It's for major medical policy. That's what it's for."

Terzich: "No dental care or ... "

Greiman: "No, it's for whatever he had, whatever he had before he's entitled to now. That's all. Whatever medical coverage he had, he's entitled to now. He's paying the premium."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Terzich: "Well, what is your definition of medical coverage?"

Greiman: "Well, life insurance is not medical coverage. Medical coverage is medical coverage." Terzich: "Is dental medical coverage?"

Greiman: "My...."

Terzich: "Is dental benefits, medical coverage?"

Greiman: "Whatever was in the policy. I mean, they negotiated the policy, whatever was there."

Terzich: "Is this a Bill or the income medical coverage?"

Greiman: "Pardon."

Terzich: "Disability we claim dimity."

Greiman: "I wouldn't think so. I would think medical coverage is medical coverage. It's defined in the policy cause that's what they pay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich, to the Amendment."

Terzich: "Well, as Representative Schuneman mentioned, that the majority of the group policy holders in the state is not administered by the insurance company but rather by the employer itself. At the same time under many many circumstances they do not even ask you for your address or where you're located and because of being in transit and so forth. This I think is a very very bad Amendment and I don't think you would be doing the employee any service by having....having them make it compulsory that they have all the health benefits converted because of the cost would make it astronautical and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates that he will."

McPike: "You had deleted on page 1, lines 29 through 32 and the first 2 lines of the next page. If a...and it says here that any person who could be covered by another type of insurance then could not be covered by this. All veterans

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

for example are eligible for veterans benefits. And you're eligible veterans insurance benefits of some type. If this language is left in then would a discharged veteran be eligible under this law?"

Greiman: "I think certainly the insurance company would try to get out of coverage. I think there is a good chance they could argue that that's additional coverage, therefore, this Bill wouldn't apply."

McPike: "Are any other insurance plan any person may have, some people like to carry two insurance plans."

Greiman: "Maybe a person has a supplemental insurance program."

McPike: "Right."

Greiman: "Absolutely, he would be out."

McPike: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Or to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

McPike: "Senate Bill 89 has some faults and the Amendment #3 tries to correct those. The Bill itself says that, if your a veteran and if you're eligible for veterans benefits. insurance benefits, medical benefits, or if you happen to have a supplemental plan and...or discharged or laid-off and want to continue your policy. You could no longer do because it says that if your....the language right here clearly says, that if you're covered by any other insured or uninsured arrangement which provides hospital, surgical, medical coverage, etc., then you wouldn't be eligible. Furthermore, what the intent of the Bill is, is to say that, if you're discharged or laid-off and want to continue your medical coverage, you have to pay for the entire We're not trying to give somebody a free ride. We're saying that, you're now unemployed, you're faced and your family is faced with the same kind of risk that were before and that if you want to pay for the coverage that you had prior to leaving your job, you have to pay all

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the cost. But since you pay all the cost and since the risks are the same, you should be entitled to same benefits. If there were dental benefits or if there were eye care or prescription drug benefits under the policy and you paid for those as an employee and if you're willing to pay for those now as an unemployed person, you should be entitled to the same benefits that you had previously because you're willing to pay the same cost. The Amendment that we're talking about, Amendment #3 simply corrects those errors in the Bill and allows the employee who willing to pay the same cost, allows them to have the same benefits, allows them also if he has supplemental coverage, it still allows him to qualify for group coverage if he is still willing to pay the same amounts. I think it's a good Amendment and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlmen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. This Amendment is a modest proposal, it simply says that if a person has been laid off from a job that that individual will be able for limited period to continue the insurance that they....the health insurance that they have. Now what takes place without this kind of Amendment is, that the poor individual who is laid off receives a double whammy. First, he is laid off and his income stops and he has very little money left other than the unemployment compensation. At the same time in order to protect his family he must now go out in the market and purchase health insurance on a individual Now all of you know that that means the cost of insurance is going to increase by an enormous amount. that this Bill does is to say, that the individual who is being laid off will have an option for a while of able to continue, at his own expense, the insurance, paying

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the same amount of money that the employer has been paying to cover his insurance. Now the insurance company is really no worse off, they're getting the same thing from this fellow that they would have gotten from the employer. But from the point of view of the individual who has been laid off and his family or her family, it is really an enormous difference. It enables that person for the limited period of time in which they're unemployed, to able to continue their insurance. We have had this Bill before, serveral years ago in Illinois, it had a distruct provision and hence has expired. It worked very well during that period and I heard no complaints with This is a humane and sensible Bill, it helps regard to it. people who facing unemployment. It does not require the employer to pay the insurance premium. The individual pays that insurance premium, the insurance company gets the same amount of money from that individual that the insurance company would be getting from the employer. I urge the support of this Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 89."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the It is unfortunate that this should come up at this time in the form of an Amendment. The Sponsor of this Amendment and I discussed this almost three months ago. matter of fact, I introduced a Bill which was quite similar to this only to find out that the Sponsor of this Amendment had fostered this idea for several years. And I relinquished my Bill to him, adjusted him as the Sponsor and asked him to proceed accordingly. Matter of fact the Bill was put on our posting on three or four different Various members of the insurance industry occasions. wanted to discuss it with the Sponsor because the problem is not that the individual who is discharged cannot get

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

insurance, the problem is that he cannot afford a cadillac especially at a time when he is out of employment, when he is now faced with paying the premium himself which, heretofore, had been paid for by his employer almost in its entirety. Accordingly today, under our existing law and the laws which we recently passed, the assured the former insured, when his policy is terminated can convert but he can convert to a policy which he can afford. He can afford a ford or a chevrolet rather than a cadillac. In this case you're suggesting that a man or women who is now unemployed who has no source of income, who's premium was paid for by his employer can now pick up a policy which has all the features of a cadillac and pay the cadillac price. doesn't help him at all. As a matter of fact in most cases he's on unemployment insurance or welfare. What we try to do and what we have succeeded in doing to a great extent is proceeding with a policy which will adapt to the needs of the many. To suggest that an insurance company will not be harmed is a fallacy. Because first, they do not have the names and addresses of the individual and secondly, those people who will take advantage of it are those who are in the critical need, who are by far the poorest risk. think that if perhaps we had had the Bill that the Sponsor of this Amendment and I had discussed time and time again, we would have been able to pass it long long ago. Amendment does in no way solve the problem, it only complicates a good Bill and I would appreicate your voting \*no\* . "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kustra."

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

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

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

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

'ayes' have it, the main question is put. The Gentleman, Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. As to the last speaker, there might be validaty to what he said, if he had read the Bill. a... more than a casual eye. As far as paying for cadillac premiums and cadillac benefits, the Bill provides that he must pay the same premium, the same premium that they were paying under the group policy. It says in paragraph 5; an employee electing continuation must pay the amount of contribution required by the policy holder or employer and it's the group rate. Now what they do then, they is they reduce the benefits but they keep the rate at the same level, that's what the Bill does now. The Amendment merely says, if you're paying that group rate, you get the group benefits. As far as they're being poor risk, all they've done is been laid off...all they've done is lost their job. That doesn't make them a worse health risk. This is....this Bill is not a poor peoples Bill, this Bill is a middle class Bill. Some people care about continuing medical coverage for their family, not people who are necessarily on relief and welfare but people who have lost their job but aren't completely down and out and want to continue to pay the medical premiums for their family. it is minimal protection, sure the industry, we hear agrees to this Bill. Why in the hell shouldn't the industry agree with it, they're lowering the benefits and getting the same money. Why in the world wouldn't they agree to it, I would agree to it too, if I was in the insurance industry. Bill does equality, it says you can continue for six months if you get fired, to protect your family, at the same premium level, at the same benefit level. But you've got to pay the premiums for you to get the benefits and that's

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

all it does. It's a fair Amendment, it makes this Bill a very very thoughtful and correct Bill. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'no's' have it....Roll Call? Yes, Sir. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Younge, to explain your vote."
- Younge: "Thank you, I'm voting 'aye' Mr. Speaker. on this Amendment because in many instances people are told on Friday afternoon that they don't have a job on Monday morning. And in addition to losing their job they have also lost their insurance, their group insurance coverage. That's simply is not practical, it is not workable it is just terrible in a Democratic society. And at least we ought to give these people six months in which they can make some adjustment in reference to insurance on their on their spousces, on their families and on themselves. What we're saying is, that a fellow loses a job because of a plant closes and then you take his insurance away from him too, you leave his whole family out there unprotected. That certainly isn't fair, there's no justice OL equity about that. I think it is the responsibility of the General Assembly in that instance to step in and help people who cannot help themselves .... "
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Amendment there are 80 voting 'aye', 86 'nay', 1 'present'.

  The Gentleman request a poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Alexander.

  Garmisa. Jackson. Margalus. McBroom. Oblinger.

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Redmond. Stuffle. And Topinka."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Topinka, votes 'no'.

Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I would like to verify the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson requests leave to be verified. Does he have leave, Sir? Leave is granted.

Proceed with a Poll of the Negative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alstat. Barkhausen. Barnes. Barr.
Bell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Could I be verified?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you please change my vote from 'no' to 'yes'."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Boucek. Bower.
Bradley. Brummer. Capparelli. Collins. Conti. Daniels.
Deuchler. Deuster. Donovan. Jack Dunn. Ralph Dunn.
Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Findley. Virginia Frederick.
Dwight Friedrich. Griffin. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstom.
Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McBroom. Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Proceed, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Karpiel. Jim Kelley. Kociolko. Kustra. Leinenweber. Mays. McAuliffe. McCormick. McGrew. McMaster. Ted Meyer. R. J. Meyer. Miller. Neff. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Sandquist. Schuneman. Irv Smith. Margaret Smith.

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Stanley. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Swanstrom. Tate.

Telcser. Terzich. Topinka. Tuerk. Vinson. Vitek.

Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard.

Zwick and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Negative Roll. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I would like to know where we start..."

Speaker Daniels: "Could we please have some order. Members of the House will you please be in your seats and please have some order. Proceed, Sir."

Greiman: "Perhaps I could know where we're starting from? One should always know where they are starting from."

Speaker Daniels: "81 'aye', 87 'no'."

Greiman: "Okay. How about Representative Ackerman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ackerman is in his chair."

Greiman: "Okay. Representative Bell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bell, is in the rear."

Greiman: "Okay. Representative Bianco."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bianco, is in the rear."

Greiman: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley....Representative

Bradley, is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Greiman: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Capparelli, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Capparelli. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Greiman: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing, he's in his chair."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Greiman: "Oh, I see him now. Representative Findley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Findley, the Gentleman is right up front here, Sir."

Greiman: "Okay. Representative Grossi."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Grossi, is in his chair."

Greiman: "And, Representative Hallstrom?"

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

Greiman: "I see her now, yes. Okay. Representative Leon?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leon."

Greiman: "Oh, I'm sorry, he voted affirmative. Representative

McCornick, is he back there?"

Speaker Daniels: "McCormick, C. L. McCormick is in his chair."

Greiman: "Oh, there he is. Representative Martire?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Martire. Representative

Martire, is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative

Martire. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Greiman: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe. Roger McAuliffe.

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Greiman: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Daniels: "McGrew. Representative McGrew. How is the

Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Greiman: "Representative Polk?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk is in the rear."

Greiman: "Okay. Representative...is Representative Pullen

there?"

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Greiman: "Pullen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen, is in the rear by the men's washroom."

Greiman: "Well."

Speaker Daniels: "Well, you are aren't you. Proceed, Sir."

Greiman: "Well...Representative Jack Dunn?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Dunn, is standing up front."

Greiman: "Oh, his back is to me. Okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Martire has returned. Return him to the roll."

Greiman: "Representative J. J. Wolf?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf, is in his seat."

Greiman: "Okay.

Speaker Daniels: "Any further question?"

Greiman: "I have no...."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Greiman: "...question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is Representative Rea recorded?"

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

Rea: "Would you change my vote to 'aye', please."

Speaker Daniels: "Change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. On this question there are 82 'aye', 82 'no' and the motion fails.

Representative Smith."

Smith, Margaret: "How do you have me voting?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Smith, we already declared the results."

Smith, Margaret: "I would like to change my vote to 'aye',
please."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "The Lady's light was on and we had not moved to the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

next order of business. We had not moved to the next order of business."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "This is just a game. If the Lady is allowed to switch,
the vote was already announced, we will simply verify your
vote and you won't have all the people here. So, why play
these games, Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me."

Epton: "Well, now if you want to be...if you want to get serious about it, I suggest you stick to the truth on what was stated. You misrepsented the Bill, I didn't go into that, I don't think we need..."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's...Representative Greiman, address the Chair, Sir." Greiman: "I am, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, address the Chair,
Sir."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Epton raised some issues earlier, so that there can be no doubt. I won't take that Bill, Mr. Speaker, as it was offered by the insurance industry. I wrote the first Bill in Illinois like this and I won't take that Bill because it's a company Bill. This is an insurance industry Bill that screws the public, Mr. Epton and you know it and I had to read it to find it out, very carefully."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Only as a matter of personal privilege. I think that he should also add that he was authorized at my request, specifically to change the Bill anyway he would like to changed it, not the insurance industry and that I would support it. So that when he talks about insurance industry Bill, I don't know what you're talking about. I gave you the Bill and said, change it so that it meets with your

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

pleasure and I would support it. I think that should suffice to answer any further comments."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Representative Greiman, Representative Epton, Members of the House, the Vote has been announced.

82 'no', 82 'aye', the motion fails, the board is cleared,
Representative Greiman. For the Clerk's instructions, that
the motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a more pleasant note, I would like to make an introduction. Mrs. Joyce Donovan, the wife of our colleague, Tim Donovan but more importantly the mother of a new two week old baby boy named, Patrick Timothy Donovan, in the rear gallary."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, might it be said that, as long as the nose of the prevailing side, Mrs. Smith voted on the prevailing side and she might want to move to reconsider the vote by which the Bill was rejected. Since she did vote on the prevailing side."

Speaker Daniels: "The Bill is on Third Reading, Sir. And we are moving on now. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if Patrick
Timothy Donovan was here for the Greek Dinner."

Speaker Daniels: "It would be a pleasure. Senate Bill 115. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 115..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman. It's your Bill, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act relating to interspousal torts.

Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

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

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps with little less acronym. This Amendment is put on that the suggestion of the House Judiciary I Committee Members who suggested that we make it clear that testimony in a divorce action cannot be used in a personal injury action for a personal tort between spouses. And that it also could not be used for impeachment purposes as well. It makes the intent of the drafters clear and makes it fair for the litigants. I ask for adoption of House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 115."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."
- Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would certainly like to support this excellent Amendment by Representative across the aisle on an excellent Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman,
  Representative Greiman, moves the adoption of Amendment #1.

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

  The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$2, Jaffe. Amends Senate
  Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, Amendment #2."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Other Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 143, Representative Barkhausen. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sale on credit and the lending of money. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

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

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlmen of the House, amendment #1 is the same as Senate Bill 885. I'm offering it here in effort to put back into life a Bill that got lost in the suffle. Senate Bill 885 is a very simple Bill, requested by the Illinois Commerce Commission that provides that a request for judicial review of a final ruling must be made within thirty days. It came out of the Agriculture Conservation Energy Committee, 10 to nothing and out of the Senate, 55 to 1. And what happened is, for some reason I was not notified of the Committee hearing, that's why I'm offering it."

Speaker Daniels: ".... Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "The thirty day change, what is it currently? Why are we changing it to thirty days or is there no time..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

- Deuster: "There is thirty days in the law, the only thing this
  Amendment does is add one adjective, "final", so that...so
  it makes clear that you have thirty days after the final
  rule regulation order or discussion."
- Schneider: "Does that mean that you cannot appeal any interim order? I'm talking to my lawyer next to me."
- Deuster: "It just means...I think that it means that you have...the thirty days just applies to the thirty day cut-off is only to final rules and orders. And descisions."
- Schneider: "Well, I'm...being explained to me as best I understand it. It means any other order cannot be reviewed...right...at the consequence of the word "final" being inserted."
- Deuster: "Well the existing law says, within thirty days after the service of any order or decision of the Commerce...or

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

of the Commission refusing an application for a rehearing of any rule or regulation order of decision, so forth. And then it says, and after a rehearing of any rule or regulation so forth and it just adds the adjective 'final' in there, so that the thirty days begins when the final descision is made."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have a good one here. I would like to question the germaneness of this Amendment. And in light of the last ruling by the parliamentarian, it should be very easy."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

- Deuster: "If I take this out of the record, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make that request at this time. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Sir, we're on Senate Bill 143, the Sponsor of the Bill is Representative Barkhausen. Out of the Record. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I think after a motion has been made to question germaneness that perhaps it would be best if we got a ruling first and then the Sponsor can determine whether or not he wants to take it out of the record. I don't think it's really appropriate to take it out of the record now after having made my motion."
- Speaker Daniels: "Take the Bill out of the record and we will make that ruling before it's called again. Senate Bill 160, Representative Hastert. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 160, a Bill for an Act in relationship to protests against zoning Amendments. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Tate, et al. Amends Senate
  Bill 160...."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

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

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

Amendment #1 provides that no county or city may regulate ownership of firearms. In America's Bill of Rights we are assured that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The exact meaning of that Article has been debated over and over despite its clear language. So I will not use it as a defense for my Amendment, even though I could very easily do so. Instead let me cite the State Constitution which reiterates our right to arms in language that is more clearly understood..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Tate. Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bowman: "I yield to Representative Getty."

Speaker Daniels: "What purpose do you rise, Sir? Representative
Bowman."

Bowman: "Okay. Repres....I'm going to question the germaneness of this Amendment. I yield to Representative Conti then.

Apparently this is all wired up."

Speaker Daniels: "You have yielded to three people now.

Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have several inquiries of the Parliamentarian. The first one is the germaneness of the Amendment because everything in the Amendment strikes everything after the enacting clause and starts at line 1 and the Act calls for amending the Municipal Code and the County Zoning Act. Now, I know that it would affect the Municipal Code, but no place in the Amendment does it refer to the Zoning Act. So I ask for the ruling of the Chair if...on the germaneness of the Amendment and then if the germaneness holds up, how many votes will it take because it preempts the home rules on counties and cities. And the last inquiry I would like to

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

yield to my esteemed colleague, Michael Getty."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman did indicate he wanted to yield to me and I certainly would want an opportunity to address myself to this before the Chair makes a ruling because I think it's a very important subject matter. And I want to be recognized for that purpose before the Chair makes the ruling. May I proceed?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

- Getty: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have you specifically at the fact that Senate Bill 160 is a local zoning Bill and its subject is limited to that specific topic and more particularly to the matter of protests of local zoning actions. The subject of the Bill is clearly set forth in its title as well as by the content of the Bill. In accordance with that defined subject, the Bill now amends two separate Acts, the Municipal Code and the Counties Act, in order to deal with both local types of zoning ordinances. It is precisely because the Bill desires to amend two separate existing Acts that the Bill has been drafted with a title which defines the single subject of the Bill to be a particular topic pertains..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Getty. We are being interrupted by the person that yielded to you, Representative Conti."
- Conti: "Mr.Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is known as one of the most anti-local government Sessions we have ever had and what the Gentleman is trying to put across, a message here, I think it is very important and the noise level is so high I can't hear his arguments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may we please have order? Thank you. Representative Getty, you

68th Legislative Day

June 22. 1981

were addressing the Chair, Sir."

Getty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the Bill has been drafted which ... with a title which defines the single subject of the Bill to be a particular topic which pertains to both of those Acts. Otherwise, each existing Statute by definition would separately constitute a separate subject matter which could not be amended in the same Bill. Amendment #1 does not deal with the subject of Senate Bill It does not deal with local zoning. It does not relate to local zoning by any stretch of even the liberal imagination. It deals with the local control of a firearm, an entity separately subject altogether. Amendment #1 were itself a separate Bill with a common subject matter, title and so forth, such as an Act relation to local control of firearms, it might well be Constitutional. But Amendment #1 would amend two existing laws in relation to a subject matter which itself is unrelated to the vehicle Bill. This is a clear violation, only of the legislative germaneness requirement, but also of the single subject requirements of the Illinois Constitution. If this Amendment is adopted and if the Bill passed, it will encompass two unrelated subjects. However, the title reads, ... In order to try and mask that divergent subject matter ... . If the Bill is signed by the Governor, in that configuration, it will be a nullity. It will be unconstitutional and it nothing to accomplish the goals of the Sponsors of either the zoning change or the firearm change. The Sponsor of this Amendment can only hurt the legislation, embarrass the Governor and the General Assembly and generate a lawsuit. He should either introduce his own Bill or attempt to amend another Bill which deals with firearm regulation. For Constitutional reasons, Mr. Speaker, I suggest those

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

respectfully that you declare this nongermane and out of order."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I just wanted to speak to the Amendment in the event that you do rule that it is germane."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Just in the event that you rule incorrectly, I would like to speak against the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I don't mind those people doing that, but, as a hyphenated Sponsor of this with Representative Tate, we would just like a ruling on it so we can proceed on the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "We are in the process to make sure that everybody is given their opportunity to address the Chair on the question of the germaneness. Did you, Representative Vinson, want to do the same? On the question of germaneness, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. There have been two questions raised by the foregoing speakers on the subject of germaneness in general. Number one, I would like to argue that the Chair should rule that the Amendment is germane and number two, that the Amendment does not violate any single subject limitation compelled by the Constitution. In the Constitution in Section 11 of Article IV of the Legislative Article, the single limitation is spelled out in some detail. I would read one sentence from that single subject limitation. It says, \*Bills, except for Bills for appropriation and for the codification, revision or rearrangement of laws, shall be confined to one subject. That is the single subject limitation. The Bill that the Gentleman proposes to amend, Senate Bill 160, is a Bill for the rearrangement of laws or

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

for the revision of laws. It specifically would revise the law in relation to zoning Amendments. For that reason there is no single subject limitation applicable under the current Constitution to the Bill. Secondly, on the subject of germaneness, what the Bill does is to amend the Municipal Code. It amends the Municipal Code in regard to restrictions on otherwise lawfully exercised Constitutional rights regarding property. What the Gentleman's Amendment would do is to similarly amend the Municipal Code in regard to an otherwise Constitutionally exercisable right in regard to property and for those reasons I would argue that the Gentlman's Amendment is both germane and is confined to any applicable single subject limitation in the 1970 Constitution."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the ruling of the Chair is that the Amendment is germane and that it deals with a common subject right, the restriction of property rights, vis—a—vis municipal law, and in this Amendment relating to the Municipal Code. That answers one of your questions, Representative Conti, that you raised. The single...second guestion, relating to the number of votes necessary to adopt, that will be a ruling that will be determined on the final action of the Bill and is not appropriate on the Amendment stage. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's not only the subject matter in Senate Bill 160, but there are several Bills as bad as this Bill that are pending before this House. In all the years that I have spent in the General Assembly, never once did I ever make a move like I am going to make tonight. I'm going to move to overrule the Chair. I reluctantly do so. This is a very, very important subject matter to me and their are several Bills pending that will affect local municipalities."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to overrule the Chair.

  The question is, 'Shall the Chair be overruled?'. All
  those in favor of overruling the ruling of the Chair will
  vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative
  Brummer."
- Brummer: "Could you restate the question again so that we clearly know what..."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Chair has ruled that the Amendment is germane which would allow the Members of the House to determine which way they wanted to act on the Amendment. Representative Conti has moved to overrule the Chair in regards to that ruling. The question is, 'Shall the Chair be overruled?'. All those in favor of overruling the Chair in its ruling that the Amendment was germane shall vote 'aye', all those opposed shall vote 'no'. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. There are 76 'aye', 82 'nay'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I respectfully dissent from the ruling of the Chair and I would like the record to indicate that dissent and that I am joined by Represent...I think by quite a few other people. Representative..."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Journal will so reflect and any Member that
  wishes to join you in your dissent may do so by coming up
  to the well later and filing along with you.
  Representative Getty."
- Getty: "I further request that my dissent be journalized with the record of this day's proceedings and that I be given leave to file as I have in the past that written dissent in my own form with the Clerk."
- Speaker Daniels: "You may do so, Sir. Representative Tate,
  Amendment #1."
- Tate: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

As I was saving, the State Constitution which clearly gives our right to arms in language that is more clearly It states in Article I, that subject understood by all. only to the police power the right of the individual citizen to keep and bare arms shall not be infrigned. While this makes it impossible for police to regulate gun ownership among criminals, it should be clear to all of you that most importantly it quarantees the right of law abiding citizens to own guns. What would be to the point of this Article if it were not meant to quarantee that right, why would the authors of the Illinois Constitution have bother with this issue. With little regard for our State and Federal Constitutions, the Morton Grove Trustees recently passed a local ordinance banding hand guns. would assume they were understandably outraged by the of Deputy Police Superintendent, James death...death Reardon, as well as by the recent assassination attempts on other public officials. I hope that a motion guided their actions not logic. I hope that Members of this Body can evaluate my Amendment without that kind of passion or The Morton Grove Trustees imposed this ban on hand quns in spite of the protest of hundreds of residents, the public testimony at the meeting of the Trustees was overwhelmingly against the ban. But the Trustees chose to ignore this, peoples all across...."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Tate. Ladies and Gentlemen, may we please have order. A very very important subject matter and there are many Members who wish to address the subject. You will all be recognize but we're going to have order. Representative Tate."

Tate: "People all across this state are reacting to these kind of shootings by panicking. Several attempts to regulate guns have been introduced to local governments throughout the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

state but these state and local regulations are not the answer to end the murders, shootings and armed robberies, that we will want to see end. These regulations would instead pile new procedures on top of old ones until the acquistion of any kind of firearm would be more trouble than could every be justified by the result. The worse part about the regulations is that they wouldn't effect criminals who abuse the rights to keep and bare arms. would only irate and hassle abiding law Criminals can avoid the restrictions we now have, adding more won't help anyone. We need tougher pentalies for tougher pentalies for law abiding citizens criminals, not who chose to own firearms. In April, the FBI reported that violent crime in the United States had jumped by 13% Some estimates say an American is killed every 1980. thirty minutes, that adds up to ten thousand Americans killed every year. There are about fifty-five million handquns in circulation and this number grows at a rate of 2.5 million each year. With this many handguns distributed about the country, it would take years to get the guns out of American homes even if legislation was passed requiring The statistics that I have just given you say, there are a lot of guns out there and a lot of people are being shot. But what the statistics don't say is that there are now many many people who own guns and don't go around shooting people. Less than half of a percent of the guns in the United States are used in crimes each year and handguns are used in less than half of the robberies less than 1/4 of the aggravated assult. Studies have shown that almost all handguns brought for legitimate purposes. I would hope that Members of this Body will agree need this legislation to help enforce our Constitutional rights, whether you're a proponent or an oponent of gun

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

control I think the consenses among the majority of people is that of minimum you need legislation at a Federal level and not piece meal, city by city. Thank you and I might add, the Wildlife Federation is in favor of this Bill and I would also like to yield or hope that Representative Stuffle will be recognized to speak on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think it's sort of funny, first of all to hear the Gentleman from Decatur take about Morton Grove. Morton Grove as you know is not in his district, it happens to be mine. I don't i f the Representative could find Motion Grove with a bloodhound, quite truthfully. But two weeks ago Morton Grove passed two handgun ordinances that were probably the toughest handgun ordinances in the country. I want you to know that since the time that they have passed those ordinances, many people have come into Morton Grove and have taken independent polls to find out what the citizenry of Morton Grove actually think about those ordinances. overwhelmingly, one of the ordinances has an 85% acceptance value by the public in Morton Grove and the other one has just a tiny bit under that. But let me tell you that, in addition to that the City of Chicago just indicated that they are considering a new gun ordinance, so what are we really talking about over here. We're really not talking about a gun...could I have a little attention, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, it's a little noisy."

Speaker Daniels: "May the Gentleman please have order."

Jaffe: "So, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what we're really talking about..."

Speaker Daniels: "May the Gentleman please have order. Senator

Lemke. Members in that part of the aisle, could we please
have some order. Representative McClain what purpose do

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

you rise?"

- McClain: "Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, would you turn up the Gentleman's microphone a little bit we can hardly hear him back here."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay."
- Jaffe: "Okay. So what are we really talking about, Ladies and Gentlemen. We're talking about the National Rifle Association and let me tell you about the National Rifle Association. They are frighten and let me tell you why they are frighten. They haven't won a single court case on qun control in the last fifty years..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Jaffe.

  Representative Deuster."
- Deuster: "I think the Speaker should confine his remarks to the merits of the Amendment and not talk about some unrelated organization or association."
- Jaffe: "I know that Representative Deuster feels that if the shoe...you know, if the shoe sweezes and hurts your foot you should yell about it. But the truth of the matter is, we are talking about the National Rifle Association and I don't think that I ought to be curbed in what I'm talking about because I'm talking about this Amendment and I'm not going to be censured by the Chair and I'm not going to be censered by Representative Deuster."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, address your remarks to the Chair, Sir and limit your remarks to the Amendment."
- Jaffe: "I'm doing exactly that and if you would pay attention you would know that I'm doing that."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, bring your remarks to a close."

Jaffe: "I still have time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The timer is on."

Jaffe: "Before we got in to it. The Communicable League is

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

against particular Amendment and look at the Amendment. If you want to see a pro crime Amendment, it says, no municipalites may in any way it. Okav. regulate restrict or license the ownership position, purchase, sale, transportation or transfer a firearms or firing arm ammunition. Nor may any municipality maintain or enact any ordinance or rule with in regulates, restricts, prohibits license or ownership, possession, purchase sales, transportation or transfer of firearm or firearm ammunition. And if that isn't rough enough, it goes on to say that all the ordinances that have ever been enacted are DOW nul and And if that isn't bad enough, it says, any officer, employee or elected official of any municipality who intends to enforce any ordinance rule after effective date of this Act shall be liable to legal action to any person complaining thereof, in the amount of damages resulting from such attempt. That basically means is that if police officer is going to try to enforce a local ordinance in his village or municipality that deals with hand qun control, he better watch out because he could liable for civil dangers. It's a ridiculous Amendment, Mr. You know, the very very people who always talk Speaker. about local control and putting the control of government into the hands of the people and local government evidently don't believe that. What they mean is, they want to do that when that view is theirs but when the view on the local level is not theirs, they want to take that view away and they want to take away the rights of municipalities and in this state. This is an Amendment, it's an anti government Amendment, it's an municipal league Amendment. It's just a terrible Amendment and it ought to be defeated, Mr. Speaker."

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kustra."

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respect the Sponsors intentions in adding this Amendment to Senate Bill 160. However, I do feel that as a Representative who has within his District, Morton Grove, I should speak to the Bill. I can add to Representative Jaffe's comments that not only do I represent Morton Grove but I live within blocks of Morton Grove. Those residents, those neighbors who turned out that night are literally my neighbors, three to four blocks away. Those who turned some were for qun control some were against. The Gentleman who sponsors this Amendment talks about the problems that this brings to other municipalities and talks about the fact that most of the people turned out at the meeting were against gun control. Well, it seems to me that what we have to bear in mind here is that the people who passed the ordinance, the ordinance that would prohibited by this Bill are people that were elected by the residents of Morton Grove. And there will be future elections in the village of Morton Grove and at those future elections, I'm sure the number one issue will be whether or not the village of Morton Grove should Act to this ordinance. I believe the issue here is not really gun control and I'm not really going to get into that and discuss the issue of qun control although, I personally favor gun control statute and ordinances. I \* m not so sure I agree with what Morton Grove did because it's just possible with the possession part of the ordinance that they have gone too far. But I'll let the courts debate that. instead what I would like to address this evening is the question the right of a local government for self control and that's what it's all about, this is a local control issue. It's whether or not a local

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

government ought to have the authority to enact its own ordinances in this particular case as far as gun control is concerned. We're talking about a man who wanted to open up gun shop within the borders of Morton Grove. The residents were ensensed at that and they chose to pass an ordinance to forbid that. I happen to live in a town where there is also a gun shop, I don't particular care to have a gun shop in my town and I don't want to forbid my locally elected representatives at some point in the future from enacting the very same kind of ordinance that would prohibit the sale of guns in my community. So for those of you that get bogged down on the issue of gun control, I ask you to take a step back and instead of dealing with the issue on the grounds of whether or not we should or shouldn't have it. I would just ask you to look at the issue of local control. Give your local cities the power to govern themselves and let then....let those local representatives stand for re election on the bases of those For those reasons, I cannot support the Amendment on the issue of homerule for a local communities. vou-"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Stuffle. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are eighteen people that desire to be recognized. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, sometime ago I added my name as one of the main Sponsors of this Amendment and since then I've suspect have had as many calls and letters about this Amendment as anything that I have ever been involved in or seen placed on this floor in my three terms or in all the years I've worked in the General Assembly as a Member or a staffer. It seems to me that the proponents of this Amendment, including myself, a Democrat and Republicans alike who favor the Amendment are being told that on one

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

hand this is not an issue that involves gun control or an attempt to restrict. On the other hand we're being told that the whole effort is one that smacks on attact of local Now I suggest this to you, this is a gun control issue and there's probably no issue that people care more about in my district and care about for real reasons, not just emotional ones, than this particular issue. I've had hundreds of cards and letters and calls to support this Amendment. Not just from the people that Representative Jaffe referred to, the NRA, not just are emotional about the issue but professional people from people who belong to organizations such as gun clubs, people who really believe that the Amendment to the United State Constitution means something. People who really believe when they call you, that it's impossible to enact any gun control law on ordinance that Ι happen to believe in that position and I will work. belived in it long before I was a candidate or a Legislator and that's why I support this particular Amendment and have added my name as a cosponsor. You saw what happened in Washington, D.C. in a city with a strict gun ordinance. You saw what happened in the Nation of Italy, virtually bans the ownership of a firearm. Still there were attacks on prominent people that every Member of this General Assembly regrets, every Member of this General Assembly feels deeply about. But those ordinances and those laws did nothing, whatsoever, to prohibit the type of people who took those actions from doing so. Some may differ with what the second Amendment says as to it application about a well regulated militia, I happen to believe that means we have the right to keep and bare because at the time that particular Amendment was put in to the Constitution, a well regulated militia meant, the man

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

in the street protecting himself and his family and his property and his country and it got there because they were doing exactly that against the British. I would point out too, that what Representative Tate said, is true. The Constitution is clear and unmistakable. Those State Constitutions certainly give the right to keep and arms in my opinion, those Constitutions, at least Illinois is clear and I think the Federal one is concise and clear in my opinion and I suggest to you, that whether or not you belive in homerule there are times that come that this Assembly must decide what public policy is. To put vote down there whether you support those of us who would preempt homerule here or whether you would homerule. I suggest to you to that no where in the Pederal Constitution is there a right to homerule. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr."

"Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The issue Barr: here involved is not whether one believes in various forms of gun control or not. The issue is clearly that of local government and local control, the Constitution of the State of Illinois is designed to strenghten. We've heard a charge that an ordinance was passed in the village of Morton Grove, this Amendment is a...almost hysterical reaction to an ordinance, if that ordinance is in fact unwise if it's not supported by the people of Morton Grove as Representative Kustra point out. There will be an municipal election there shortly and the people their will known. But what we're can make Grove doing...what we're doing here if this unwise Amendment were to be adopted and become law in this State of Illinois. It's saying to every community, every municipality in the state not only that they can't pass an ordinance such as

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the village of Morton Grove passed. But in no way and no fashion can they regulate the sale, possession on any other matter relating to hand guns. In my city of Evanston, have a local ordinance that prohibits the sale of hand guns within the municipal boundaries, that's all it says. ordinance was passed by the city council, there was no dispute, it's been accepted the people of Evanston don't want....don't want stores within the city limits of city of Evanston to sell firearms. There is no restriction on ownership or possession but there is a provision preventing stores in the city of Evanston from selling That's what the people of my city want, they have the right to that under the Constitution of the State of Illinois and the laws of the State of Illinois. ordinance was passed pursuant to the public policy of state by freely elected local officials and this Amendment is a hysterical reaction which if we're going to follow this policy, what we are saying is that every time this General Assembly disagrees with the term of any local ordinance passed by any city, town or village, any county, any township in the State of Illinois that what we're going to do is take away from all local government units in the State of Illinois the right to self government. This is a terrible Amendment and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
think Representative Barr puts it quiet well. The issue
here is the question of whether we want to take away from
our local communities the powers that our Constitution and
we have traditionally have given them. I've very surprised
to find that the Sponsor from the other side of the aisle
whose party continues to harp on the need for control to be
enacted locally, for people back home to have powers that

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

we should not take away from them, to be offering this Amendment to it. Representative Stuffle, I think, confuses issue when he talks about the Constitutional question, there's no question given court rulings year after after year that the second Amendment in the Pederal Constitution deals only with the rights of a militia in public population and our own State Constitution defines the right to bare hand guns subject as Representative kindly told us, to the police power. The police power is exercised both at the state and the local levels traditionally and what we have here are a local ordinances that have been enacted appropriately subject to power in communities who citizenry feels that there is a need to control and end hand gun abuse. That's what were about today, we're talking about hand gun abuse when Representative Tate, told us the statistic, I thought for minute he must be speaking against his own Amendment. Yes, indeed, fifty to seventy million hand guns in States right now. Added to at a rate of two and a half million a year. Those are powerful statistics, American is shot, is killed every thirty minutes by a hand Representative Tate's Amendment if qun out of control. adopted would take away from us any power to deal with the shooting of Presidents and Popes of babies laying in their cribs, of friends of neighbors of victims of criminal attact. To the Chicago Police Department last year reported six thousand stolen firearms. I assume that the people who reported those thiefs were law abiding citizens guns for protection in their own who had brought those homes. I further assume that the six thousand thiefs occurred because criminals broke in and took those quns. There is no way to keep hand guns out of the hands of criminals without somehow dealing with the number of hand

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

the amist and among general population. Representative Tate, would tell us that we can only deal with this at the state level. Well, I'm here to tell you as a Sponsor of legislation to deal sensibly with the problem o hand gun abuse at the state level that this General Assembly is not prepared to do that. He tells us, the Federal level. maybe we can try it at Well, I m standing here to tell you that as a Sponsor of a Resolution calling upon the Federal Congress to enact effective hand gun controls, no mention of ban on sales, no mention of of those nasty cold words, just a posession, none Resolution asking the Federal Congress to take the problem hand guns violence seriously. That proposal rejected by the House Executive Committee on a 16 to 3 I would say to anybody that concerned about this voteissue, whether you come from the City of Chicago where we Mayor who knows that it is a problem and is doing what she can to make a difference in that town or whether you come from Decatur, like Representative Tate, where perhaps there are no hand gun problems. It would unconscionable, unconscionable to adopt this Amendment. would deny to the sixteen suburbs that surround the City of Chicago the power to enact the ordinances that they have for years had on their books to ban the sale of guns, to deny to Morton Grove, the leader in this area another suburb of the City of Chicago that is not just baning sale but also possession. And to deny the power to the City of Chicago which has a serious problem of hand qun violence, permit the Mayor to offer her ordinance that will strengthen our already strong registration controls. urge everyone who cares about the right of people at the local level to control their own destiny, and everyone recognizes that there is a problem of hand guns out of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

control, to vote 'no' on this dreadful Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

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

The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye' oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the main question is put and Representative Johnson to close."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there has been a lot of talk about some of the collateral issues involved in this Amendment and this Bill. But the fact of the you've heard from the constituents and your people and this is a gun control issue. Whatever way speakers to the contrary may want to purvey it, it's a gun control issue. With all due respect to Representative Jaffe. Representative Currie, they've come here in all sincerity time after time over a number of years and are among the House of gun control. leading proponents in this Representative Currie has sponsored a Bill that she truly believes in but the fact of the matter is, if you believe in the second Amendment, if you believe that people ought to be free to exercise their Constitutional rights, if you believe the Illinois and the United States Constitution has validity you ought to vote 'yes' and if you don't, you ought to vote 'no'. Now for those people who talk about local control and I've heard two or three speakers address that issue. I would suggest to you that there are certain issues that are of statewide significants and that ought to be controled at the state level. How many of your people who are prolife voters would believe that the village of Morton Grove or the village of Paris or the village of Monmouth ought to be able to pass law legalizing the extent they can abortion. How many of the people of the other

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

side who believe in civil liberities in the first Amendment believe that the village of Morton Grove or the village Waukegan ought to have certin rules respecting free speech and that the rest of the state ought to have different How many of you believe that the definition of rape or armed robbery ought to be one thing in Morton Grove and something else in Arlington Heights and something else the uncorporated areas of the state. There are certain issues that because of there very nature ought to controlled at a state level. That a hodgepodge of homerule units simply add to the confusion of the citizens and law enforcement agencies and that's exactly what we'll do if we allow this Morton Grove ordinance to stand and similar ones like it be enacted around the state and around the country. And on the gun control issue itself, I would suggest to the opponents of this Amendment and people who support qun control generally, that there are other avenues where effective qua control in the United State and in Illinois. To provide for stiffer penalties and mandatory sentencing for people who commit crimes while armed with a firearm. the only affect of gun control in the State of Illinois or anyone else, is to allow the criminal element to maintain guns in their position, while the law abiding citizens have them invested of their Constitutional right and the right to bear arms. I would suggest this is a absolute gun control issue. I would suggest to you that the vast majority of your constituents support this Amendment, the Constitution dictates it and a 'yes' means that you believe that the Constitution of this state and the United States still are valid and that people ought to have a right in a free society to make those decisions on their own. I urge a 'yes' vote on Representative Tate's and mine and Representative Stuffle's Amendment to Senate

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Bill 160. Thank you."

- Gentleman moves for the adoption Speaker Daniels: "The Amendment #1. The question is, \*Shall Amendment #1 be All those in favor will signify by woting 'aye' adopted?' voting no. The voting is opened. opposed bу Representative Winchester to explain his vote, the timer is on, Sir."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason I'm supporting Amendment #1 is because, I believe Amendment #1 will save lives. How many people know that when the Village of Morton Grove passed their ordinance that it gave certain police powers. Ιt gave powers to search any home to seize and to confiscate strickly and merely on suspicion that there may be a gun in that home. How many of you knew that? Look at the tremendous amount of police power that that community has given. Whatever, I as a resident of Southern Illinois go to Northern Illinois to go hunting and I go into a municipality that has this type of law, and I've got a shotgun in my car, unloaded, cased, I can be subject to these laws. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is wrong. violation of the Constitutional rights and we need to vote 'green' to support this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn, to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  Listening to the opening and closing arguments with respect
  to this Amendment, you would think that we are in a state
  of hysteria. Well, I would like this Assembly to know that
  I come from the same district as the Sponsor of this
  Amendment. And there is no cry for gun control in Herick,
  there's no cry in Owaneco, no one in Edinburg wants gun
  control, no one in Stonington wants gun control, no one in

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Taylorville wants gun control, no one in Blue Mound, Buda, none of those people are out crying for gun control. Yes, not even Decatur, not even in Warrensburg where we have the Warrensburg Gun Club, none of these people want gun control. This is a phony issue, if you're a good Legislator, vote to kill this Amendment because this is a foot in the door to preempt all your homerule powers. As Elmer Conti said, this will destroy homerule, why not preempt other police powers, why not preempt public health and safety powers, why not preempt zoning powers. Vote

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not for any type of qun control, I'm opposed to gun control but I'm voting 'no' there and I'm voting 'no' up there for this reason. The State Constitution gives....does give the members of this...or the citizens of this state the right to own arms. also gives the citizens of this state the right to homerule. A lot has been said about the people who are opposed to this Amendment in Morton Grove, that it was passed without their approval. If they are that opposed to this ordinance in Morton Grove, there are ways for that very city council to resend that ordinance. don't think that we ought to be using a baseball bat to kill a flea. This is a very bad precedent to be setting, we're completely or usurping the right of the local citizen, if that's what they desire I think that that should be their privilege..."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman...or the Lady from Cook,

  Representative Braun to explain her vote. Representative

  Vinson to explain his vote, the timer is on, Sir."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not really a question of

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

whether it's local controlled, federal controlled or state controlled. It's a question of a fundamental right that is being abridge. And I would argue that none of the people who argue for local control would argue for local control if it were in the 'Dread Scott' decision, if it were in the poll tax or in a public accommendations. This is in fact an anti government Amendment. In the same spirit of the crusade against slavery or the crusade for civil rights, it's an anti government crusade in the same spirit of Thomas Jefferson when he said, we need a revolution every twenty years and I would argue for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock to explain his vote.

The timer is on, Sir."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is perhaps one of the few times that the distinguish Gentleman from DiWitt makes absolutely no sense. And the absurdity of the Amendment can only be exceeded by the absurdity of some of the people who attempt to explain why this legislation is needed. And because that is equally absurd, Mr. Chairman, I would like to verify the absurd 'yes' votes after the Roll Call is taken."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich, Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich, D.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are twenty-two sections in the Illinois Bill of Rights, Section #22 says, 'the right of the individual citizen to keep and bare arms shall not be infrigned." Now if Morton Grove, I think that what Morton Grove did was unconstitutional. But, if it wasn't they can also do away with freedom of speech, self incrimination, trail by jury, all kinds of other things because there's also in the Bill of Rights which were very carefully pounded out at the Constitutional Convention. Now, if you think Morton Grove has a right to

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

do this then they have a right to do those other things. I think we're really correcting an error that was made there."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to put into the record the fact that
my 'no' vote is based upon the ruling of the Chair which I
think, as I made the point before, was in degration of the
rights of the people of the State of Illinois and harmful.
Accordingly, I vote 'no' and should this Amendment be
adopted, I would ask that this Bill be placed on the Order
of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, since there is an
Amendment to the title."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel so strongly about this Bill, not pertaining to the subject matter. In fact I don't agree with my colleagues that who are arguing to defeat this Bill. My intent is that this is one of several Bills that are going to strip local power, local authority and we've enjoyed the sovern rights of the State of Illinois but hereafter, if this Amendment is adopted and several other pending pieces of litigation that are pending here before this House, we can now call ourselves a police state. The police State of Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Senator Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Morton Grove is certainly the mouse that roared.

I can't imagine a town of twenty—three thousand people throwing the entire Illinois Nouse of Representatives into termoil like this. I believe....I've heard a lot of talk about the Constitution here, I didn't see anyone rushing to offer such proposals before Morton Grove took its action.

Representative....excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I would says that if this Amendment is adopted, I would then excerise my

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

right under the rules to demand that this Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading, First legislative Day. It has been, okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen, to explain her vote.

The timer is on Ma\*am."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the right of law abiding citizens in Illinois, to keep and bare arms including in Morton Grove which happens also to be in my Legislative District. I would like to mention that this is just about Morton Grove through, and to the Gentleman There was an attempt a month and a who just spoke. to adopt an Amendment to another Bill which would have done precisely this, which was pre Morton Grove. like the people here to keep in mind, this doesn't effect just Morton Grove, it would...if we do not pass this created patchwork situtation thoughtout Illinois. want to call something absurd, don't pass this Amendment and you'll see how absurd legislation can really be. are a lot of things that can be handle well at the local level, this does not happen to be one of them. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my "no" vote. This is clearly an issue where there are divergent views in the State of Illinois. In the urban areas people feel very strongly that they want gun control, we have a crime problem, every single poll says people want gun control. To pass an Amendment like this that would deny us locally the opportunity to deal with this issue of crime and the way we think it needs to be done, I think it wrong. As to the question of Constitutionality of the Morton Grove statute, there is a simple answer. Take it to court if it's not Constitutional, I don't see that being done successfully

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

because Morton Grove clearly has a right to pass that kind of ordinance and they've done so. They listen to their local people, every jurisdiction in the state should have the right on this issue to listen to their local people. I may disagree with...."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Macdonald."

Levin: "...do what we feel is appropriate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would like to reiterate the remarks House. Representative Friedrich made, we were both Members of the Constitutional Convention in 1970. I was a Member of the Bill of Rights Committee, it was indeed very clear what the State Constitution intended. I also would remind this Body that the Federal Constitution preempts the State Constitution and both Constitutions preempt law. So. 1 think that in the interest of that Τ would say Constitutional law that I would explain my 'yes' vote that manner and that is the vote that ought to be on that board."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuchler"

Deuchler: "As a joint sponsor of SB 160, I just want to say, I do not think that we, in the General Assembly are babysitters for Morton Grove. The courts will certainly take care of that issue. I rise to oppose this Amendment simply on the grounds on which I campaigned. That of local options and local autonomony, the fact that this obscure Senate Bill with its possibly unrelated Amendment, is being portrayed as the major NRA Bill of this Session, is a really bazaar turn of events. And I oppose the Amendment, this is not a qun control issue."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell."

Favell: "I would....thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

again to mention two points. Number one, I've been told by Morton Grove residents that this issue is being taken to the courts. I agree with the idea that part of that law is probably unconstitutional and the courts no doubt will rule so. Second of all, there are some issues that there are a lot of people think should be governed by the state, including my own district in my own city in Wheaton, which believes that this should be a dry state and if we're going to start making these rules maybe we ought to continue along those lines."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't care whether it's Ottawa, Illinois, I don't care whether it's Morton Grove or do I care whether it's the City of Chicago. I don't want government at any level telling me that I can't have a gun in my home to defend myself or my family. And that's exactly what's happening. Local government doesn't have that right, I suggest a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. voting 'aye' on this because I feel on this particular question, I have no choice but to vote 'aye' on this. do otherwise would be to say, that homerule communities, communities of any kind can abridge and negate the Constitution of the State of Illinois. It seems to me that when I came down here, I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and the State of Illinois. The right to bare arms and to keep arms is a Constitutional right under our Illinois Constitution and I feel that it must be upheld and I feel that we would be wrong in giving any municipality homerule or otherwise, the right to abridge that right given to Illinois citizens by our Cons....

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McBroom."

- McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I have an inquiry of the Chair, I see your in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and the real Speaker in on the floor. I've just counted, there's twelve Members who have not explained their votes. Is there a way to force them to do that, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Sir, we can go through and count each one of them. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 87 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'no'. Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "A verification Roll Call. Poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."
- Leinenweber: "I would like to be verified."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right. First we're on....Representative
  Johnson has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll of the
  Absentees. Representative Johnson?"
- Johnson: "Well, not only a verification...not only a poll of the absentees, but also, in the event that the 'nos' would exceed the 'yes's', we want to verify the 'no' votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "You'll be recognized at that time, Sir. Poll of the absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Bradley. Breslin..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Breslin votes 'aye'.

  Representative Carey votes 'aye'. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Capparelli. Garmisa. Griffin. Hanahan.

  Kosinski. Margalus. McGrew. Peters. Redmond. And,

  Stearney."
- Speaker Daniels: "Completes a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman, Representative Jaffe requests a poll of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Jaffe, we're starting

68th Legislative Day

- June 22, 1981
- with 89 'aye'. Commence with a...Who's calling?
  Representative Pechous?"
- Pechous: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the interests of economy of time,

  I would request that you exercise the discretion of the

  Chair and call for electronic verification. Would you

  please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "We're already on the verification of the
  Affirmative Roll and this would be the guickest way to
  complete at this time. Representative Leinenweber?"
- Leinenweber: "Yes. Could I be verified?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber asks to be verified.

  Representative Jaffe? Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Representative Leinenweber is verified.

  Representative Domico? For nothing. Representative Terzich?"
- Terzich: "I would like to be verified, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich asks for leave to be verified. You're recorded as 'no', Sir. You cannot be.

  We're on the Affirmative Roll. Representative Findley.

  Does he have leave to be verified, Representative Jaffe?

  Representative Findley? That's it? That's it he says.

  Proceed with the poll of the Affirmative Roll.

  Representative Wolf?"
- J.J.Wolf: "Would make the same request."
- Speaker Daniels: "To be verified? Representative Jaffe? Is that alright, Sir? Representative J.J.Wolf is verified."
- Wolf: "You're a Gentleman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed with a poll of the Affirmative Roll."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Abramson. Ackerman.
  Alstat..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Members of the House, may we please have all Members retire
  to their seat and be seated? It's a very important

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

verification. Representative Johnson, Representative Henry, Representative Ewell, will you please retire to your seats? Representative Nelson, Ebbesen, Hoffman, Fawell...Quickest way we could get through the verification is for all Members to be in their seats. Representative Barr, Representative Bullock...Proceed with a poll of the Affirmative Boll."

Clerk Leone: "Barnes. Bartulis. Bell. Bianco. Boucek..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider?"

Schneider: "Hate to be a pain in the neck, but I can't see anyone unless they raise their hand. I'm not sure where everyone sits this term, but I haven't seen Junie raise his hand.

Maybe cause he's not here..."

Speaker Daniels: "All right.."

Schneider: "So if they would just raise their hand, I don't..."

Speaker Daniels: "Will the Members please be seated so that we can complete the verification? All right."

Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative: Clerk Boucek. Bower. Breslin. Brummer. Carey. Christensen. Collins. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Deuster. Jack Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Findley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Grossi. Hannig. Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Kociolko. Karpiel. Jim Kelley. Klemm. Koehler. Macdonald. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Mautino. Mays. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCormick. McMaster. Roland Meyer. Miller. Murphy. Neff. Oblinger. Pierce. Polk. O'Connell. Ozella. Pechous. Pullen. Robbins. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Ropp. Schraeder. Saltsman. Schuneman. Slape. Irv Smith. Stanley. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Swanstrom. Van Duyne. Vinson. Tate. Topinka. Tuerk. Watson. Winchester. J.J.Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. And, Younge."

TRANSCRIPTIO

68th Legislative Day June 22, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll.

Representative Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "Abramson?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson? The Gentleman is in the gallery."

Jaffe: "Could you tell me what we started off with, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Eighty-nine 'aye"."

Jaffe: "Alstat?"

Speaker Daniels: "Alstat's in his chair."

Jaffe: "Bell?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bell? In his chair."

Jaffe: "Brummer?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunner? In the back."

Jaffe: "Bianco?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bianco? In his chair."

Jaffe: "Christensen?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Christensen is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Collins?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins is in the back."

Jaffe: "Davis?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis is in the rear."

Jaffe: "Ebbesen?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Plinn?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Dwight Priedrich?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dwight Friedrich? Is in the back."

Jaffe: "Grossi?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Grossi is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Everett Steele?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Everett Steele? Everett Steele?

Is the Gentleman in the chamber, Representative Everett

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Steele? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Jaffe: "Mautino?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino is in his chair."

Jaffe: "McAuliffe?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe is here."

Jaffe: "McMaster?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Roland Meyer?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Roland Meyer is in his chair."

Jaffe: "C.M.Stiehl?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cissy Stiehl is in the back."

Jaffe: "Polk?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk is in the center aisle."

Jaffe: "Rea?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Reed?"

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

Jaffe: "Slape?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Slape? Slape? Is the Gentleman...Oh, there he is, right there. Your elbow was

covering him up, Sir. He's here."

Jaffe: "Stanley?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Winchester?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Tuerk?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk is in his chair."

Jaffe: "Van Duyne?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne is in the rear."

Jaffe: "That's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this Amendment

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

- #1, there are 88 voting \*aye\*, 75 \*no\*. And the Amendment is adopted. Representative Hastert. Representative
- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, as Sponsor of this Bill, I take it out of the record."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Well that remains on Second Reading and .. "
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir, it does. It's on Second Reading."
- Jaffe: "And it should be First Legislative Day at this particular point."
- Speaker Daniels: "No, we haven't completed it yet.

  Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, allowing the Clerk any time he may need this evening, I now move the House stand adjourned until tonorrow morning at 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Daniels: "With five minutes for the Clerk, the Gentleman's Motion is that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned till 10:00 o'clock tomorrow."
- Clerk Leone: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills: House
  Bill 1921, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend the Boiler and
  Pressure Vessel Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill.
  House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #27:
  Vinson, et al, Resolved by the House of Representatives of
  the Eighty-Second General Assembly, the State of Illinois,
  the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted
  to the electors of this state for adoption or rejection at
  the general election next occurring at least six months
  after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to
  amend Section 11 of Article IX of the Constitution to read
  as follows: (Article IX): Section 11: Limitations on Total
  of State Taxes, on the Share Committed to Local Governments

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

and on Ad Valorem Property Taxes-Prohibition of Mandate of Local Programs Without State Funding-Prohibitions (sic, Provisions) of Mandate of Local Programs Without State Punding-Prohibitions (sic, Provisions) for the Transfer of Programs: (a) There is hereby established a limit on the taxes imposed by the General Assembly for any fiscal year. The state shall not impose taxes of any kind which, together with all other revenues of the state, except revenues received from the Federal Government, revenues received by the state revolving funds, receipts from sale general obligation bonds and contributions to and earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer, shall exceed 8.5% of the average annual personal income of Illinois on the next to last full calendar year preceeding the calendar year in which the fiscal begins and the prior two calendar years. Personal income of Illinois' is the total income received by persons in Illinois from all sources, including transfer payments as defined and officially reported by the United States of Commerce or its successor Department agency. expenses of State Government shall be incurred anv year which exceed in amount the revenue limit fiscal established by this Section. (b) For any fiscal year in the event of total revenues of the state exceed the revenue limit established in Subsection (a) of this Section, this excess shall be transferred to a Budget Stabilization in the State Treasury. Emergency expenditures from the Budget Stabilization Fund may be made only if following conditions are met: 1. The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency. 2. The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency and dollar amount of the emergency and 3. The General Assembly thereafter declares an emergency in accordance with the

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each House. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each House. 'Total Revenues of the State' means all public funds received by the state but does not include revenues received from the Government, revenues received by the state's revolving funds, receipts from the sale of general obligation bonds, nor the contributions to and earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer. If it is determined that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund is less the amount needed to meet an emergency situation, taxes in excess of the limit established in Subsection (a) of this Section may be imposed and collected only if all of the following conditions are met: 1. The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency. 2. The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency dollar amound of emergency and the method by which the emergency will be funded: and 3. Upon receiving the request of the General Assembly declares an emergency in accordance with the specifications of the Governor's request by a Resolution adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Members The Bills providing for the elected to each House. appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed by a two-thirds vote of the Members elected to each House. The emergency must be declared in accordance with these procedures prior to incurring of any of the expense which constitutes the specific emergency requests. The revenue limitation may be exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is declared; in subsequent fiscal years the revenue limit of Subsection (a) of this Section shall again take effect. An emergency shall not be

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

declared in two successive fiscal years without the approval of the Majority of the qualified electors of the state voting thereon. Income earned from the maintained in the Budget Stabilization Fund shall accrue to (c) For any fiscal year in the event that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund exceeds 2% of limit established by Subsection revenue (a) Ωf this shall provide General Assembly for Section. the distribution of the excess funds in the form of the reducing or the rebating of state taxes. (d) There hereby established a limit on the ad valorem taxes levied on real property by units of local government and school The total yield resulting from the application districts. of the state tax rate for any tax year to the assessed valuation of real property as finally equalized for that year, excluding the value of new construction and improvements and properties added by annexation, shall not exceed a percentage increase over the yield in the previous year for the first year of implementation and the maximum yield computed for the current year under this Subsection in each subsequent year in excess of 75% of the average percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index, all items for the United States as defined and reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, or its successor agency, for the last full calendar year prior to the date of the unit of local government school district levies such taxes and the prior two calendar years. If the total yield exceeds this limit tax rate applied to the equalized assessed valuation shall be reduced to produce a yield which reflects no more than limit established by this Subsection. The revised tax rate shall then be applied to the equalized assessed valuation of new construction and improvements and property

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

added by annexation. The limitation of this Subsection shall not apply to taxes imposed for the payment of principle and interest on bonds or other evidence of payments of assessments indebtedness or and for the contract obligations in anticipation of which bonds are issued which are authorized prior to the effective date of this Section. The limitations of this Subsection shall apply to home rule units; however, a home rule unit may, by a Majority vote of the qualified electors of the home rule unit voting thereon, determine that the provisions of this Subsection do not apply to their home rule unit. rule unit may subsequently determine that the provisions of this Subsection shall apply by a Majority vote of the qualified electors of the home rule unit voting thereon. The tax rate of a unit of local government or school district may be increased to yield revenue extending the established by this Subsection only with limits the approval of the Majority of th qualified electors of the of local government or school districts voting thereon. If such an increase is approved, then the total yield including the new tax rate shall be used to determine the limitation in the succeeding year. The governing board a unit of local government or school district may, by a two-thirds vote of the Members elected or appointed, declare an emergency situation. The declaration of such emergency shall be specific in nature, containing dollar amount necessary and the method by which the emergency will be funded. When an emergency is declared, taxes in excess of the limit established by this Subsection may be imposed and collected. The revenue limitation may be exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is declared. In subsequent fiscal years the revenue limit in this Subsection shall again take effect, as though the

68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

emergency had not been declared. An emergency shall not be in two successive fiscal years without the approval of Majority of the qualified electors of the unit of local government or school district voting thereon. (e) Whenever by law or by court order the responsibility for defraying the cost of a program is transferred from one unit of government to another unit of government, the total yield established by the Section for the unit of government which such responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately increased and the total yield established by this Section for the unit of government from which such responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately decreased. (£) The General Assembly shall by prescribe the manner by which any unit of local government or school district created after the effective date of this shall determine the limits established in Section Subsection (d) of this Section during the first year of its existence. No new unit of local government or school district shall be created after the effective date of this Section, except by the approval of the Majority of the qualified electors of this proposed unit of local government or school district voting thereon. **(g)** For any fiscal year that proportion of the state expenditures paid to all units of local government and school districts shall not be reduced below the proportion paid to all units of local government and school districts in fiscal year 1982. The state shall appropriate funds to each unit of (h) local government and school district to reimburse it for the full costs for mandates enacted after the effective date of this Section. However, where the General is required to enact legislation or comply with a federal mandate, the state shall be exempt from the requirement of reimbursing a unit of local government and school district

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

State mandates for which for the cost of the mandate. funds are not appropriated to reimburse units of local government and school districts are void until such time as No unit of local the required funds are appropriated. qovernment or school district shall be required to implement any mandate enacted after the effective date this Section unless that mandate is the result of a federal or court mandate or funds are appropriated for the unit of local government or school district for the cost of mandate, as determined by the General Assembly. The limits established by Subsection (d) of this Section shall not apply to new or expanded federal or court mandates. (i) General Assembly shall provide by law for the The οf this implementation of the provisions Section. Schedule: If approved by the electors, this Amendment takes effect July 1 next occurring after its adoption. First Reading of this Constitutional Amendment... Introduction and First Reading: House Joint Resolution 43, Madigan, et al, Committee on Assignment. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15: Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, there shall be submitted to the electors of the state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 1 of Article VIII of the Constitution to read as follows: Article VIII Finance: Section 1: General Provisions: (a) Funds' means any funds belonging to the government which are held by or are under the control of any public official in any branch or instrumentality of government. funds, property or credit shall be used only for public purposes. No instrumentality of government may receive,

### 68th Legislative Day

June 22, 1981

hold, expend or use funds which are not public funds except as provided by law or ordinance. The state, units of local government and school districts shall incur obligations for payment or make payments of public funds only as authorized by law or ordinance. (c) Reports and records of the obligation, receipt and use of public funds of the state, units of local government and school districts are public records available for the inspection of public according to law. Second Reading of this Constitutional Amendment as amended on Third Reading. No further business. The House now stands adjourned till June 23rd, Tuesday at 10:00 a.m."

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 22, 1981

PAGE 1

HB-1921	1ST	READING	PAGE	208
SB-0017	2ND	READING	PAGE	117
SB-0059	2ND	READING	PAGE	129
SB-0060	2ND	READING	PAGE	138
SB-0062	2ND	READING	PAGE	141
SB-0068	2ND	READING	PAGE	148
SB-0089	2ND	READING	PAGE	150
SB-0115	2ND	READING	PAGE	172
SB-0137	2ND	READING	PAGE	149
SB-0143	2ND		PAGE	173
				175-208
SB-0160	2ND	READING	PAGE	100
SB-0202	2ND	READING	PAGE	
SB-0274	3RD	READING	PAGE	40
SB-0308	2ND	READING	PAGE	43
SB-0309	2ND	READING	PAGE	61
SB-0311	2ND	READING	PAGE	41
SB0312	2ND	READING	PAGE	62
SB-0314	2ND	READING	PAGE	41
SB-0315	2ND	READING	PAGE	72
SB-0316	3RD	READING	PAGE	12
SB-0318	3RD	READING	PAGE	13
SB-0319	2ND	READING	PAGE	42
SB-0321	3RD	READING	PAGE	<b>1</b> 5
SB-0322	3RD	READING	PAGE	16
SB-0323	3RD	READING	PAGE	17
SB-0324	3RD	READING	PAGE	17
SB-0325	3RD	READING	PAGE	18
SB-0329	2ND		PAGE	42
SB-0330	2ND	READING	PAGE	91
SB-0331	2ND	READING	PAGE	91
SB-0332	2ND		PAGE	94
SB-0333	3RD		PAGE	19
SB-0334	3RD	READING	PAGE	20
SB-0335	3RD		PAGE	22
SB-0336	3RD		PAGE	24
SB-0337	3RD	READING	PAGE	29
SB-0338	3RD	READING	PAGE	33
SB-0340	2ND	READING	PAGE	95
SB-0341	3RD	READING	PAGE	34
SB-0342	3RD		PAGE	39
		READING		43
SB-0343	2ND		PAGE	96
SB-0344	2ND	READING	PAGE	
SB-0423		READING	PAGE	112
SB-0568	2ND	READING	PAGE	104
SB-0697	3RD	READING	PAGE	4
SB-0730	2ND	READING	PAGE	109
SB-0853	2ND	READING	PAGE	101
SB0955	2ND	READING	PAGE	9
SB-1111	2ND	READING	PAGE	102
SB-1201	2ND	READING	PAGE	102
	2ND	READING	PAGE	116
	2ND	READING	PAGE	138
HR-0043	1st	READING	PAGE	214
*HJR-0015	3RD	READING	PAGE	215
*HJR-0027	1ST	READING	PAGE	208

### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND WARTON	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE KLEME	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4

JUNE 22, 1981

### SUBJECT MATTER

AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGR	3
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	53
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	104
MOTION - OVERRULE THE CHAIR	PAGE	180
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	208

PAGE 2