74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order. The Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Tzortzis of the St. Anthony's Hellenic Orthodox Church in Springfield, Illinois. Reverend."
- Reverend Tzortzis: "...Let us be our God always, now, and ever unto ages and ages. Amen. Holy God, in all humility, we pray to You for the source of wisdom, bless and plan perfect health of mind and body the State Representatives and all loyal officers of our government. Direct our thoughts, Lord, in the way of truth, 'in the way to not order and enforce those things that are true, those things that are pure, those things that are just,towards all excellence and virtue. Enlighten them to govern and to lead our people in the ways of Your Excellence for You are holy now and ever and unto ages and ages. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. We will be lead with the Pledge today by Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "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. ...Be the Calendar under page one under Senate Bills Third Reading. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 164 Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. Page one on the Calendar under the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 232. Representative Richmond. Is it on page Page two of the Calendar. Representative Reilly, would you come to the podium please? Representative Richmond in the chamber? Does that mean he's not here, Representative House McClain? Out of the record. Bill Representative Bradley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- Out of the record. House Bill 234, Representative Keane. Representative Keane is here ready to do business. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 234, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors, state colleges and universities, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the annual appropriation for the Board of Governors, state colleges and universities. I'd be happy...it comprises...agrees with the Governor's budget level. I would be happy to answer any questions. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question...the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 234 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', two voting 'no', one voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 237, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 237, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the State Scholarship Commission's OCE. It is \$125,123,400. It came from the Senate at \$122,241,500. The House added \$3,000,000 for the awards, and it is still 3.4 million less than it was when it was originally introduced and I would ask for the favorable vote and move the passage of Senate Bill 237."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 237 pass?' Representative Hastert."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Wolf: "Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? Representative, was there an award included in here in the Senate side that put in the only actual scholarship that we give, the award for valedictorians in each high school in the state? Do you know? Was that put back in?"

Wolf: "\$4,000,000."

Hastert: "Thank you."

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

Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 237 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 150 voting 'aye', two voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby passed. Going back to the first Bill on the Calendar, Senate Bill...or House Bill...Senate Bill 232. Representative Richmond. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 232, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 232 makes and appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Southern Illinois University for FY '82. The Bill represents a 5.1% increase in general revenue over FY '81. It was introduced at the funding level recommended by the Board of Higher Education. It was reduced twice in the Senate and now represents an increase slightly below the Governor's budget. It is

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- consistent with the funding levels and the Bills of the other universities. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 232 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 140 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 271, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 271, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Advisory Council, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Alright, this is the OCE for the Legislative Boards and Commissions. The total amount is \$1,112,554, an increase over last year of 9.2%. This is, pardon me, the total is \$13,174,683. The last figure I gave you is the changes, so an increase of 9.2%. This is identical to HB 830 which failed to pass the House last May for obvious reasons. I would ask the support of the Members of the House."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Ewell. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 271 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 107 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 238, Representative Wikoff."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 238, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the retirement of persons of higher education institutions and agencies, Third Reading of the Bill."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Wikoff to explain the Bill so we can discuss it." Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask leave of the House to take this back to Second Reading. Amendment #3 that we put on the other day was technically incorrect, and I would like to take that back and table that Amendment. We have a proper Amendment."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to take Senate Bill 238 back to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 238 is now on the Order of Second Reading."

Wikoff: "I would move..."

- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments...any Motions filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3 to Senate
 Bill 238."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 238 is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, J.J. Wolf, amends Senate Bill 238 as amended."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on Amendment #4."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This deletes the retirement contributions for the state geological natural history and water surveys by \$1,000,000. The appropriation is included already in the Institute of Natural Resources appropriation, so it is not needed. Amendment #3 is technically incorrect. But this does the job. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Wikoff, you want to comment? The adoption...the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 238. All

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I would like to ask leave in order to move this along. This has corrected what the problem was. Leave to have this heard immediately."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to have Senate Bill 238 heard immediately and suspend the appropriate rules. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted.

Representative Wikoff on Senate Bill 238."

Wikoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Representative."

Wikoff: "Sorry."

Speaker Ryan: "Leave on the Attendance Roll Call for the last Motion."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 238 appropriates \$1,248,000 from the state pension fund of the Board of the Trustees for all of the state universities retirement systems. And it has some other monies in there to the various university and governing Boards and agencies for employer contributions. I'd move for the adoption of it."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 238 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', 14 voting 'no', five voting 'present', and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We have a problem with the machine. We're going to have to run this one again. Alright, on Senate Bill 238 there are 125 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', five voting 'present', and this Bill having

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 315, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 315."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the appropriation. It is \$3,557,300 for the Delinquency Prevention Commission for their FY '82 budget. This is \$72,200 less than their 1981 appropriation. There is also a reduction in head count, number of employees. They were at 97 during the last fiscal year. That has been reduced to 85 this fiscal year, and I would ask the favorable vote of the Members of this House and move the passage of Senate Bill 315."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I, for one, don't want to stall any agency appropriations, but on Senate Bill 315 I would like the Membership to know that this House was correct, I believe, in tabling Committee Amendment #1 by Motion of Representative Bullock. That had to do with the elimination October 1 of 15 positions and transferring \$244,500 to a grant and aid section. Many of us felt that that may have been for retribution in the fact that the...some people in the Commission did oppose executive order #1. I would like the executive director of the Commission, Joan Mitchell, know that many of us believe in the community approach on the matter of delinquency. We don't think in any way that anybody ought to be punished for what they did in opposition to executive order #1. I strongly feel that this budget ought to be approved. However, by approving it with a bare minimum of votes, I think we would be

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

telling her that we are willing to protect those who voluntarily and on conviction did oppose executive order I...I hear she is out of town this weekend, but nevertheless, I think if we approve this budget by the bare minimum votes, that she'll get the message that we, as a Legislature, have some input in legislative intent. want to protect those 15 members, and we're going to show protection even though we believe in Committee Amendment #1 and the tabling of it. We're going to protect them by giving the bare minimum of votes, I would hope, and show her that we are going to protect them. So I am going to vote 'aye' unless it gets too many, and then I am going to vote 'no'. So that is my message to Joan Mitchell. And I would hope that others follow particularly on this side of the aisle for so many who I also know who believe in the community approach delinquency prevention."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to thank John for his kind remarks with regard to the Lady's Commission. However, I wasn't going to speak to that issue. I just simply wanted to ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Ryan: "Did you say you'd like to question the Sponsor, Representative Huff?"

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates that he will try and respond to your questions."

Huff: "Alright. Well, Representative Wolf, I was listening to you when you were breaking down, or making the break out on the appropriation to Mrs...to the Commission on Delinquency Prevention. Well, I'm not clear. You quoted some figures that had been taken out. What percentage portion does that

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

represent, Representative Wolf? Or do you have that?"

Wolf: "Well, it is \$72,200 out of \$3,500,000. I don't have a calculator, but..."

Huff: "Okay, well, I have a sensible portion. I would just like to say that in keeping with the Governor's urging for fiscal responsibility, I would like to say that this agent...agency has been dealt with fairly, and I think that a proof of the advocacy of the director of this agency, I think they will be able to do a continued job in the community on this amount. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Ryan: "His same response. He said he would respond."

Wolf: "I would be delighted to answer a question."

Leverenz: "Do you still have the Amendment on that deletes the \$12,500 for the attorney?"

Wolf: "Yes."

Leverenz: "Yes. It just so happens that the attorney that denied the Chairman and also a supervisor, 'Brunson', in the agency, or recommended that they do not send contracts, state contracts onto Legislators that request to see those contracts, offices or shares a suite for his legal work with the wife of the Chairman of the Commission. She is also an attorney, and that is just coincidence, I am sure. But I just wanted to make sure the Amendment was there. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

suite."

Leverenz: "Should I ask him? Is that an office or an apartment?"
Wolf: "It is in the Loop. I don't know if it is an office or an
apartment. I was told they happen to share the same

Leverenz: "Must denote multiple rooms 'if it fits out right'."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Johnson, do you seek recognition?"

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Johnson: "Yeah, I move the previous question."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf to close."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I believe everybody has gotten up and supported this. The \$12,500 is out as was asked by the last question. I would, just then, move the passage and adoption of Amendment...Senate Bill 315."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 315 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. How's that, John? On this...Representative Peters."
- Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I kind of fell asleep at the switch. May I be added as 'aye'?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Record Representative Peters as 'aye'. On this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', four voting 'present', and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 328, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 328, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 328 appropriates \$273,700 to the Medical Center Commission for their FY '82 OCE. It came from the Senate at...let's see. Their FY '81 appropriation was \$281,100. As it came now from the House, \$273,700. A difference of reduction of \$7,400 or 2.8% less than it was introduced at, and I would be happy to answer any questions. And if not, then I would move the passage of Senate Bill 328."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Miller."
Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Miller: "What does the Medical Center Commission do, Representative Wolf?"

Wolf: "...In supervising and do the purchasing...land purchasing for the medical center district in the City of Chicago."

Miller: "Thank you very much."

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

Wolf: "Just ask a favorable vote of the House."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 328 pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', five voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 339, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 339, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses, the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and the various state agencies that participate in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Statewide Plan Program, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, on Senate Bill 339."

Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and to various state agencies which participate in that Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This particular agency came under particularly heavy scrutiny by the Appropriations Committee. The amount now is \$26,137,700. That is \$1,090,900 in GRF. Most of the money is \$25,045,800 is federal dollars. This is a reduction of 33.5% from FY '81.

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- And from the way it was introduced we have reduced it by \$1,161,600 or 4.3 less than the original appropriation that was introduced."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Representative Wolf, I haven't been on the Appropriations Committee for a couple terms. Can you tell me if all this money they're spending, if they've made any dent in the crime rate?"
- Wolf, J.J.: "Well, what they're doing is mostly administering grants. As you may or may not know this agency is probably going to be phased out by 1983. That is their sole function at this time to be reviewing the grants. To be auditing the grants. They did start up a new division last November which we felt violated legislative intent. We have eliminated those five positions. We have transferred their operation to the Department of Law Enforcement where we think it would be better supervised and take care of their phasing out. And we gave them four months of funding. I can't read it from here, Mr...."
- Giorgi: "I noticed in the <u>Tribune</u> today that the headline is 'City Suburb Crime Rate Increasing'. I just mention that because I've been around here for a number of years. The more money we seem to spend with the Law Enforcement Commission, Department of Law Enforcement putting IBI guys in the field. It seems to me the more money we spend the more the crime rate escalates. I remember when I was here for years they tell that the skim from the underworld was into billions of dollars and you know, we've got nine tracks running in Illinois. We have the lottery. We have bingo. We don't get anywhere near the amounts of money that this underworld army is picking up and I'm wondering if they've made a dent in the underworld gambling, for

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

example."

- Wolf, J.J.: "Well, those are difficult, I guess, to measure.

 Like I say, most of this is federal grant dollars that

 comes down for delinquency prevention program. Some of it

 goes in for..."
- Giorgi: "It's very humorous when we passed the lottery and I said last night the lottery is going to grow one billion dollars by next year, one billion dollars and the people that run the lottery tell me we haven't done anything to underworld gambling. I thought the Law Enforcement Commission, the IBI and the State Police were going to do something about it. Do you mean to tell me that all these millions we've spent and all these new sophisticated crime fighting equipment we have not been able to put the hoodlums on the run yet?"
- Wolf, J.J.: "Well, you have to understand, Mr. Giorgi, that the hoodlums, I guess, are pretty smart hoodlums and they are difficult to apprehend. I do concur with you. I was a supporter of the lottery as you know."
- Giorgi: "I want to put in the record again that all this money you spent, they still could not track a bleeding elk in true snow."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

 Leverenz: "Than you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I wish to compliment the Republican and Democratic staff people and the members of the Appropriations Committee for working on this budget for all of the problems that have come up going through the appropriations process. And at the end result of moving this agency under the umbrella of the Department of Law Enforcement has been confirmed as the right thing to do by the Federal LEAA which passes on the money in the first place. And to my distinguished colleague from Rockford on

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

this side of the aisle, it is the pass through federal dollars that go to locals that are unable to put the hoodlums on the run so to speak. And that was a different problem. With this agency and the action we are taking is most responsible and will actually be what the federal government will do with agencies of this type in all states. I share Representative Wolf's concern. I think, though, that we should send the proper message here with putting on a minimum of votes for this agency's budget to pass. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, too, want to compliment both the Democratic and Republican staffs. This is one of the most difficult agencies that we had to come before the Appropriations Committee. and Carter before him had begun to phase out all of the monies that we are spending federa 11y in enforcement administration. I think they found out and I agree with them that we are wasting so much money in bureaucracy in the name of law enforcement and law enforcement enforcement. This.. you know, we Legislators get wrapped if we go to one trip out of state. Just one trip and you're wrapped even if it may be a hundred dollar Yet, the Appropriations Committee found that this agency had spent in one fiscal year over twenty-eight thousand dollars in out-of-state trips. The next year another close to thirty thousand dollars in out-of-state trips. And I think that you'll find all across the country so much money has been wasted in these so called Law Enforcement Commissions and much more good would be done by hiring extra policemen, law enforcement personnel in the enforcement of law. I think this is

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

another agency that, in spite of the fact that we as an Appropriation Committee, I think, did the very thing that we ought to do by transferring the administration of this agency to the Department of Law Enforcement. This is another agency that should not be passed out of here with an overwhelming number or both the Governor and those who are now in ILIC might take it wrongly. I take it as a fact that we don't like the way that it has been administered. I personally don't like the fact that the Executive Director was making all kinds of political calls because we, as an Appropriations Committee were doing what. responsibly. We were acting responsibly because of they were doing irresponsibly. So I know that this Bill should be passed. It should be transferred to enforcement but I don't think it should get an overwhelming number of votes."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder. Could we have a little order in the chamber, please? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Schraeder: "Representative Wolf, does this cover any appropriation to local 'mig' units throughout the state?"

Wolf, J.J.: "No, to local what?"

Schraeder: "'Mig' units. Narcotic units."

Wolf, J.J.: "No, not in this appropriation."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

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

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, to close."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

the distinguished minority spokesman pointed out and as I said earlier we did probably spend more time in our staff more hours reviewing this particular agency and it's true that their travel was quite extensive. We have cut them down considerably. I think there's only about \$9,000 or so left in travel. But I would say one thing. Because of the cuts that we made and the action taken the Appropriations Committee I would say don't just send this out with the bare minimum number of votes. If it wasn't for the action we took I would agree with that. But they may misconstrue that as if the House does not approve of the action which we took. And I hope that is not misunderstood. So, I would urge that we have a strong vote to show approval for the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee which was particularly hard on this particular agency. And I would move the passage of Senate Bill 339."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 339 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 113 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill, received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We've got a new vote on that Bill. On Senate Bill 339, there are 115 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Daniels in the chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, may I be recorded *aye* on Senate Bill 315?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady asks for leave. Does she have leave?

Any objections? There are objections, Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Balanoff. File a slip and we'll see what we can do. Alright, Senate Bill 339, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Excuse me, Senate Bill 344, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 344, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State, and Southern Illinois University for permanent improvements, grants, and related purposes, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a reappropriation of Capital Development Board for various permanent improvement Capital projects which is part of their...CDB's FY 82 budget request. This is \$2,031,635,980. Included ín that. οf course, is \$1,294,265,000 for road programs. These are the capital projects reappropriation for projects that have already been approved. Some are already in the...in the stages of Some of the planning has been done, and this completion. is a continuation of those projects, and it is necessary for us to reappropriate this money in order to continue the projects which were earlier approved by this General This was passed out by the Appropriations Assembly. by a unanimous vote, 20 to nothing, and I would solicit your votes."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 344. Any discussion? Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "What is the total appropriation in this Bill now by the Department or agency?"

Wolf: "I have it by fund. I don't have it by agency. I can give it to you by fund if you like."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Kane: "Well, that would be a first step."

Wolf: "Okay, alright, general revenue, \$17,432,083. The road fund I already gave you, one billion two hundred and ninety...road projects, one billion..."

Kane: "How much...how much for road projects?"

Wolf: "\$1,294,265,000. Wait a minute, \$1,294,265,000."

Kane: "Does that represent..."

Wolf: "That includes DOT's rehab now."

Kane: "Okay. Does that include the road program at current revenue projections, or with new taxes?"

Wolf: "These are all reappropriations."

Kane: "How much of that..."

Wolf: "All these were improved, you know, earlier."

Kane: "How much of that \$1,300,000,000 will actually be spent this year? What is the cash flow that this budget entails?"

Wolf: "These are for projects that have been obligated and are already underway. How much will be completed is always a question mark. You never can tell. You have something underway, you get bad weather where they can't work on the road construction. Then, of course, there are some delays in that."

Kane: "Well, just an estimate."

Wolf: "75 - 80% possibly."

Kane: "75 - 80% is going to go out this year, or 75 - 80% is not going out this year?"

Wolf: "Will be obligated."

Kane: "No, no, will be spent. Cash flow. Out, not obligated."

Wolf: "Well, as I said, it is difficult, you know, to estimate.

It could be maybe half of that money depending, you know,
on the weather. Any construction delays."

Kane: "What's been the historical experience then? What is the relationship between cash..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

June 28, 1981

74th Legislative Day "Maybe 40 to 50%." Wolf:

Kane: "Well, what, \$300,000,000?"

"\$350 approximately." Wolf:

Kane: "So about \$350,000,000 will go out out of an appropriation of 1.3 billion."

Wolf: "Yeah. One of the problems you have, Sir, is that you have to obligate the entire project in order to get any work done at all. You obligate the project, you signed the contracts, you get it underway."

Kane: "Sure, I understand that. I guess what I am thinking is that we need as a Body is to have some idea of how much money is being spent and not just how much is being obligated. I think both numbers are important. What about the other funds."

Wolf: "Alright, well, I have been advised that probably about maybe 40...30 - 40%...about 40%? About 40% of it would actually be spent."

Kane: "Okay, what about the other funds?"

"What can be spent is what is sold...actually sold in bonds Wolf: which will be approximately \$380,000,000."

"About \$380,000,000 in bonds will be projected to be sold Kane: this year?"

Wolf: "For FY '82, yes, Sir."

"Okay, is that highway bonds or CDB bonds or everything?" Kane:

Wolf: "Total."

"Total. Can you break those down for us?" Kane:

"No, cannot." Wolf:

"Okay, how much do you expect...how much is appropriated Kane: out of the capital development bonds?"

Wolf: "Capital development reappropriation?"

Kane: "Yes, reapprop and new approp."

"A little over \$454,000,000. Hold on, that Wolf: the reapprop. Just a minute. \$598,000,000 total."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Kane: "\$598.000.000."

Wolf: "Yeah, approximately \$600,000,000."

Kane: "Anything else besides general revenue and road fund and capital development? What else is in this Bill?"

Wolf: "You say anything besides road fund and capital development? Is that your question?"

Kane: "Yes."

Wolf: "Yeah, grade crossing protection, \$13,800,000. School construction about \$50,000,000. And a contributory trust about \$1,100,000."

Kane: "Thank you. May I address..."

Wolf: "And then some other about \$3,300,000 in others."

Kane: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, can I address this Bill for..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Kane: "...Just a minute. Last night when we were contemplating the new authorization for increasing the general obligation bonds of the state, we were told by the Sponsor of that Bill that it was the intention of the administration to slow down OB bond financing. Today we have the appropriation, and I don't intend to vote against this appropriation, but I do want to point out to you that contrary to the statements made last night in terms of authorization and authorization of bonds is administration does not have any intention to slow down its deficit financing in this state. Nor we have heard an awful lot about what you do with deficit financing. ¥e have heard an awful lot about the federal government and that the federal government should not be running into debt. We have to balance the federal budget. Well, I would like to say that if you have an out of balance state budget, if you go into deficit financing at the state level, it has exactly the same effect on the economy as

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

deficit financing at the federal level. Deficit financing is deficit financing. And it has the same effect on the And if we are going to get inflation into line, economy. we can't just stand here and pass Resolutions asking the federal government to stop its deficit financing and stop going into debt and stop creating new money. what we are doing here at the state level is that we are deficit financing. This will be approximately the eighth straight year that we will be selling \$400,000,000 plus, or approximately \$400,000,000 worth of bonds. That is an That is an awful lot of debt awful lot of money. And I think that before we proceed and before we go on and keep on adding to the debt structure of the state that we slow this down and we tell the administration that debt financing and going into debt at the state level has exactly the same effect as it does at the federal And if we're going to hold inflation in line, not only can we ask the federal government to hold its expenditures in line, we have to hold our expenditures in line too. And I would urge you to look very, very carefully at the kind of increased debt financing that we were asked to do last night."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Henry."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Henry: "Representative Wolf, I understand there is \$1,526,798,000 earmarked for highways. Now, how much of the one billion five will be spent downstate?"

Wolf: "I think it will be approximately around 60%. Let me check with staff and see if that is right. Yeah, about 60% downstate and 40% for Cook."

Henry: "40% of the \$1,500,000,000 would be spent in Cook county?"
Wolf: "In the six county area."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Henry: "In the six collar county area? The \$17,028,000 on township ridge programs, how much of that money would be spent in the six county area?"
- Wolf: "Very little. It is for township road...bridges, so it would be very little."
- Henry: "Representative, of the \$13,800,000 on grade crossing protection programs, how much of that money would be spent in or around the City of Chicago?"
- Wolf: "Okay, I am not sure exactly the number of grade crossings around, but it would probably be pretty close to half."
- Henry: "Is that a guess or is that a fact?"
- Wolf: "It is an approximation, Sir."
- Henry: "So, can you give me a fact on the amount of the \$13,000,000 to be spent in or around the City of Chicago?

 You don't have those figures or you don't have the locations?"
- Wolf: "No, I don't, because I don't have the exact number of grade crossings that there are. But I think...and how many of them are bad, so you know, we'd have to figure from the number you had and how many were in bad repair or, you know, not safe. But I think about half would be a pretty good guestimate."
- Henry: "The population, I am told, in the six collar area of Cook, of Chicago, is 60%. As you, as I understand that you're speaking of, we will receive in that particular area an approximate 40%, and you can't tell me the number of grade crossing protection programs that we have plenty of problems in the City of Chicago with that. Now the next question, there's \$19,000,000 earmarked for water resources. Could you explain that?"
- Wolf: "Whatever the water resources capital projects that were earlier approved by this General Assembly, that is what they are for their reappropriation."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Henry: "Are there any in the Chicago or six collar county?"

Wolf: "Almost all of these would be in the Chicago area. Very few of these are downstate. The majority are in the Chicago six county area."

Henry: "The water resources are the majority of the six collar area? Representative Wolf, let me bring to your attention Amendment #11 of 344 and Amendment #10. They both are saying the same thing technically. Amendment #10 seeks to reappropriate \$43,000 to the Department of Military and Naval for the planning of a new armory at north Riverside, and Amendment #11 restores \$43,000 to the capital development bond. Could you explain that?"

Wolf: "Yeah, the Amendment failed. It is not in there."

Henry: "Amendment #11 failed or Amendment #10?"

Wolf: "One was withdrawn and the other failed."

Henry: "Thank you wery much. Could I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle have been preaching all Session on the constraints in spending. And I would like to point out that the prior Representative, Doug Kane, hit the nail right on the head. We are expected to hold back spending on day care centers. We are expected to hold back spending on Medicaid and Medicare. We are expected to hold back spending on education. But don't be fooled that these bonds, if they are going to float through the Capital Development Board, will not one day come to haunt all of us. And I would suggest to the Members of the House of Representatives that they take a real good look at some of the things that are being requested through House Bill 344."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bill 344 reappropriation for Capital Senate is a Bill 345 is for Development Board. Senate And my remarks would go toward both of the appropriations. We are, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in our ninth year since the creation of the Capital Development 1972. And the use of Capital Development Board Act in Board bonds to finance capital construction has risen greatly. CD bonds have come in even larger payment each fiscal year in principle and interest payments. Starting in FY '73 when we paid, and that is our first fiscal year, we paid \$1,391,901 in interest, nothing in principle. have increased to the point, nine years later in this fiscal year 1981, we are paying \$51,048,100 in And \$41,700,000 in principle. And each year yet paying more in interest than in principle. As you all know, debt payments have become a very serious problem in state government, and I commend those who are addressing problem. Let us examine for a moment the cost implications of only one project. And I should tell the Members of this House, after this Bill came to Committee, some Members came to me and both sides of the aisle. So am not too surprised that the CDB authorization Bill did not get the required 107 votes last night, because this is matter of concern on both sides of the aisle. Let us take the cost implications of only one project. of Illinois Building in Chicago. That project is budgeted for \$120,000,000. And it will take another \$25,000,000 equip the building. Illinois taxpayers, for that one project, will pay \$250,000,000 in principle and interest to construct that building. I'll get back to the Illinois Building in just one moment. Another issue that has been touched on, and we touched on it in last year's Appropriation Committee meeting, and it is a continuing

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

problem that still has not been resolved. I am sure that all of you are aware of the fact that 13 community colleges in Illinois have been the victims of serious construction deficiencies on CDB projects. CDB is involved legal suits against contractors in some of those community college projects. Meanwhile, each day that these drag on in legal limbo, the projected costs to repair the deficiencies increase. And in some cases, inaction will mean that the cost of the project will increase and in some cases, like in my community College in Lake County, it will mean that structural damage will also increase. Now back to the State of Illinois Building. That has been planned by CDB to be Illinois' glass showcase. In the end, this may result in the world's largest greenhouse to which the taxpayers may end up throwing rocks. I have been told, and by the way, this is not from Members just on my side of the aisle, that this may be a project that may end up being the embarrassment not only of the Capital Development Board, but maybe all of us in the Legislature. and I want to get down to the point that I think all of us ought to be concerned about it. Too often when we get to the matter of projects, they aren't always bid on like they should be. There has been some indication to me after this left the Committee that the bidding with regards to the State of Illinois Building was not done properly and the specifications were drawn...Remember last year and the year before where so many of us talked about the Illinois Plan? Buy Illinois, buy USA. I understand that the specs were drawn on the State of Illinois wherein they couldn't put any glass anywhere in the State of Illinois nor in this country. That they had to purchase from out of this country. I understand that some of the bidding was not done prior to the...with regard to the Illinois

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Purchasing Act. One of the Members said to me that it is so serious in that person's opinion...in that Legislator's opinion, that we ought to have an Illinois Investigating Commission investigation of the State of Illinois Building. One of the Members said to me that there may correlation with regards to the State of Illinois project and campaign contributions to the Governor's campaign. don't know about that, but I know enough to know that this matter ought to have further study. I know enough that many Members are concerned that the CDB even isn't run by the Capital Development Board, that more of it is run by the Bureau of the Budget and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who, in my experience here in the Legislature, doesn't know much about building, doesn't know much about roads, and surely knows nothing about human services. think it is about time that the Legislature has some input on the Capital Development Board, on projects. We sit here like dummies. We sit here so often because it might be one political Party or the other and say, 'Let's approve this or approve that'. I would hope that some of you would like to back up the Legislature for a change. And that is all I'm doing when I stand here. None of us have any input in the decisions, and I think it is about time. going to vote for either one of these Bills because I think the Legislature has zero input into the whole process."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

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

Wolf: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me try to clarify a few points here. There has been many statements made, and for those of you who are

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

maybe not familiar with what we're really talking about, let me combine my closing remarks to specifically what this This is not asking for any new bonding authority. All this particular Bill is to reappropriate dollars for projects that have already been approved by the General Assembly and approved by the administration. approve projects, generally it takes about three or four years to spend it out. And the road projects which were brought up, these are paid off as the work progresses. And that is why it is not all spent at one time. You don't pay anybody before the job is finished. And if you have trouble putting this in perspective, if you go out to buy a or an automobile, what do you do? Very few people home can go out and afford to write a check for the entire amount. You finance it. And that is exactly what this is. And it is not reappropriating, not asking for any new What we're asking for here is to bonding authority. reappropriate dollars for projects that have already been approved by the General Assembly that are already under There was a point made about the community construction. colleges, well, they were inherited from the Illinois Building Authority. But if your feelings on this matter is if you feel that all road construction ought to come to a halt, repair of bridges and railroad crossings should come to a halt, if the construction of the new Revenue Building in Springfield should come to a halt, if \$9,000,000 for the Waukegan harbor project ought to come to a halt, then you ought to vote 'no' on this. But if you think we ought to continue the projects for which we've already authorized, which are already underway and should be completed, then your proper vote and your only vote is to vote 'yes' Senate Bill 344."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Senate Bill 344. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 344 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The Gentleman, Representative Huff, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not to explain my vote, Sir, but to rise on a point of inquiry. I would like to know from the Chair precisely what the number of votes required for passage for this Senate Bill, Mr. Speaker. The reason I raised that question, because it is my understanding that for all revenues that are going to be obligated to the state of this magnitude, it requires a 3/5ths Majority under the 1970 Constitution."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, I thought I..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

"...I thought I tried to make this as clear and as plain as could to Members of the General Assembly. This is a reappropriation of projects that were approved. Now some points were made up. I don't know what particular line of thought was behind the questioning about, you know, the road miles, that 40% of it is spent upstate in the northeastern Illinois area and 60% downstate. Well. where the roads are. I mean, 60% of the road miles are in downstate and about 40% of the road miles are in northeastern Illinois. And if it were...if the converse were true, the money would be spent in the City of Chicago if that is where the highway road miles were. And that is precisely it. I don't think it is any devious scheme to provide more dollars for downstate than it does for Chicago That is where the highway miles are, and that is area. where they are spent. And these are projects that been approved by the General Assembly, and as long as the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

votes were there, and this General Assembly votes for it. You know, I notice whenever we have projects there are always special interest board projects that Members are quite anxious to add on. You're, you know, very quick to add these projects. What we're doing here is put your money where your mouth is. And from the projects that you've approved. If you don't, then I would say that you ought not vote for any more projects. And don't go back home and tell the people in your district how wonderful you are because you're voting to do all these improvements, to build a new harbor in Waukegan, to put in some new grade crossing protections for areas. Don't do that. And forget about putting your press releases out."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff, 89 votes. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those votes who wish? Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I just want to put this in perspective. There has been a number of comments regarding the state's service and how we are continually going into debt for the sale of bonds. For the record, we have passed House Bill 1489, and most of you voted for that Bill. It has passed the Senate and is on its way to the Governor. That will lock in the amount of debt that we can incur to 2.57% of personal income. The figures that were included in that ratio include this appropriation. If those of you are voting because of fear for the state's financial economy in the future, if the Governor signs House Bill 1489, that won't hap...that won't occur. The ratio is a balance of fiscal integrity as well as the needs for construction improvement projects in the State of Illinois. The rating agencies have indicated that with that limitation we maintain a triple A credit rating. So if those of you are

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voting against this Bill because of the fear of what's going to happen in the future, given the signing of House Bill 1489, your fears will not be founded."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are some Legislators who are very much involved in the area of transportation who are voting 'no' on this issue. It seems as if most of the debate has been centered around an Amendment that attached Reading. on Second Ιt would be the reappropriation of dollars for construction throughout the State of Illinois. And I underline the word These are projects that for the last reappropriation. three years, contracts have been issued, construction has been going on in various phases and we've been paying the Bill all along. all throughout those phases construction. Now we're saying to those contractors, 'We're not going to pay you any more. Tough luck'. that is what we're doing when you vote 'no'. You're saying to those road contractors who have completed nearly 75% of those projects, those bids that were left in all areas of the State of Illinois, northern, central, and southern, 'We're not going to pay your bills'. Now, that has got to be irresponsibility."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, we talk about spending the money, we also ought to talk about raising the money. About 65% of the money is raised in the six county area. We don't ever get our share. But yet, I look over there and see that the Republican Party with 91 votes won't even back its own governmental program. Well, I wanted to...and there is one further question I have to ask of the Sponsor. I just want to know what downstate county he is from. Cause all I'm

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

saying is you've got to put your votes where your mouth is.

This is your Bill. Put the votes on it."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am not sure that the Members have looked at the Bill to see where this is going. Funds go here for the Alton Medical Center, for the Elgin Mental Health Center, the McFarlen Mental Health Center, the Zeller Mental Health Zone, Lincoln Developmental Center. Dixon. Mantino. the University of Illinois, for those of you who are interested in funding of the projects at the University of Illinois, for the medical center, for the Rockford Medical Center, for the various armories throughout the state, Vernon, Lawrence, Monmouth, West Frankfort, Northwestern Urbana, Lincoln, Cairo, Delavan, East St. Louis, Effingham. It is all in this Bill. All of it is in this Northern Illinois University. Northeastern Illinois, Western, every one of them is right in this Bill. want to make whatever recommendations you want to make in terms of not voting for this, fine. That is a decision that you've got to make. But it is all in this particular package and it is all stuff that is basically very much important to downstate areas who are looking for this kind of construction for industry, for services to community, for services to people in terms of projects, school projects, mental health projects. got to put up or shut up on this. You can't be for the developmental programs and not be for spending the money to put up the facilities."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Huff is trying to get your attention. For the last ten minutes you allowed him to speak for five minutes on this Bill."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff had an inquiry of the Chair. His inquiry was answered, Representative Henry.

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Huff: "Well, just to remind the Chair, Mr. Speaker, that I am, you know, I hear this articulately all the time that I am entitled to explain my vote. I think that is a courtesy that is reported to all Members."
- Speaker Daniels: "Sir, when you stood up you said you didn't want to. You had an inquiry of the Chair."
- Huff: "No, no, no, no. I just wanted to make an inquiry as the number of votes, and then I want to give some..."
- Speaker Daniels: "We would be happy to hear your explanation, Sir. Proceed."
- "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, my question is not where Huff: the money's going. My question is whether we can afford you remember last night, boys and girls, that in the continuing saga, it was graphically displayed by Representative Kane that the state's bonding debt obligation is around \$8,000,000,000. If we fund this \$1,294,000,000 at the current interest rate, we will be spending something like \$200,000,000 a year on the will that it within a interest. That mean very short...one, or two, three years we will have a obligation somewhere between \$10 and \$11,000,000,000. just add...just put that against what our...the general budget is, around \$14,000,000,000, and you will see that we very close to what Charles Dickens gave is in admonishment about economics..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Finish you remarks, Sir."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, Charles Dickens admonished us about economics when he said this, 'That three pounds and thirty sixpence income against two pounds

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

ninety-five sixpence expenditures the result is happiness. But if you have an income of three pounds and thirty sixpence against an expenditure of four pounds and ninety-five sixpence', Ladies and Gentlemen, 'The result is misery.' And that is exactly what we are courting with if we pass this bonding. We don't have to pass this amount. We can pass a lower amount and still hire those contracts and still fund the things that J.J. Wolf is worried about. But not at no \$1,300,000,000 at an interest rate of almost half a billion dollars every year and a half."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish?"

Huff: "I want a verification on this."

Speaker Daniels: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 101 'aye', 47 'no', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional...Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I would like to verify."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks for a verification. The Gentleman, Representative Wolf, asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Capparelli, DiPrima, Doyle,
Garmisa, Kane, Keane, Margulas, Mautino, Pierce, Redmond,
and Stearney."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Of course, on a verification on a Third Reading Bill, we take off the positive vote. There has been certain Legislators, who in order to have nice, conservative voting records that aren't present, have had their seat mates vote them 'no' the entire morning. Certainly some in my area that are doing so, and I resent it, and I hope that they won't continue to do that in the future."

Speaker Daniels: "Your point is well taken, Sir. Okay, a

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Poll...verification of the Affirmative Roll. Now, Representative Flinn asks leave to be verified, Representative Leverenz. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "First if we could just clear the center aisle and at least hopefully everybody can get in their seat."
- Speaker Daniels: "That is a fair request, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, can we please have order? Members please be in their seats. Those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the rear of the chambers. Will everyone please retire to their chair so we can proceed? The Gentlemen in the center aisle will please retire to the rear of the chambers. Alright. proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Abramson, Alstat, Bartulis. Barkhausen. Barnes. Barr. Bell. Bower, Braun, Bullock, Carey, Christensen, Collins, Conti, Daniels, Darrow, Davis, Deuster, Domico, Jack Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewing, Fawell, Findley, Flinn, Virginia Frederick, Dwight Friedrich, Giorgi, Griffin, Grossi, Hallock, Hallstrom, Hanahan, Hannig, Hastert, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Huskey, Johnson, Karpiel, Jim Kelley, Koehler, Kosinski, Kucharski, Kustra, Lechovicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Macdonald, Mays, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McCormick, McGrew, McMaster, Ted Neyer, Miller, Mulcahey, Oblinger, O'Connell, Ozella, Peters, Piel, Polk, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Riquey, Robbins, Ropp, Saltsman, Sandquist, Schraeder, Schuneman, Slape, Irv Smith, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Swanstrom, Tate, Telcser, Tuerk, Vinson, Vitek, Watson, Wikoff, Winchester, J.J. Wolf, Sam Wolf, Woodyard, Younge, Yourell, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll.

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir, may I have a starting count?"

Speaker Daniels: "Starting count, Mr. Clerk. 101 'aye', 47

Leverenz: "Representative Johnson."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Representative Tate."

Speaker Daniels: "Tate, Representative Tate is by his chair."

Leverenz: "Representative Domico."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Daniels: "McAuliffe, Representative McAuliffe, Roger McAuliffe. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Laurino."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, can we please have your cooperation on the verification so we can go on with our business.

Representative Jones and Ewell, you're in between the questioning of the verification. Alright, proceed, Sir. Your question." Leverenz: "Laurino."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, change Representative O'Brien from 'present' to 'aye'. O'Brien. Center aisle. Alright, proceed, Sir."

Leverenz: "Laurino."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Laurino. Representative Laurino. The

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Representative Alstat."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Alstat. Wayne Alstat. Is the

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him." Leverenz: "Bartulis."

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

Leverenz: "Collins."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Representative Ebbesen is requesting

leave to be verified. He's up front here, Representative

Leverenz. The Gentleman has leave. Representative Hudson.

Change Representative Hudson from 'no' to 'aye'. Alright,

your next question."

Leverenz: "Collins."

Speaker Daniels: "Collins. Representative Collins. Phil

Collins. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Irv Smith is in his chair."

Leverenz: "Representative Ozella."

Speaker Daniels: "Ozella, in his chair."

Leverenz: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Daniels: "Steczo. Terry Steczo. The Gentleman in the

chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "You want him switched to 'aye', Sir?"

Unknown: "Switch him to 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further questions?"

Leverenz: "Representative Reilly."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

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

Leverenz: "Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Daniels: "Dwight Friedrich is in his chair as usual.

Representative Collins has returned. Return Representative

Collins to the Affirmative Roll."

Leverenz: "Representative Abramson."

Speaker Daniels: "Abramson. Representative Abramson is in the aisle."

Leverenz: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

Leverenz: "Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "He's in his chair."

Leverenz: "Robbins."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins. How is Representative

Robbins recorded? Where is he?"

Leverenz: "At the deli."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, he's here."

Leverenz: "Vinson."

Speaker Daniels: "Vinson is in my chair."

Leverenz: "That is why I couldn't see him."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, we look alike."

Leverenz: "Representative Bullock."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "McClain."

Speaker Daniels: "McClain. Representative McCLain is over here exercising his leadership role."

Leverenz: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barnes. Jane Barnes. She's in her chair as usual."

Leverenz: "Barr."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Barr is in the center aisle."

Leverenz: "He is my county Chairman. Bianco."

Speaker Daniels: "Bianco. Phil Bianco. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Senator Geo-Karis has just entered the chamber. Senator Geo-Karis."

Leverenz: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn. He was verified, Mr. Leverenz. He asked for leave to be verified. Mr. Huff. Laurino has returned. Return Representative Laurino to the Affirmative Roll."

Leverenz: "Did we question Sandquist?"

Speaker Daniels: "Sandquist. Representative Sandquist. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?" Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Double checking, did we remove Leinenweber?"

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "McBroom."

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

Leverenz: "McGrew."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Oblinger."

Speaker Daniels: "Oblinger is in her chair."

Leverenz: "Representative Slape."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Slape is over by Mr. Friedrich. Further questions, Sir? Johnson has returned. Return Representative Johnson to the Affirmative Roll. Representative Farley. Change Farley from 'no' to 'aye'. Further questions?"

Leverenz: "Ropp."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp is over by Representative Watson, Hallock, and Birkinbine."

Leverenz: "I wish he would stand up. I couldn't see him."

Speaker Daniels: "He is standing, Sir. Further questions?"

Leverenz: "What is the count?"

Speaker Daniels: "Do you have any further questions, Sir?"

Leverenz: "We play this game all the time. No further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "On this question there are 96 'aye', 45 'no',

18 'present'. Senate Bill 344 having received a

Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate

Bill 345, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capitol Development Board and Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wolf, J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This is the....these are the new FY-82, appropriations, CDB, one hundred and forty-three million, three hundred and thirty-two thousand, seven hundred dollars. If they're any questions, I would then, refer these to, Representative Winchester, who is the Chairman of the Subcommittee."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of....only to repeat all the remarks that I said, with regard to the reappro Bill, I think are in order on this Bill. I want to

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

again say, as strongly as I can, that all of those community colleges, for example, that ought to have funds to repair the damages caused by improper design and the fact that contractors are now in court, that it's about time, CDB, get off it's duff, because all they're doing is aggravating injury to those community colleges, and the taxpayers too. That's only one part of what I said, on 344. So, I would like to just say, that, I'm going to also vote 'no' on this one, to make that point and all the points I made on 344."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester, indicates he will."

Darrow: "Could you indicate what the amount of this was when it came from the Senate, and what it is at this time?"

Daniels: "Okay. Speaker Ladies a nd Gentlemen οf the having House...we're some difficulty hearing the questioning here, may we please have your attention, so we can get on with the legislation. Representative

Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, Representative Darrow, it's my understanding,
it was a hundred and thirty million dollars when it came
over from the Senate, it's now a hundred and forty-three
million, as it stands now."

Darrow: "And, there's no problem, we have the bonding authority to cover this?"

Winchester: "It's my understanding, not yet."

Darrow: "Not yet?"

. Winchester: "Yes."

Darrow: "When will they have the bonding authority?"

Winchester: "When it passes. We don't have the authorization, because it has not passed, yet, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Am I, correct, that it passed last evening in Cissy

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Stiehl's Bill? Or it did not pass?"
- Winchester: "No, it certainly did not. It failed."
- Darrow: "Well, if it failed last evening, where are we going to see the authorization? If you know? When will it be coming?"
- Winchester: "Well, I don't know, but I'm...I'm guessing that there would probably be a Motion, to take from the table."
- Darrow: "Well, wouldn't it be better to hold this back until we see if we have the bonding authorization, before we pass the bonding?"
- Winchester: "No, I don't think so. No."
- Darrow: "Well, I'm going to join, Representative Matijevich, and vote 'no' on this. I think you're putting the cart before the horse. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf, to close."
- Wolf, J.J.: "I'd be happy with the last Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 345 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The...Clerk....will....take....Representative Wolf, to explain his vote."
- Wolf, J.J.: "I think, I explained it pretty good on the last one."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester, to add to,

 Representative Wolf's explanation."
- Winchester: "Well, you know, I think we're playing some games here, Mr. Speaker. We've got to keep government going and I don't know why, all of a sudden, the Democrats are...are opposing these Bills, when they haven't opposed them in the past. Perhaps it's part of some kind of strategy, or game plan, but I'm more disappointed in the Republicans on this side of the aisle who are falling in for some kind of game

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

plan that's taking part of the other side. Now, if we're going to be responsible, we're not going to have to fool with this thing for another six months in Special Sessions. Let's get this Bill out, now."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry, to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Henry: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not...I'm not involved in any game plan other than trying to take care of the business of the people of the State of Illinois, taxpayers, that would be struggling for years with the interest on the bonding for the big cooporations or the big banks. So, if you are here representing your people, you're people that must pay the taxes, you're not playing games, you're trying to protect those people that you represent."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman, Representative

 Ewing, to explain his vote. the timer is on, Sir."
- Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish that, Clyde Choate, would come back and talk to some of the people on the other side, for this appropriation. I think he would have some influence. ¥е need to put out these Appropriation Bills. We have two days left, before the end of the Session. Now, if you want to mess around down here, all through the week before the 4th of July, keep on going. But let's put 89 votes up there, Representative Winchester, put it very well. We have to carry on the business of the state, I get a get a little tired of those who wote their switch and try and make their record good. Well, I hope they get a wall full of plagues from the conservative union, whoever else, for how little they vote for. We do have to keep government going, and I would encourage some 'yes' votes."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Pechous, to explain his vote. The timer is on, Sir."
- Pechous: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I'm voting 'yes' on, Senate Bill 345, simply because, it's
 the right and proper thing to do. However, on a previous
 measure, 344, for the record, I was not recognized at that
 time. The taking out of the planning monies for the new,
 Riverside Armory, was a sad and distressing fact, and a
 duly negative vote. I urge my colleauges to vote 'yes',
 however, on 345."
- Speaker Daniels: "Alright, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Record, Representative Robbins as 'aye'. Robbins, 'aye', and Hanahan, 'aye'. On this Bill there are 90 'aye', 58 'no'...Slape 'aye'. 91 'aye', 58 'no', 14 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 233, Representative Bradley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Henry, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Henry: "Mr. Speaker, a point of information. After you had declared...after you had instructed the Clerk to take the record, I understand you took some more votes. I understand that the...after you close it, no more votes could be taken on that. But you didn't do that."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, what happened, Sir, as you know, for the past several days we've been having trouble with the machine. When I asked the machine...if you'll listen, Representative Henry, we'll explain...alright. Representative Bradley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 233, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 233 is the Board of Regents Appropriation Bill.

 Originally introduced at a hundred and fifty-three million, reduced in the Senate to the Governor's level of funding, reduced by five million. The House Appropriation Committee reduced it another eight hundred and seventeen thousand, eight hundred and twenty dollars. We have a total appropriation of a hundred and forty-seven million dollars for the Board Regents, it's down...or it's about a 9...7 or 8% increase over last year. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Bradley, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 233. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 233 pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 130 'aye', 17 'no', 3 'present', Senate Bill 233, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Page 2, of your Calendars, Senate Bills, Second Reading, Appropriations. Senate Bill 381. Representative Leon. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 381, has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Vinson. Amends Senate Bill 381...."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, Amendment #1.
 Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Peters-Matijevich. Amends
 Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters, Amendment #2.

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Representative Matijevich, Amendment #2, Senate bill 381."
Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is the sum of forty
thousand dollars to the Commission of Intergovernmental
Cooporation, Springfield Office, for that Commission or
ordinary and contingent expenses. This has been agreed,
Representative Peters, isn't on the floor, and I'm handling
it for him. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2, to
Senate Bill 381 as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Any questions? Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'm sure this is a very good Amendment but, I couldn't hear the explanation. Could you explain, one more time, please."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Forty thousand dollars, Representative Hallock, for the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooporation, its Springfield Office. I think all of us, are aware, this is a bipartisan Amendment. I think all of us, are aware of the job the Commission has been doing...as helping this Legislature, getting us knowledgeable at what's happening in Washington. This is even more critical now because, in Washington, as so many of you know, the matter of cuts in funding in Washington, we've got to have added personnel to keep us apprised of what's going on, so that we can better relate to the problems in Washington. And, I know you're one of those concerned about this."

Hallock: "Yes, indeed. Very concerned. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further Discussion? Representative Barr."

Barr: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Barr: "Yeah, we've got another Bill with appropriation for this Commission in it....It's in House Bill 766, as it's come

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

back from the Senate with a much different amount on it. I wonder why we need to tack it on this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative...."

Matijevich: "Representative Peters, will answer that."

Speaker Daniels: "...Peters to answer..."

Matijevich: "We've got it in another place, just in case but..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. had happened is that the Senate, in it's usual manner of considering Appropriation Bills, neglected to add this money as per the general agreement that has been made. Some of you that are involved and follow the action of the. Intergovernmental Cooporation Commission, know that next year a convention will be held here in the City of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, in which we expect some three to four thousand people in attendance. A committee of the private sector is being put together, to raise an estimated budget of four hundred thousand dollars to cover the expenses of this convention. Money which will come from the private sector. In order to give the committee, the start-up funds to make the proper deposits, one place another. this money is needed as the roughly 10% contribution from the state for the holding of the convention."

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

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Abramson, amends Senate Bill 381..."

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

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Amendment #3 is the OCE for the Illinois Commerce Commission. It appropriates \$9,3...\$9,034,900.00. It's a seven-tenth of one percent increase over last year. No new positions. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

O'Connell: "Representative Abramson, would you repeat this? Is this the appropriation for the Illinois Commerce Commission and if so, is it the entire appropriation?"

Abramson: "Yes, it is."

O'Connell: "Is it the entire appropriation for the Illinois

Commerce Commission?"

Abramson: "Yes, it is."

O'Connell: "Is there not an Amendment on House Bill..strike that, Senate Bill 1228?"

Abramson: "No. It's not adopted to that Bill yet."

O'Connell: "But there is an Amendment that has been passed out providing for an appropriation for the Illinois Commerce Commission?"

Abramson: "It's been passed out..."

O'Connell: "Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1228."

Abramson: "I think there's a couple different ones floating around..."

O'Connell: "Are they the same?"

Abramson: "Yes."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

O'Connell: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like
to remind you that this is an Amendment of some consequence
and of significant importance to the..not only to the
Illinois Commerce Commission...Mr. Speaker? Have some
order?"

74th Legislative Day June 28, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, okay."

O'Connell: "Can't hear."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has requested some further order.

May the Gentleman have order please?"

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many of you are probably aware that there's been a great deal of controversy with regard to the latest appointment to the Illinois Commerce Commission. Without commenting on the value of the appointment, I think it's important for this Body to realize that the Senate has never had an opportunity to vote on that particular appointment. I am going to vote against this Amendment simply because it represents a perpetuation of a process that is, in my opinion, an abuse legislative role of government. the The recent appointee by the Governor had been voted down in the Senate Executive Appointments Commission....Committee. present the Senate with another appointee, the Governor has decided to maintain steadfastly this appointee, utilizing a sixty day back-door referendum. Without commenting on the propriety or the legality of such a movement, I would submit that it is certainly not consistent with the intent of the appointment process by the Executive. Accordingly, I would urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle in a bipartisan manner to voice its disappointment with the Governor's treatment of potential appointee to the Illinois Commerce Commission. And I would request that this matter be given a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, would you direct the speaker to direct his remarks to the Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell, in the future you will direct your remarks to the Amendment. Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Jim Kelley."

Kelley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I
wholeheartedly agree with Representative O'Connell. I
would rise to oppose this Amendment and I would urge
everybody on this side of the aisle to oppose it until the
Governor and the Senate get their House in order and the
Commerce Commission. We heard this in Committee and in my
opinion, it should be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I find it ironic that now we, on the other side of the aisle, we begin to agree. But their's is one thing and it relates to what Representative O'Connell was talking But I want to deal directly with the Amendment. about. The Amendment asks for, if I'm correct, \$9.034.000.00, now, nine million dollars to keep funding a Commission that is raping the poor in our state. They have allowed the utility companies to run rampant throughout the state with increased. increased rates, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would say that we should kill this Amendment. We should kill the Amendment, kill their appropriation and let's start all over again. Let's start all over again with an elected board that will reflect the needs of the people, because it has been proven that the Commerce Commission does not reflect the needs of the poor. nor does it reflect the needs of the people living on fixed incomes or the senior citizen. And I agree Representative Reilly (sic, O'Connell). Let's kill the whole appropriation."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. It was no accident that the Appropriations Committee killed this budget in Appropriations by a vote of sixteen to four. Now

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

the reasoning may be different for the votes that oppose this Commission, but for all the right reasons on both sides of the argument, it is a good reason to keep it killed and to keep it in the dark. Let it be a mushroom like all of us. Now let me tell you that Representative O'Connell is absolutely correct. There are two more days to run on the Senate's confirmation on that particular appointment of which he spoke. And I support the killing of this budget until such time as that hearing is held, the same way he does. But, notwithstanding that, the Illinois Commerce Commission has not audited a major utility in this state since 1948 in a management and compliance audit. The rate-making procedures are inexpert at best. They wander about with very little information as to what they are all They don't take into consideration productivity of the utility in terms of the labor and the management effects of that productivity. They don't take into account the fact that the utilities are using management and maintenance ...er..maintenance construction facilities for rate-making. There's a great deal wrong with this Commission, a great deal that needs examining and yes, at this late hour, in a Conference Committee, those things can be examined. So I recommend you vote 'no' this particular Amendment and that we keep them a mushroom until at least June 30th."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman,

Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Henry and Mr. Davis. This Commission and this Amendment ought to be defeated for all of the reasons that they stated, especially the one on ..in terms of the Gentleman appointed to the ICC. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for a Roll

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Call vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing."

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

- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Abramson to close."
- Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all the attacks on this budget are not on the numbers or the Commission, itself, but on collateral issues. The responsible thing to do here is fund this agency and find some other method of voicing your disapproval for the actions of the Governor. I move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Amendment there are 23 'aye', 100 'no'. Amendment #3 is lost. Representative Henry, 'no'. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Fawell-Hoffman. Amends Senate
 Bill 381..."

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

Pawell: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is for...the Mental Health Crisis Center, that we're trying to set up in, DuPage County. Our problem is, that we have no place to take our people who are suicidal, who are depressed, we have tried to take them to Madden. Madden, unfortunately, is occupied basically by Cook County citizens, because of the fact that they are over, 100% filled. We cannot get the care we need for our people, we are going to use this money to help our people in a

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

hospital that is already built. We are not building a thing, this is for service care, for our people and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Fawell: "I will answer any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, be aware that this program is essential for, DuPage. The dramatic growth and population has spurred, obvious problems that resulted in consequent growth. This is a start-up program within the facility that already exists, it is one that makes it convenient for, DuPage residents to get treatment. It's a small and beginning program under thirty-five beds, if I'm not mistaken, in DuPage...hospital and I would ask that you adopt this Amendment, Amendment #4 to 381."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

This is an Amendment that's been around a few times, and

I've told both the Sponsor and Glenn Schneider, that I'm

not going to oppose it because of their persistence. I

think that we can adopt it, there won't be any promises in

Conference Committee, we all know that, but right now

we...we support it."

Speaker Daniels: "Further Discussion? Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, although I presently do not live in that area, it's quite possible that if I do move there, I will have a conflict of interest. Nevertheless, I'll vote my conscious."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Mark O'Brien, we are glad to see your two children here. See the twins. The O'Brien twins, up front. Senate Bill 517, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 517 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "All these Bills that were agreed now are read a second time yesterday...previously. So, Representative McAuliffe is on Senate Bill 517. Any Amendments from the floor?"
- McAuliffe: "Amendment #1 I'd like to withdraw. It's technically incorrect."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Chapman, amends Senate Bill 517..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman has withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Chapman, amends Senate Bill 517..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman has withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 517 as amended."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe, Amendment #4."
- McAuliffe: "Amendment #4 makes 27 awards from the Court of Claims for a total of 785,121,000 dollars."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being 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 Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

517..."

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

McAuliffe: "Amendment #5 makes 315 awards at a total cost of 1,139,594 dollars."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption... Okay. Yes, Sir. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mulcahey: "Representative McAuliffe, why wasn't this put on the original appropriation?"

McAuliffe: "Because the Court is in Session continually making awards and these just came over."

Mulcahey: "These just came over, and how many additional ones do
we have from between now and the time that we heard this in
Committee?"

McAuliffe: "There's... Well, there's 315 on this Amendment."

Bulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Technical question. Did you go with 4, or did you table 4, or withdraw Amendment #4?"

McAuliffe: "No, Amendment #4 we went..."

Speaker Daniels: "Was adopted."

Leverenz: "That was adopted too?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Leverenz: "I was concerned with Amendment #4 and some of the other awards that are in Amendment #5. In 4 you have 53,000 dollars for some type of probe assembly for the Department of Transportation, but in Amendment #5 to the YMCA on page nine, lines 20 through 23, to the YMCA of metropolitan Chicago and alterations made to allow for the

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

installation of a washer and dryer by the Department of Corrections. Do you have any idea how that happened?"

- McAuliffe: "None at all. I'm not familiar with any of these
 Amendments. They just asked me to handle them for them and
 that's what I'm doing."
- Leverenz: "On page ten, 23 through 25, Oak Tower Inn, a debt for coffee breaks furnished for employees in the Department of Corrections. On page 11, perhaps staff could help you identify from lines 5 through 7. It says Elaine 'Pelts', et al, debt benefits under AABD program due to the Department of Public Aid 522,863,000 dollars. Does that all go to one person?"
- McAuliffe: "I really don't know. I have no way... If you don't
 want to vote for it, it's alright with me. I have nothing
 to gain or lose by this."
- Leverenz: "I don't know that that is even a proper response."
- McAuliffe: "That's the only response I'm going to give you,

 Teddy. If you don't want to vote for it, don't vote for

 it."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Leverenz: "I've reviewed Amendment #4 and Amendment #5, and it appears that the Department of Public Aid, the Department of Corrections, certainly the Department of Transportation, the Department of Children and Family Services, in some cases, that this is the way to forget about taking care of your debts when they occur or should properly be handled. It is a way that they don't even go into lapse period spending, and I would suggest to the Body that this is a way for the Departments to get a lapse, lapse period spending which is totally wrong and it, apparently, is a way to do business that now is starting to grow by leaps and bounds. Thank you."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative

Johnson."

Johnson: "I think the Body should be aware so that you're not mislead by Representative Leverenz and think we're voting on something without any knowledge or in the dark. these awards that are made by the Court of Claims are awards that have gone through a far more rigorous process before they even get here than anything that's undergone, in other appropriations processees, here in the General Assembly. Number one, it has to be approved, or an award has to be approved, by the Court of Claims with a very stringent set of rules, due process, examination, The adjudicators are one that are all adjudication. schooled in their profession and reach those determinations based on very specific rules, not only rules of evidence, but substantive rules as well. In addition to that, each award is reviewed and must be approved by the General's Office and that process, in addition to the regular legislative process, certainly would enable one to think that any of these Court of Claims awards that are here before us are ones that have gone through a terrific And for us to expect here that amount of scrutiny. Representative McAuliffe, with 600 different awards made by the Court of Claims, to be able to stand here and tell you exactly every detail about every award is just totally unreasonable. And for anybody who thinks they're going to against the award... or against the appropriations based on that, they just don't understand what the process I think this is reasonable and I urge a 'yes' vote on Representative McAuliffe's Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative

Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with both of the last

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

speakers but the fact remains that this is the biggest appropriation Bill of its kind that's around and it certainly indicates to me that a lot of the Departments in this state are pretty sloppy in their handling of the fiscal affairs. If they can't handle it one way, they just turn it over to the Court of Claims to be paid. Why don't they put it in their appropriations? Why aren't they timely in submitting these things to the Comptroller That's the thing we're criticizing, payment? Representative Johnson, not the fact that the person who gets the money is not entitled to it. But when you get an item of 522,000 dollars that's not in an appropriation that's being awarded by the Court of Claims, then there's something wrong, and if you can't ... if the Departments can't get their travel expenses in on time from their employees, there's something wrong with the person running the Department. We're not critical of either the Attorney General or the Court of Claims. We're critical of the Departments who let this go on from time to time and it's getting worse, and I think we're going to have to change our procedure in billing and straighten out some of these departments that are handling their fiscal affairs. This is absurd what you've got here. I think if you'll take the time to go over this list, you won't believe what you see. So I think the time has come when we have an investigation of the spending procedures and the vouchering procedures of the Departments that are involved in this report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I move the previous question."

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

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

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

McAuliffe: "Move for the adoption of the Amendment."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #6, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 517..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe, Amendment #6."
- McAuliffe: "Amendment #6 appropriates 58,000 dollars to former state employee, 'Norberd Rayford' and 26,000 dollars to Richard 'Tuninny'. They were fired, I think, about ten years ago and this is their compensation."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, 'Shall Amendment #5 (sic, 6) be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. That's Amendment #6, isn't it? Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6 adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Chapman-Ronan, amends Senate
 Bill 517..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman, Amendment #7."
- Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment provides 350,000 dollars to the Comptroller for disbursement to the Illinois Developmental Disabilities Advocacy Authority protection and advocacy services pursuant to the Illinois plan to protect and advocate the rights of developmentally disabled persons. This is the appropriation for the group which provides not only the direct advocacy services for children and adults who are developmentally disabled and to their families, but also offers training sessions, provides information and we hear, all of us throughout the state, that the providers of services to the families of the ... I'm having trouble today, developmentally disability and their families that they need this and that the families

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

seek that there be an appropriation made again this year for IDA. I urge your favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, reluctantly I must rise in opposition to this Amendment. I'm a member of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission which was created under the Mental Health Code which we passed in 1978, and that Commission is now functioning and it's functioning well. And the duties which used to be performed by IDA...it's no longer needed because we can do it under the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, and; therefore, this would just be an extra appropriation, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Question of the Sponsor. Representative Chapman, has this appropriation, or award, or whatever you want to call it been approved by the Court of Claims, by the Court?"

Chapman: "This is not related to the Court of Claims. This is an appropriation for IDA."

Johnson: "Doesn't need to be approved by anything other than the Legislature. Is that right?"

Chapman: "The Legislature, and obviously the Governor has the opportunity to veto it if he chooses."

Johnson: "Is it in the Governor's budget?"

Chapman: "It's never been in the Governor's budget."

Johnson: "That's what I'm saying. It's not now, right?"

Chapman: "That's right, Sir."

Johnson: "Okay, thanks."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, this is an appropriation matter that's come up every year since the inception of this particular agency, which I guess you could call a quasi public one. It deals in the public domain with programs involving

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

developmentally disabled children and adults. Representative Chapman is accurate in indicating that it hasn't and isn't in the Governor's budget. This is an agency, I think, that the Governor's people have supported each year after we've put the money into the budget. Since 1977 at the inception of this particular agency, Advocacy Authority, if you will, we've added money on the floor of the House and the Senate to make this an ongoing, continuing entity. There is, with respect to Representative Sandquist, a serious question about the ability of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission to continue or to provide necessary assistance to certain of the DD cases in this state because there still are federal questions, there still are federal laws and there still are federal regulations that suggest a conflict of interest where the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission is involved. this particular entity, the Developmental Such that Disabilities Advocacy Authority, is necessary continued in this state. They're not asking for substantial increase in operating funds. It's slightly above last year, as I understand it, and below even the year before. This particular Advocacy Authority is one I'm familiar with, familiar very much so with the Director and I can tell you that in three and a half years they've dealt with some 3,000 cases, DD cases, of adults and children in this state. People who very well could between the cracks and have no one representing them in the absence of this appropriation because of the federal conflict of interest regulations. It's been suggested that this particular entity is a duplication, as Representative Sandquist and others have suggested. That simply is not the case because of those federal conflict of interest standards. It's been suggested, too, that those standards

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

are going to be changed. Well, they haven't been changed and, in fact, some of the proposals would have tightened rather than lessened those conflict standards. For those reasons and because we need this particular entity, because those people shouldn't fall between the cracks, DD cases, people who can't help themselves otherwise, we ought to be supporting this minimal appropriation for those people who won't be helped otherwise in this state and have been helped every year and we've had to come to the rescue of this agency every year. I've dealt with the agency, my constituents have. They find no problems with it. It's probably one of the best agencies or quasi public ones in the State of Illinois, and this ought to get a green vote from Republican and Democrat alike. Somewhere you have to draw the line in suggesting that we can cut people entirely out and these people aren't the ones that ought to be cut It should be given an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Piel: "What is the total appropriation, Representative?"

Chapman, this is a question of you, Ma'am."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman. Representative

Chapman: "I beg your pardon. What was the question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "What is the total appropriation of this Amendment?"

Chapman: "350,000."

Piel: "How much is that over last year?"

Chapman: "Let's see. It was 268,000 last year, I believe and the year before it..."

Piel: "So in other words, we're talking about 268, so you're talking about 82,000 dollar increase, right?"

Chapman: "In '79 it was 392,000."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Piel: "But you're talking about... how much increase this year?"

Chapman: "From 26..."

Piel: "... 8 to 350."

Chapman: "I beg your pardon. Representative Satterthwaite has better information than I do. 323,000 last year. 392,000 in '79. 350,00 is what we're asking in this Amendment."

Piel: "What is the total, the expenditure of operations for this department... agency."

Chapman: "278 was what was..."

Piel: "Total operations was 278, that means the differences in services. I want to know the difference between services and operations in this budget."

Chapman: "Just a minute. The whole budget is 610. That... Is that federal funds, Helen? That's federal and state brings it to 610,000. You see, this is the agency that has been designated by the Pederal Government to provide advocacy for DD persons."

Piel: "Isn't this a private agency?"

Chapman: "It's a quasi public agency."

Piel: "So it would be a private agency then. What does the Director of this agency make? I don't need to know his travel. I've already got his travel."

Chapman: "I was given that information and I can't seem to find it here. I can't answer that."

Piel: "40,000 dollars."

Chapman: "Representative Satterthwaite, who is a Member of the Commission along with Representative Reilly, says that that is not accurate."

Piel: "Then the Representative better check his salary that they're paying the Director because the Director is making 40,000 dollars plus travel and expenses, Helen. Yes. Getting back to the previous question that you mumbled through a minute ago. How much is used for services and

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

how much is used for operation in its total budget?"

Chapman: "The 300,000 dollars from the Federal Government is currently specifically for services."

Piel: "The figure I had was basically a little bit different than that unless you're talking about your total 600,000. In other words, you're talking about half for services and half for administration. Mr. Speaker, addressing the Bill, I would... or addressing the Amendment, I would ask the Members on both sides of the aisle to look very closely at this Amendment because, first of all, we're funding a private agency and, to me, it's a big waste of state dollars when we're in a time of sort of pulling in our belts; and I would ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Daniels, I believe there are some lights on."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Cosponsor of this Amendment, I just want to clarify a few of the points that have already been raised. This is an agency that does a good job for the State of Illinois. It's really the agency that's worked on behalf of the developmentally disabled citizens of this state. As was stated many times before previous speakers. the Federal Government designated this is the agency to represent developmentally disabled of this state. There is no way we can get around The Governor's Office can make its statements. that_ agencies can make their statement, but this is the Other agency the Federal Government has designated. Next i f the Federal Government lifts that designation, obviously, the Legislature can do something about this situation. But at this point, we're going to lose federal money into the state and the developmentally disabled are

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

going to suffer the consequences of that. I urge everyone on both sides of the aisle to fund this agency, back over to the Senate. Let them support it and then let the Governor make his determination. If the Governor doesn't go along with what the Federal Government says, then he can veto this appropriation. In the last three he's supported the appropriation. I assume he's going to do it this year because that's what the Federal Government is designating this agency to do in this state. In the future, if further actions taken then we can act appropriately. I urge everyone on both sides of the aisle to support this Amendment to protect the developmentally disabled of this state."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, a point of personal privilege in the sense I just have to correct what the prior speaker just said. The agency is not designated by the Federal Government. They do not do it. The designation is made by the Governor and he has not done it for this year so you can't say that that's true. You're talking about prior years."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there obviously has been a lot of misunderstanding in regard to the two advocacy agencies within the state. When we created the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, it was thought by some of the backers of that legislation that they would be able to get designation to be the agency that would take care of the statewide plan for services to the developmentally disabled. However, when the Guardianship and Advocacy Agency applied to do that, the response was that the Federal Government would not designate them and I have here a letter indicating that and I quote, 'I must

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

advise you that the Commission, as presently constituted, does not meet federal requirements established to insure the independence of state protection in advocacy systems. Section 113 of the Developmental Disability's Assistance and Bill of Rights Act require that each state protection and advocacy system be independent of any agency which provides treatment, services or habilitation to persons with developmental disabilities. The letter goes on to say that 'to insure that Illinois maintains a PNA system free to intervene in all matters related to guardianship and which is perceived by the public as free of conflict, it is essential for the state's PNA agent to remain independent of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. and so it is quite clear that the Federal Government would not approve the PNA Commission, did not approve them when they applied to get that designation. Those laws have not changed and even if they might have a possibility of change in the future, I think there is a more basic question and that is one as to whether or not it can be possible for an agency to provide service and, at the same time, be the advocate for a client. A letter from a resident of Ottawa detailing what has happened to a disabled person in her family for whom she has just now become the guardian indicates that these people really cannot take care of themselves in this complex system to see that their rights are preserved. And she concludes the letter by saying, 'In this country, including the State of Illinois, all people are guaranteed certain rights, not just normal people, not just powerful people, all people. For those individuals incapable of protecting their own constitutional rights, agencies such as IDA are not mere conveniences. They are essential. We do not, I do not have before me a break out of last year's budget to indicate what is service and what

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

However, I can say as a Member of the IDA is operations. Board that all of our funds really are devoted to service. It's hard to say when a newspaper goes out to several thousand people throughout the state how much of that is an administrative cost and how much of it is a service cost. But the end result is that all of it is service because it gives information to developmentally disabled people and their representatives who would not easily have access to that information otherwise. When you look at a telephone budget for an agency, it's hard to tell how much of that is service and how much of it is operational because most of the telephone service goes to people who are in need of information about their rights and for how they can obtain access to services or rights that are theirs. And believe, quite frankly, that the 610,000 dollars that we've had for operation for the past year really are totally service dollars. We do not want to perpetuate an for the sake of the agency. We want, instead, to have it there as a back up for those people for whom there is a conflict between the Guardianship and the Advocacy services provided under the GNA Commission. We have, in fact, made arrangements with the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission in terms of which clients are in conflict and will receive direct case work under IDA. But beyond that direct case there are many educational functions that IDA performs and needs to continue to perform and I 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

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

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

All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Chapman to close."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Chapman: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker. As Mr. Stuffle and Representative Satterthwaite pointed out, there is no between the Guardianship and Advocacy duplication Commission and IDA, and, very clearly, as the facts demonstrate, the only designation of which organization can funds is made by the Federal the federal Government. Only the Federal Government. Now, I was told by a lobbyist for the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission that the designation was going to be changed. I said, 'Has it been changed?'. I was told, 'No', that the Governor and I said I have a letter in which the Governor asked that it be changed and the letter from HEW saying no for some very good reasons relating to conflict. They would not change the designation. They could not, under rules, designate the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. I was told that the Governor had asked again that there be a redesignation. I said, 'Please give me a copy of the letter in which he asked that . I was told the Governor hadn't gotten around to writing the letter yet but he was going to write the letter asking that the designation be removed from IDA. I think it's clear that at such point that the Governor might decide to write the letter, that the designation might be changed, that the Governor can veto this appropriation; but, until such time services needed аге bv the families of developmentally disabled persons, are needed by developmentally disabled children and adults. There is no other place these people can go because of the conflict that exists in the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission where they provide both guardianship and advocacy. I ask you to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Dwight Friedrich."

- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a place to save 350,000 dollars.

 This is a private agency asking for money. If you heard the questioning, you realize that a lot of this money's going to the Executive Director and some high paid staff people who want this to go on forever. Here's a good place to save 350,000 dollars."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 85 'aye', 58 'no', 1 'present'.

 Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Chapman-Ronan..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman, withdrawn. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 670. Read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 670, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the furnishing of legislative staff.

 Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 671. Out of the record. Senate Bill 956. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 956, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board for the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor? Or Amendments in Committee?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #1..."

Speaker Daniels: "Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Adopted in Committee. No Motion filed."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, O'Brien. Amends Senate Bill 956 as amended on page 1, by deleting line 1, and 2, and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Brien, Amendment #2."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we ran this Amendment one...one time before, would you table the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1157, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1157, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Performing Arts and Film Commission. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motion filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan, Amendment #2.

Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich."

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

Floor Amendment #2 is a fifty thousand dollars for the

Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly. I

move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, to Senate Bill

1157."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're eight minutes late in recognizing me, I wanted to be recognized on, Senate Bill 670. I just wanted to ask, if the Sponsorship of that Bill, precluded us from asking any questions about it. But you went through that so swiftly, and so surely, I suppose that's the reason."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Well, there weren't any Amendment, Sir, filed on it. That's why we went through it quickly. There was nothing offered on it. Alright."
- Yourell: "I wanted to ask a question about the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Are there any questions? Being none....Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Matijevich: "Go ahead, Jake."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Is this a Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly?"
- Matijevich: "That's right, Jake."
- Wolf, J.J.: "We had that years ago, what happened with it? I served on that Commission in my Preshman term, I thought it had expired."
- Matijevich: "It's still going on, they may have not done much, but we've got new plans for you, Jake."
- Wolf, J.J.: "Have you talked to, Ronan, about that?"
- Matijevich: "He's part of all the plans."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Alright, once more. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it, the Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Ryan. Amends Senate Bill
 1157 as amended on page 1, by deleting all...."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley, Amendment #3."
- Stanley: "Yeah, I would like to withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment...Ploor Amendment #4, Preston-Barr..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston, Amendment #4."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 appropriates \$890,000.00 for the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981.

resurfacing and repair of a state highway that is in my District, Representative Barr's District and Representative Bowman's District. I received a phone call about five minutes ago from Senator Berman who had just last evening spoken with the Governor and Governor Thompson is in favor of this. I want to make that clear on the other side. He is going to help with this. The situation on this road that this appropriation is for, if you'll stop whistling for just a minute...this Ridge Avenue running in Chicago from Howard Street to Broadway is completely potholed, unsurfaced at this point and a danger to cars going over that street. And..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative..."

Preston: "And.. Go ahead.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support Preston's attempt to get this Amendment on, but I want to caution him that you can't always take the Governor's word for some of these things. In fact, three years ago, we overrode the Governor's veto to the tune of 40 million dollars for FAP 412..."

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

Giorgi: "..And didn't spend a dime on the highway..."

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

Giorgi: "...And you'd better take this very lightly, the Governor's word, Mr. Preston.."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Henry: "Representative Preston, the \$890,000.00 covers how many miles of repair?"

Preston: "Approximately a mile and a half."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Henry: "A mile and a half? In Chicago, do we have a road fund to make some pothole repairs?"

Preston: "The road fund that the city may have does not apply to this road since this is a state maintained and state owned road."

Henry: "You made mention of the Senator Berman from your District had some type of understanding with another authority of the State of Illinois that they would sign...that he would sign \$890,000.00, close to a million dollars for repairs of potholes in your District?"

Preston: "Yes, Representative."

Henry: "Well, I hope that the deal that you made with the person will be kept, but as not, I agree with Representative Giorgi that you cannot keep deals with the man that says he'll do one thing one day.."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay, okay..."

Henry: "... And does another thing another day..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

J.J.Wolf: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

J.J.Wolf: "Is this is a capital project?"

Preston: "This is for the resurfacing, repair of a road."

J.J.Wolf: "Yes. I seem to remember that you were opposed to all those road construction and repair projects a little while ago."

Preston: "I think you may have been working under a misconception."

J.J.Wolf: "I notice also you added a million and a half for day care. I think we need the money for day care. I think this ought to be defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Well, I was just going to echo Representative Wolf's statement. I am interested in day care and I know the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Gentlemen that are sponsoring the Amendment, I certainly know are interested in day care. I think \$800,000.00 would go a long way in terms of helping the day care. The surfacing of the street, we can wait with that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. Even though it is not in my District, it will be in the next Session and therefore, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a road rebuilding as I understand it put on to a Performing Arts Commission. I would question the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Let me see the Bill and the Amendment, Mr.

Clerk....(microphone off)...Purther discussion?

Representative Ronan?"

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Ronan: "You know, Representative Preston, is this going to be a state awarded job or is it going to be awarded by the city of Chicago?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "The contract you're referring to, Representative?"

Ronan: "Yes, your road. I want to know what the procedures are that are going to be used to award this contract."

Preston: "It will be the same procedures that any state contracts are let. It will be through the State of Illinois."

Ronan: "So this will be a state awarded project?"

Preston: "That's correct. That means good Republican contractors will be hired to construct this road."

Ronan: "Well, I have difficulty responding to that comment, because you obviously don't know what the bid procedures

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

are for this state so I won't even respond. My position, though, is obviously to support this. I'm delighted that the Governor's seen fit to spend some money for road construction up in Cook County. We'd had a serious problem during this administration and during the last administration, I'm sorry to say, that there hasn't been enough money spent on the roads up in the six counties of northern Illinois, the northeast sector. And I'm happy to see the Governor finally is committed to put some money up there to do some road work. So I wholeheartedly support this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is clearly a pork barrel project. Now we, in southern Illinois, aren't opposed to pork barrel. But in the words of my colleague and distinguished running mate, Representative C.L.McCormick, 'If we're going to help kill the hog then we want some of the bacon'. And Mr. Preston has a notoriously poor record of helping us get the bacon. So I vote 'no' when the time comes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in two and a half years in the House of Representatives, I have never stood up here and asked to take home, if you'll excuse the expression 'pork' for my District. This road is a disaster area. A similar appropriation to this has been brought up time and time again before this General Assembly by my predecessors here because the road is in a disastrous shape. It's one of those unusual circumstances where the road is situated in the city of Chicago but yet the city cannot expend money to repair the road. The state has in the past refused to spend money to repair the road and it's a major thoroughfare that people use to get from the suburban areas

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

into Chicago's loop. It is a disaster area. potholes. The asphalt is crumbling all around and we need this desperately. I wouldn't be standing up here and asking to bring home jobs or anything else. I'm telling you as honestly as I know how to make it, this road is condition and you'd be helping Illinois in the suburban areas who vote primarily Republican. So, I'm asking your support for this. The Governor's behind it. People, since I can remember, from my District have been behind it. So, please help me out if you can."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment lost...You want a Roll Call, Representative Preston? The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. Is he joined by four Members? All right. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed bу voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from southern Illinois was wrong. Representative Preston doesn't want any pork. He wants some good Illinois beef. And I think he's entitled to it. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that Representative Preston is entirely correct. While I live in Chicago, I use that road going to Evanston, going up to 'Ravinya'. The road comes through Chicago into Evanston and a few other suburbs. It has fine delicatessens. It takes you down past Carson's Rib Joint, if you want to go there for ribs. And I think Representative Preston is trying to enhance the commerce and industry both of Chicago, Evanston and Wilmette and all the surrounding suburbs. Without this

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

road, people cannot get to those places of leisure, leaving Representative O'Brien's District on the near north side.

I think it's an excellent Amendment and I'm surprised Representative O'Brien's not here to defend Representative Preston on this Amendment. It's a good Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn."

- John Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, why should there only be one magnificent mile in the city of Chicago? Why can't Representative Preston have a magnificent mile under his District? Let's get some more green votes up there."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 82 'aye', 73 'no', 1 'present'. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Conti-Zito."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, Amendment \$5.

 Representative Zito, Amendment \$5. Representative Conti,

 Amendment \$5. Read the Amendment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Seventy-five thousand dollars for the bipartisan

 House Committee on the Medical Assistance Program."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, withdraw Amendment...what number is it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1228. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1228, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the development and implementation of financial reporting system which is in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. 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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Keane."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane, Motion to table Amendment #1."

Keane: "Yes, I move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. They 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is tabled. Any Ploor Amendments?"

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

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2
does...creates...corrects the technical errors in
Amendment #1, it refers to the appropriate lines...for the
correct lines and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Any discussion? The question is,

'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor
signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,

#2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #3, McGrew-Hoffman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew. Representative Hoffman.

Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative Keane, your pleasure, Sir."

Keane: "Thank you...."

Speaker Daniels: "Hold it. Representative Hoffman is running down the aisle. Here we go, he's on his way, he's going to be there soon...right now. Representative Hoffman, Amendment #3. Excuse me, Sir. Representative J. J. Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Wolf, J.J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe this Amendment, which we have already disposed of another Bill is technically incorrect, it does not amend the title. Would you take a look at it and give a ruling, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. May I see the Amendment and the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bill, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman is correct, Amendment #3 is out of order. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Peters-Hatijevich."

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

Peters: "Withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson, Amendment #5.

Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Fawell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell, Amendment #6.
Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Currie, for an announcement."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Member of the House. Just a reminder that tonight is the night that you've all been waiting for, the Conference of Women Legislators, ham and eggs party. Ham and eggs are not the menu, the menu is chicken, beer, wine, and trimmings. And the feature of the evening is amateur night with the Illinois General Assembly. Legislators from both sides of the aisle, both genders and both Houses, will be preparing acts, skits, humor and fun for our delication and enjoyment. tickets, twenty-five dollars a piece, the party starts at 6 Pretty much...well all the members of the Conference of Women Legislators have tickets available for Helen Satterthwaite, Virginia Frederick are the two co chairs. Twenty-five dollars, we start at 6:30, and we would welcome your attendance."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to correct one small point in Barbara's discourse. Ham and

- 74th Legislative Day

 ggs are on the menu, cold ham and deviled eggs. I hope
 you will all come. Thanks alot."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman. Just waving, alright.

 She's got tickets. Alright, Representative Capparelli, are
 you on the floor, Sir? Capparelli. You have an
 announcement to make, Representative Capparelli. Coach
 Capparelli has an announcement...oh, Representative
 Nelson."
- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I forgot to tell where the party is. It's right across the street at the State House Inn. Follow me out, down the stairs and I'll take you there."
- Speaker Daniels: "Coach Capparelli, at Representative Kosinski desk. Coach Capparelli. Important announcement, Ladies and Gentlemen, please listen."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much. The game is now going to be put on the Spring Calendar, we're supporting the players of the National and American League in their strike and we won't be playing this evening because of undo...hard business in the Senate and we're going to put the game on Spring Calendar."
- Speaker Daniels: "Coach, what is the reason that they've canceled?"
- Capparelli: "They are definitely afraid of us."
- Speaker Daniels: "Let the Journal...Representative Kosinski."
- Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, possibly we could petition for a Special Session to run this game."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind all the Members, that the Royal Order of Mushrooms, did not get scared away and the mushroom party will take place immediately following the program of the Women's Legislators, at the State House Inn, approximately between

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

9 o'clock or 10 o'clock, till 1 o'clock in the morning. So, you're all invited, there will be stuffed mushrooms, fried mushrooms french fried mushrooms, sauted mushrooms, poison mushrooms and free wine and beer. So...you're all invited, please go and have a good time."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff."

- Huff: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make a report from...on behalf of Royal Order of the Spear Carriers, who just received an urgent message from, E. F. Hutton, to inform us that the bases that were to be used in the ga....tonights game are now in the hands of the Rothchilds, under the orders of Secretary of State. And that they are holding them for forty bushels of mushroom ransom."
- Speaker Daniels: :"Representative Conti. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On page 4, of the Calendar, Order of Concurrence, House Bill 77. Page 5, of the Calendar, House Bill 77, Order of Concurrence. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Peters in the Chair."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 77, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. With Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative....for what purpose do you rise,
 Sir?"
- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I just...I wanted to inform the Chair that...on House Bill 28, which is the first one on that order of business, I wish to nonconcur. Are you just calling Bills where we will nonconcur or..."
- Speaker Peters: "No, we are starting up where we left off, yesterday and the first Bill is, House Bill 77."
- Cullerton: "Alright, thank you. If you want...just for the record, if you wanted to know, 28, I wish to nonconcur in."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Polk for what purpose do you

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

rise?"

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you said, that's where we left off. I
don't recall being off the floor at all yesterday, and
don't recall 31 or 32, being called. Now are you telling
me that they were called and I was not here."

Speaker Peters: "Evidently."

Polk: "I...I take your..."

Speaker Peters: "Evidently. Representative Conti for what purpose do you rise?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just as we were about to Jouralize that you called House Bill 70, and somebody made a Motion to adjourn at that time. And I wasn't able to reply, 70 is where you left off."

Speaker Peters: "No, Sir."

Conti: "You called 70..."

Speaker Peters: "The tapes....no, it will clearly indicate that House Bill 70 was called, Representative Jaffe was called, he was not here. Representative Conti was called, he was not here, we had intervening orders of business. We are now on House Bill 77. Representative Huskey, proceed, Sir."

Huskey: "Ladies....Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 77 is the same Bill as House Bill 24 was last year, it's a child support Bill where the Clerk of the Circuit Courts, in Cook County will collect child support to the permissive for any county in the state that wishes to join in. It's not mandatory in counties other than Cook. But it is permissive, if your county wishes to participate in child...child support collections, they can do it at no cost to your particular county. It's a good Bill, it's been cleaned up. It's been changed from the Supreme Court administering it, to the Department of Public Aid, that's the main text of the Bill and in the Senate it

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

had...it went out 53 to nothing and I hope it will go out of here 177 to nothing. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will respond."

Pullen: "If the Clerk of the Circuit Court is the one that is receiving these payments, why should the Department of Public Aid be doing the over sight functions instead of the court system?"

Huskey: "No, the Clerk of the Circuit Court does the collecting with the help of the States Attorneys Office. To answer your question, it was to be done by the court system, the Supreme Court refused to administrate the Bill. So, they refused to put it in the budget, we passed a law out here last year under the control

Huskey: "No, the Clerk of the Circuit Court does the collecting with the help of the State's Attorney's Office. To answer your question, it was to be done by the court system. The Supreme Court refused to administrate the Bill. So, they refused to put it in the budget. We passed a law here last year under the control of the Supreme Court. They made the statement, maybe rightfully so, that they were not an administrative group and the Department of Public Aid is an administrative group so that's where it lies now."

Pullen: "Well, there are a lot of administrative groups in State

Government, Sir, and I'm wondering why the Department of

Public Aid would be an appropriate one to be enforcing the

collection of child support."

Huskey: "Well, they support about 25% of the child support collections of the people that are on Public Aid so they're doing part of this right now. So they're experienced in this particular field so...rightfully so and as I say, they're doing it now. So..."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Pullen: "They're only doing it now for people that are on Public

Aid though, isn't that correct?"

Huskey: "Well, if you don't vote for the Bill you may put a lot of other people on Public Aid. So..."

Pullen: "Ho-ho-ho. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The reason that the Public Aid Department is involved in this now is that they are designated federally as the people who administer the people locator service and they do that for people who are not on Public Aid as well as people who are on Public Aid. The reason they do it for people who are on Public Aid obviously is to try and reduce our burden on our taxes, but they do it on a sliding scale fee basis for other people. So they get paid to look for absent parents. I would like to congratulate Representative Huskey for the work he's done on this. This is an excellent Bill and it untangles the snarls in getting the program to actually take effect next January 1st, which was the original intent last Session. It ran into problems though as he said, with the administrative office of the Supreme Court. He has worked long and hard to take care of those problems. The Bill is now in fine shape and I hope everyone here would support it."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 77. This is final action on this legislation. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Braun?"

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was afraid I hadn't been voted, but I'm apparently on, so.."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 157 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 1 voting..none voting 'present'. Motion to This Bill. having received the concur prevails. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, if I might have attention one moment? Hopefully at some point, the Chair will be given some leave to expedite some matters. of you who have nonconcurrences to put, David here has a list and if you would come up and give him the numbers, if the Chair has leave to move to that kind of Order at some point, we would try and get all of those together. In the meantime, we will continue going down the list. House Bill 83, Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 83, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal.."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Madigan? Go ahead,
 Representative Flinn."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 83 is the so called 'tear gas mace canister Bill' which would permit our citizens of our state to carry them for self defense only. The Senate Amendment #1 restricts the purchase to those 18 years of age and older and 16 years of age and older to possess. It's a very good Amendment and I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 83."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 83?'. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'.

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 150 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 83 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 93, Representative Deuster? Out of the record. House Bill 103, Representative Yourell? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 103, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Revenue Act with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 103 strikes out the revision reducing tax delinquency from five to three years prior to application for judgment of sale. We had considered that during debate on Second Reading in Committee on this legislation and I have no objection to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 103. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 103."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 103. This is final action. All those...in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 145 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 103 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair will skip the appropriation measures since we've got another day and a half or so for those. House Bill 109, Representative Ronan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 109, a Bill for an Act to amend the baccalaureate assistance law for registered nurses. Third Reading...with Senate Amendments 1 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Roman."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the number of loans from three awards for every 1,000 registered nurses actively engaged in the practice of nursing to three awards for each 2,000 professional registered nurses actively engaged in the practice of nursing. Amendment #3 redefines this Act. It changes the Act from the baccalaureate assistance law for registered nurses to the nursing education assistance law, broadens the declaration of policy, puts it under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health as opposed to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission and basically does a few other things."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's my belief that the Senate reinserted a forgiveness provision in this Bill. We made, at least I made representations to Members of the House that this Bill would not pass with a forgiveness provision for the nursing loans. That provision being back in the Bill, I would urge that we nonconcur in this, that we vote 'no' on the Motion to concur and then nonconcur so that we can keep faith with the Members of the House who oppose a full blown forgiveness provision. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was
a Cosponsor of the Bill that stood in the House. When it
went back to the Senate it did pick up that Bill which we

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

had defeated. I think it was 9-20, which included not only the forgiveness provision, but also addressed the nursing shortage and needs of the diploma program, the community college associate degree program, the one year program and so on, all of those are important. However, I think I out also that the diploma programs continue to dwindle because of their inability to function I think the role of nurse in terms of the advances in the technology as well as the need for higher education. т support a version of this which deals with the baccalaureate and I think that's the way we should return Bill by not agreeing to concur. I have other new problems with the Bill that I don't think existed before that I saw last night as I read through the Amendment. only do we find the forgiveness feature restored, but we also find that now the Department of Public Health, of all agencies. will bе dealing with the question scholarships. It was a very simple change. They deleted 'Commission' and inserted 'Department'. Now, can you really believe that the Department of Public Health ought to be responsible for all the functions of a scholarship Commission? I don't think they're equipped to do that, even if they have an advisory council which is obligated to report to us one year out of five, that agree in extent to that program as it progresses. On a point that some of you might find more curious than anything else, on page when we hit a reference to nurses, although we realize that most nurses are females and that there are occasional males in the field, the reference for a characteristic of the applicant's intent to pursue a nursing program uses the pronoun 'diligently pursuing his studies'. I don't know that that's going to change anybody's mind, but it seems to me we ought to at least be able to say maybe "their

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

studies' or maybe 'his/her (slash) studies', whatever. But it seems to me the Bill is fraught with all failures. But the critical thing is that it doesn't deal with the nursing shortage. It just adds in that bad Bill that we had defeated earlier, adds a few more less palatable factors such as the change from the Commission to the Department of Public Health. I think it's kind of silly actually. It's about the best word I can use to say to the Department of Public Health, you are now responsible for providing the scholarships that we, in the Scholarship Commission, were providing in the past. The logic probably rests in this area. The logic probably says the Commission was opposed to those kinds of awards that were to granted to nurses in various programs. I suggest to you that this is a bad Motion to concur in. I would ask that we defeat the Motion, go to a nonconcurrence and then hope that we can knock out some of these unpalatable features in the Bill. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Roman to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, I have spent more time on this single piece of legislation than anything I have ever worked on. We have worked with the Nurses Association, the Hospital Association and every interested Legislator on both sides of the aisle, both Houses of the General Assembly. This is the best compromise we've been able to achieve through hours of work, negotiations and a lot of hard effort on the part of a lot of different people. I agree it's not a perfect solution, but very rarely do we come up with perfect solutions when they're such divergent views on what's the best way to improve health care in the State of Illinois. I feel it's a decent compromise. We can come back next year and review this

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

legislation if there's not total agreement. We can possibly do something next year. However, I have tried to work with everyone. I've tried to be honest with everyone and I move for concurrence so we can finally put this legislation to sleep and move on to other topics. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 109. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question ..It didn't lock? Have to do it one more time. Again, on House Bill 109, the Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 109. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting Mr. Clerk? Take the record. Okay? It hit? On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 58 voting 'nay', voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 109. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 120, Representative Darrow. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 120, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in regard to Attorney Generals and State's Attorneys with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 120 requires the Attorney General to pay into the State Treasury all fees and costs recovered by him. It left here with an immediate effective date. Over in the Senate, the effective date was removed so that there would be more time to comply with this rule. I'd ask for a

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

favorable vote."

ThereRepresentative Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Schneider, discussion? Schneider? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Discussion? House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 120? . This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 158 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 120. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 130, Representative Hallstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 130, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 130 amended the School Code by providing that the powers of school Principals and/or school Superintendents and the procedures relating to suspension of a student for gross disobedience or misconduct while riding a school bus, be the same as for other forms of misconduct. The Senate...And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It simply added that Assistant Principals could be included as well as the Principals and the Superintendents. And I would move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

Bowman: "Representative Hallstrom, is the term 'Assistant

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Principal' defined anywhere in the Statutes? It's not defined in the Bill and I couldn't find it in the Statutes myself."

Hallstrom: "Yes, Sir, I believe it certainly is in the School Code."

Bowman: "You believe it is in the School Code?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, Sir."

Bowman: "Okay. I'll take your word for it."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Bowman: "Otherwise, I support the concept but I was just concerned about the possibility we might be using a term which is not defined. But if you say it is, I'll take your word for it. Thank you."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 130?'. Final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 164 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 130 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 132, Representative Getty? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 132, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure with Senate Amendment \$1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Nembers of the House, I would move to concur in Amendment #1 by the Senate to House Bill 132. This is a Bill which, as it left the House, was a comprehensive and it is the Uniform Post Conviction Hearing Act sponsored

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

by Representative Leinenweber and myself. In the Senate, we made three minor changes that took out a retrospective application of certain substantive or procedural changes. It further provided that those actions commenced which were in the nature of Section 72 actions would be within a two year period as the law presently is and that would conform to existing state law. And it clarified that where a case was brought, it would be assigned to the Judge who originally heard the case if that Judge was still sitting. These are...That is a clarification. I would ask for concurrence in the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 132?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 161 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 132. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 137, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 137, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Senate approved and adopted two Amendments to House Bill 137. Amendment #2 simply just changed a reference from '1983' to '1985'. The first Amendment seeks to clarify provision in the law on the abolition of the office of Township Highway Commissioner. The present law says that

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

the office should be abolished on the first year after the roads drop to five miles. This says after ..on that...on the next year, first of April or at the end of the term of the Township Highway Commissioner. I would ask for the concurrence in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 137."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Conti: "Representative Steczo, I didn't hear. What are you going to abolish?"

Steczo: "No, the present law right now.."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Steczo.

Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could just give the Gentleman our attention, we could get through many of these a lot quicker. Proceed, Sir."

Conti: "No questions. Just explained. No questions."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 137?'. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Conti, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments \$1 and 2 to House Bill 137. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 145, Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have Representative O'Brien kindly move on the side? He's sort of disturbing me. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It provides that a patient examines or copies the records of clinical

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

psychologists pursuant to a court order. The patient must reimburse the psychologists for all reasonable expenses in copying. It also provides in cases of domestic violence the court may recommend that one or both parties undergo counseling with the clinical psychologists. As presently worded, the Act states that the court may order either or both parties to seek counseling with the social work or family service agency, mental health center, psychiatrists or any other guidance service that the court deems appropriate. At the present time, all of our health insurance programs include clinical psychologists and I would move for its concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative Terzich, the Bill itself is the reorganization of all of the civil procedure provisions in the one new Bill. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "And the Senate added some excess baggage?"

Terzich: "Call it what you wish."

Leinenweber: "Well, the only thing. We sent this Bill out as far as possible, as clean as possible so that we could assure everyone who is voting on this Bill, that it did not make any substantive changes. The Bill is a massive, I believe around 400 page Bill, which was gone over with a fine tooth comb by both the Majority and the Minority staffs and by a Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and by the Sponsor and his organization that he is the Chairman of. We sent it out of here. As far as possible we were able to assure every Member of the House that we were not changing the law as substantively. The Senate added this excess baggage for whatever reason, the Lord only knows. And I don't know if they're good or not. They obviously have not had any kind of a hearing at all in the House. The Bill..It was a good

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bill and remains a good Bill and I don't think we ought to concur with this Amendment. We ought to continue to send this Bill to the Governor in a absolutely clean form. It has also, I might add, been reviewed by the respective Bar Associations and had their endorsement. I don't know if this is a good Amendment or not. We haven't heard any..had a hearing on it in Judiciary Committee. We did have a hearing on the Bill and made numerous changes, both in Subcommittee and in full Committee. So I would oppose the Gentleman's Motion to concur."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock."

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "I agree with Representative Leinenweber that this Bill was approximately two years in the making. It did receive substantial scrutiny by the Bar Association as a great major change in the statutes in the State of Illinois. However, as far as the Amendment is concerned, Senate Amendment #1 is a very, very minor change. It simply states that clinical psychologists who are presently covered under law, health insurance programs, that they be reimbursed for whatever expenses they have for copying reports and also, if a court recommends that a person go to a clinical psychologist, that he be reimbursed for that, whatever the court deems appropriate. These are minor changes and I would move for its concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 145?'. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'nay', 3

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 145 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

- Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, my wife just wants to thank everyone for being so nice to me. My wife, Barbara, is right here behind me. She wants to know what a true Legislator looks like in action."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi, House Bill 158.

 Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 158, a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing and regulating certain games of chance with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi to explain the Amendments."
- House Bill 158 is the raffle and chance Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Bill. It went to the Senate. The Senate put One Amendment provides an immediate Amendments on. effective date. The other Amendment, because of the problems of the corporations councils and city attorneys have found, they needed a special category of licenses to promulgate and promulgate rules for those special categories because we legalized something that had done on the marketplace for the last hundred years. They ran into a lot of peculiar problems. This will take care of their problems. I urge your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion?"

Giorgi: "I move to concur."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 158. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 158. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 159, Representative Ronan? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 159, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
creating the Data Information Systems Commission with
Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill
159, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's a
very slight change in the legislation we passed out of
here. All Senate Amendment #1 does, it states that the
Comptroller's Office when they file a security plan with
the Data Information Systems Commission, all they do is
that they file a written notice that they have a plan as
opposed to filing the actual plan with us. The reason that
we go along with this is that the Comptroller's Office has
a very sophisticated plan which they use to control their
ADP privacy program and consequently, if they give it to
us, then we will have access to a sophisticated plan that
we don't want anyone else to see. So, I agreed with the
Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 159?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 147 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'nay', 2

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 159. This Bill, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. If we may go back and just pick up a Bill we took
out temporarily, House Bill 93. Representative Deuster."
Clerk Leone: "House Bill 93, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law together with Senate
Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is quite a significant concurrence. The Senate amended this Bill which had been...which was an Amendment to the Inheritance Tax Law. When it came out of the House it dealt with the exemption for step children. It was amended in the Senate so as to provide a delayed effective date and a repeal or abolition of the Illinois Inheritance Tax. does increase the amount counties will receive from five to six percent on the tax collected. It's similar to other legislation that has twice passed the Senate and similar to a Bill that was pending in the House. Many of the sunbelt states, as you know, either have abolished their Inheritances taxes or have very large exemptions. This is really tax relief for, in many cases, widows and those who survive. I think many feel it's quite morbid to tax an estate. There is a fiscal impact of course, but it has a delayed effective date which I think makes it reasonable. would urge your support for concurrence to Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 93."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would the Sponsor of the Motion yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "You indicate that the Bill is now a complete repeal of the Illinois Inheritance Tax, outright, no phase in? Is

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

that correct?"

Deuster: "That's correct, with a delayed effective date to Fiscal Year 1983."

Ewing: "1983.."

Deuster: "And it is similar to other legislation that has been discussed in the House and in the Senate."

Ewing: "What was your original Bill?"

Deuster: "As I stated, it was a Bill that specified that step children would have the same exemption as normal children."

Ewing: "Kind of an innocuous little Bill and the Amendment kind of catapults you into the center of some controversy. Correct?"

Deuster: "I'm not sure if I've been catapulted or what happened.

I'm here. I'm presenting...Yes. They've changed the
Bill."

Ewing: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everyone here knows how I feel about the Illinois Inheritance Tax. I'd like to see it go too. But at a time when we're considering raising taxes on all the working people, all the young families, all the old people, to pay for government services, I cannot understand how any of us, in good conscience, can vote for a tax relief package which will give 80 million dollars worth of tax relief to 15 to 20 percent of the people of the State of Illinois. Many of my constituents would of course like this. But I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a time to be responsible, not political. And I would certainly hope that you would not vote to approve this concurrence. I think we should send this Bill back to the Senate; take that Amendment off and put Representative Deuster's Bill back in its innocuous former position. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, there are still some questions I have

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

regarding this Gentleman's Motion. I wonder if he would take it out of the record for a minute so I could talk to him?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster. House Bill 93 is out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 187, Representative Barr? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 187, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code together with Amend...Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barr."

Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill when it was in the House earlier was sponsored by my predecessor, Representative McCourt. The Senate, Senate Amendment #1 improves the Bill. The Bill included security guards at certain financial institutions in the Statutory exemption permitting them to carry concealed weapons certain specific circumstances. The Senate Amendment adds certain requirements for education and training of security quards at financial institutions in order to make them entitled to the exemption and tightens up the circumstances under which they may actually carry concealed Bill was originally supported by the weapons. The Association for Modern Banking and the Association is in support of the Bill as amended and I would move that this House concur."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Barr, as I understand the Amendment, it would now require the same training of these people as would be required for license under the Security Guard Act.

Is that correct?"

Barr: "I believe that's correct, Representative."

Getty: "So, it's your intention and what this would do would be

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

to provide at least those minimum standards."

Barr: "That's absolutely correct."

- Getty: "All right. Well, I think that the Senate Amendment did, indeed, Mr. Speaker, improve the Bill and although I did have reservations about this as it left the House, I think with the Senate Amendment ensuring that there are safeguards and considering the fact that financial institutions would, by their very nature, have sufficient liability insurance to insure the public, I think that this would put us in the posture of being at least as safe as we would be with private security agencies which would be the alternative. And that's the reason I intend to support this."
- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 187?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. It's final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 187. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 190, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 190, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors together with Senate
 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 190. House Bill 190 was on the Consent Calendar. It simply provided that an applicant for

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

a liquor license, they pay for it with a check drawn on any Illinois bank and the Senate's Amendment simply allowed that draft to be...or check to be drawn on Illinois banks or Savings and Loan Associations. I would ask for the House to concur."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 190?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. It's final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 161 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 190. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 198, Representative O'Brien? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 198, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The Amendment, for those who would like to know what the Amendment did, it dropped back the scholarship grant from \$2,000 to \$1,950 and that was an Amendment that I agreed to verbally on the floor of the House in order to get the votes to pass it and they went ahead and did put that Amendment on in the Senate. And I'd move for a favorable...I move to concur on it."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Dunn? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 198?'.

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 198. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 209, Representative Giglio? Is the Gentleman on the floor, Representative Giglio? Out of the record. House Bill 218, Representative Friedrich."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 218, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill was designed to define those who are eligible for veterans preference on state job applications. The Senate Amendment merely added those who are discharged from the service because of hardship. I move we concur on the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill 218?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 155...We'll have to wait on this one. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill 218 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 239, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 239, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 which made the language for aggravating circumstances into separate death penalty trial. Much more restrictive and much more burdensome upon the prosecutor. I think it's a very good Amendment and I recommend to you its approval."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Representative Davis, I do not rise in opposition. want to make that clear. I am, however, somewhat concerned about this language and I think we ought to read it into the record because it may have a little bit of difficulty in interpretation from a legal point of view. The added part is that the murdered individual was under 60 years of age and was killed by the defendant in a manner or following a course of conduct which was especially heinous, atrocious or cruel, that is, which was conscienceless or without pity and unnecessarily tortuous to the victim. my question is, there's... I have no problem with the words on the lines 4, 5 and 6. But the 7th and 8th, which was conscienceless or without pity or unnecessarily tortuous, would you explain conscienceless and indicate to me if you mean that it was in such a manner that the person did not have use of their faculties or not."

Davis: "Well, that word is somewhat vague, I do admit that to you, Representative Getty. And the Senate staff attorneys in trying to draft language that would incorporate the torture aspect with a prior..with prior conduct in child abuse came up with the word conscienceless. It's hard to say, isn't it? Conscienceless or without pity, meaning to them and meaning to me in explanation that ..not that they were without faculties, but they were aware of their actions, but had no, no..what's the word, the phrase I'm looking for? No, no guilt or remorse about or no pangs of

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

conscience about their course of action."

Getty: "Well, of course, quilt or remorse would have to do with an after thought and would be not at the time of the commission of the crime which would not be ...so you could not take that into account. That is what the person felt afterwards. It has to be the mental state at the time of the commission of the crime and that's one of the reasons that I wanted to nail this down because I want strengthen it by what we do here by legislative intent and I would suggest, Sir, that you may mean that at the time that the act is done, that the person was doing it knowing full well what he intended to do. And was of a hard heart wanted to do precisely those actions, notwithstanding the fact that he felt that it was a wrong act and a atrocious or cruel act as is referred to heinous. immediately before."

Davis: "I could not have phrased it better myself, Representative Getty, and that is my intent."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion?"

Getty: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Who was the genius that came up with this language?"

Davis: "Senator Phil 'Weber'."

Leinenweber: "It says, '...which was conscienceless or without pity and unnecessarily tortuous...'. Are there many murders that are done with conscience or with pity? And is torture ever necessary?"

Davis: "Well, that point of course has been raised by
Representative Getty on the word, 'conscienceless'.

'Unnecessarily tortuous' was put it, obviously, for the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

notion that there's never necessary torture. The word 'unnecessarily tortuous' to 'Weber' and the other staff attorneys in the Senate meant the same thing as it did to me, that if you're going to kill somebody in a course of action, there are ways to do that and there are other ways to do that. And if you burn a child with a cigarette burns or if you water torture, whatever, if you do that sort of thing that that is unnecessary torture.."

Leinenweber: "Well, you know, I understand that ..."

Davis: "If...If...Representative..."

Leinenweber: "..Point.."

Davis: "Yes, go ahead."

Leinenweber: "They're apparently making, but a lot of our laws are so poorly drafted now and I've sponsored Bills that I, myself, which probably fall within that category. Fortunately or unfortunately, my Bills never seem to pass. But, it just seems to me that when we put something into the booksnow you didn't draft this. I understand that-..."

Davis: "That's true."

Leinenweber: "We ought to clean it up and this Amendment seems to

me to be absolutely meaningless, heinous, as Representative

Collins says, and I really would suggest that you ought to

get rid of that Amendment."

Davis: "Well, I see that the legal community has some problem with the language. Rather than trust this...this language to the Governor's amendatory veto, even though he supports the Bill, and I know would sign it and use that veto pen, I think at this point, Mr. Speaker, a Conference Committee might be the best place and I would move to nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 239. Those in favor will

signify by saying 'aye', opposed? The 'ayes' have it.

Nonconcur. House Bill 241, Representative Davis? Read the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 241, a Bill for an Act authorizing the conveyance of certain state real property to Will County together with Senate Amendments \$2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you. This is a little more clear, I think, than the last one. It's a simple land conveyance Bill. When it went to the Senate, the Senate adopted language that would provide for an easement at Pontiac at request by Representative Ewing. Both Amendments now require that if nothing is done on the easement or conveyance within the two year period that the Department of Corrections request that the easement would be withdrawn and the land in Will County returned to the Department of Corrections. I concur in both Amendments and recommend them to you."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 241. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Final action. Have...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? Did it hit? On this question there are 160 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 241. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 242, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 242, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Municipal Code together with Senate Amendment #1."
Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 245 (sic, 242) was amended in the Senate to allow the Illinois Department of Transportation to set the method and conditions of retainage in its standards of

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

specifications. This only applies to a CDB, to counties and municipalities and I think it's a fair Amendment and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 242."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 242?'. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry. Representative Conti to explain his vote."
- Conti: "Not to explain my vote, just to clarify the transcription up there. Yourell started out by saying 'Senate.. House Bill 245' and then he finished up with 242. Just so they transcribe it properly upstairs. It's 242."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 165 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 242 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 249, Representative Yourell? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 249, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code

 of Criminal Procedure together with Senate Amendment #1."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton, do you seek the
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton, do you seek the Chair's attention?"

Cullerton: "No."

- Speaker Peters: "No. Your light is on, Sir. Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249 was suggested in the Judiciary I Committee of the Senate when this Bill was heard there. And they wanted to make it very clear as far as the fine that is imposed by the court at the full street value of the drug seized, that they wanted

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

to be certain and with proper language they inserted,
'..not less than..' and I think that's important because
what it does is make it very specific in the legislation
that the bail shall be set at not less, not less than the
street value of the drugs confiscated. The other part of
the Amendment deals with testimony given as to the street
value of the drugs and they wanted to have not only the
authority or the prosecution who tries the case to present
testimony, but in order to, I think, be Constitutional in a
more Constitutional sense to allow the defendant as well to
give testimony. I think that both parts of this Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 249 strengthens the Bill and I
move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 249."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Cullerton?" Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I spoke with Senator Bower about this particular Bill. He's the Chairman of the Judiciary II Committee from Republican from DuPage County, the former State's Attorney. He indicated he was against this particular Amendment and I just wanted to... It's the first time I've had a chance to look at it. As I understand it, if someone's convicted of possession of marijuana or controlled substance, what this does is to .. if he's convicted, allows the court to fine that person the total street value of the drug. Now, right now, the law, as I understand it, first of all, there's very few people who are ever fined for these offenses because they usually don't have any money by the time, Zeke would say, the lawyers are through with them. right now, the fine is up to \$10,000. So, I really don't see the need for something like this. It just... It seems to me, what you get involved in is a real long hearing to try to determine how much the street value of certain drugs It just would again, allow for another unnecessary is.

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

court proceeding when you already now have up to \$10,000 fine that you can impose and when it's not done, with any frequency whatsoever. So, for what it's worth, so you know what you're voting on, I think it's not a very good idea.

Neither did Senator Bower', Chairman of the Judiciary II Committee, a former State's Attorney from DuPage County."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you.."

Speaker Peters: "Representative, excuse me. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "I'd just like to correct the record. Representative

Cullerton, it may be true that...what you say about the

Bill, but Jack Bower was never State's Attorney of DuPage

County. That was Bill Bower."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I've been hearing these arguments such as the one just propounded and in the amount of the fines imposed on these individuals who are..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Yourell: "The amount of the fines imposed on these individuals who are perpetrating the worst crime in the history of the world. I have special specific knowledge of what's happening in this area and I can tell you that the lawyers who represent the drug merchants are now so arrogant in south Florida in particular, that they appear in court prior to the time that the defendant gets there to arrange bail. That was a matter of media attention just this morning in the Chicago Tribune. The lawyers are appearing in court to bail out their clients and they have this money available to them in order to accomplish that fact. I can tell you that 'Mr. Gueterris' in Florida, who was

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

picked up with ten million dollars worth of coke, the bail was set at three million dollars, later reduced court to one million. His attorney walked in, deposited one million dollars on the bench and walked out, been heard from since. So, those of you who want to be light on these drug runners, the money's it is considered as the cost of doing Whatever it costs. business. Now a ten thousand dollar fine for an individual that distributes ten million dollars worth of coke is certainly not in my judgment sufficient to keep these people off the streets. Either we put them in jail. Пe fine them or take their money in order to fight them. think this is a good Amendment and I think this is good legislation and I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment to 249."

- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 249. Those in favor will
 signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'.
 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Representative Huff to explain his vote."
- Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to give some of the Members some idea of proportion of what we're talked about. I know, for a fact, that on a certain corner of Larame and Lake in Chicago, on the west side, that the dealers that I have some awareness of and I know, tell me that they're making about 20 thousand dollars a day on coke which comes to about 200 thousand dollars every ten days. Think about that."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Huff?'

 Huff: "Just wonder..I just wanted to point out, Ladies and Gentlemen, they don't make political contributions."
- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 153 voting 'aye', 10

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 252, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill ..."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Yes? House Bill 256,
Representative Wolf? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 256, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Senate Amendment #1 some revisions that it was unlawful practice for any commercial vehicle located to employ an operator...any person who does not have an operator's license or temporary it makes the same addition of a temporary operator's license to persons employed as dispatchers. That..the Commission may issue to any new applicant for a license who has not been previously denied a temporary license which would be valid during dependency at the Commission's decision and would be valid for a period of 60 days or when the decision was made, whichever was less. Senate Amendment #2 was merely a technical Amendment and the Bill, as amended, did pass the Senate unanimously by a vote of 57 to nothing. I would now move, Mr. Speaker, that we concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 256."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 (sic, Amendments 1 and 2) to House Bill 256?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 160 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 256. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 284, Representative Stiehl. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 284, a Bill for an Act to create an

Inter-Governmental Law Enforcement Officers in Service

Training Act together with Senate Amendment \$2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for concurrence with Senate Amendment \$2. House Bill 284 provides in service training for local law enforcement officers. Originally the Bill places responsibility in the Department of Law Enforcement. However, in the House, Representative McAuliffe amended it to place this responsibility with the local law enforcement training board. In so doing, certain Sections of the law were not properly changed and all this does is reflect these changes so that the Bill will be in proper form and I would ask for approval. I would ask for concurrence in Amendment \$2."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, I believe in the concept of the Bill, Representative Stiehl, but I'm afraid that you might still have a problem in so far as the..whether the state's commitment is equal to 50% of the approved budget on page three line two or up to 50% of the approved budget on page four line mineteen. And I certainly would like to see your Bill passed and if it's just a matter of clean up technicalities on it, I think maybe we shouldn't concur with this so that your Bill would be approved. It's up to

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- you. It's entirely up to you but there might be some technical problems here."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, Representative Stiehl to close."
- Stiehl: "Well, it's my understanding that Amendment \$2 reflects
 that it will be up to 50% and I would like to move for
 concurrence."
- Speaker Peters: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2
 to House Bill 284. Those in favor will signify by voting
 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.
 Clerk. On this question there are 163 voting 'aye', none
 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does
 concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 284 and this
 Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is
 hereby declared passed. House Bill 289, Representative
 Stuffle? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 289, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #1 to House 289 is an Amendment which limits the initial Bill application of the early retirement formula passed by this House for the University Retirement System. It was worked out by myself and Senator Bruce and Senator DeAngelis. limits the initial impact to allow only 15%...er..to allow in the first year rather the universities and the community colleges to determine who, if any, employees would qualify to take care of a possible first year cash flow problem. Second year, the Amendment would provide for a limitation of 15% of those eligible. It limits the application of the Bill, as I say, for cash flow purposes. Amendment #2

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

adopts a formula for the Retirement System that applies to those people in the university system and the community colleges that are security officers. It provides an alternate formula for them, increases their pension contribution to gain that formula by one and one half percent. It provides that they must have at least 20 years of service at age 55 or 25 years of service at That Amendment was the same as House Bill 779, qualify. which passed the Pension Committee of the House here by vote of 12 to 1. It died on the Calendar at the deadline. That Amendment is supported by the Illinois Police Association, the POP, the Police Benevolent, the APL-CIO, the Teamsters and the Police Chiefs of the State. I move concurrence in both Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

J.J.Wolf: "By Senate Amendment #2, what we have done, am I correct, that you've taken the university police and let them retire at age 50 with 25 years of service with that formula that you give for other hazardous duty such as regular police officers?"

Stuffle: "The same as we did in Committee, yes, Sir."

J.J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members...If that's what your intention is, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't equate that with other law enforcement officers and jail guards which wethis provision for. I don't know. You vote the way you want, don't you? I don't tell anybody how to vote, but I know what I'm going to do and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Collins. No? Any further discussion? Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise in support of the concurrence on this. I had a little experience in the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

front lines with some of these university police. Some attended 12 years ago and they weren't singled out from the rocks and everything else and some of the problems of the regular police today. I think it's a good Amendment and I would recommend concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this concurrence on these two Amendments. Any policemen who straps on a firearm and tries to enforce the laws of the State of Illinois puts his life in jeopardy and he's entitled to consideration of any other police officer. University police officers jeopardize their ..put themselves in jeopardy and are entitled to this kind of consideration. So I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the

Sponsor."

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

O'Connell: "Representative, can you tell me how...what the age of retirement would be for say, a Chicago policeman?"

Stuffle: "I believe that that formula is 53 with regard to the Chicago policemen. It's similar to the downstate policemen. I think there's a slight difference in the two.

This would conform the standard to what we have with other people who are security people in the state systems."

O'Connell: "Representative, I don't mean to rebut your argument.

I was under the understanding that the retirement age for
Chicago policemen was 55."

Stuffle: "I don't believe it is and we could double check that.

But I believe that it's 53."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McAuliffe."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- McAuliffe: "To answer that Gentleman's question, 53 and 23. You have to have 23 years of service on your 53rd birthday in order to retire."
- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 289?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 289. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 293, Representative Satterthwaite? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 293, a Bill for an Act relating to the increase of the Drivers' Education Fund together with Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 293. The first Amendment leaves the Bill in the shape of an additional fee for driver's instruction permits. Only the second Amendment deletes the reimbursement mechanism, but that reimbursement mechanism is now contained in two other Senate Bills and so I move for concurrence on these Amendments to this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

- Henry: "Representative Satterthwaite, what is the cost of the program in question?"
- Satterthwaite: "The driver's education program itself or the cost of the license permit fee, which did you mean?"

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Henry: "The increase in cost. The increase."

Satterthwaite: "The increased cost for the permit fee, the permits are currently \$8.00 and they would go up to \$20.00.

But we need to remember that you have one year to drive on that permit. If, during that period of time, you are able to pass your test for licensure, then you automatically get a three year's license within that same original permit."

Henry: "Were there any other approaches made to fund this particular program without increasing the fees?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, Representative, there were some other attempts. But my Bill has always talked in terms of increasing the permit fee."

Henry: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she would. I ask the Members who are near the open microphones not to speak. It does reverberate around. Proceed."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be rather brief. Cut it off. Representative, why is it necessary at this point that we have a fee increase for kids?"

Satterthwaite: "Representative Bullock, this is not a fee increase at the school. This is only an increase for your driver's permit through the Secretary of State's Office. The necessity arises from the fact that it is a mandated program within the schools and it is not being funded sufficiently so that when the local school district has to pick up this cost, what happens is they have to take money that would otherwise go for the teaching of English or mathematics or other programs within the school to fund the driver's education program instead. Even with this funding, we'd only be up to a level of about 35 to 40%

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

- funding. It would be a slight increase to the school districts over what they're currently getting."
- Bullock: "Why didn't the...Did you talk to the Secretary of State about this Bill? Does he support it?"
- Satterthwaite: "I did not talk directly with the Secretary of State, but I have talked with his staff and it's my understanding that he has no objection to this increase."

 Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none...The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 293?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 293. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 305, Representative Swanstrom? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 305, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Insurance Code together with Senate Amendments #1
 and 2."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Swanstrom. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we did move along fairly quickly and fairly well. And I think that's because of the attention given by the Members to what was being said. Those individuals who are not entitled to the floor, would you please leave? And the Membership would limit their remarks or at least keep them down. I think we will progress as quickly. Proceed, Sir."
- Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

2 to House Bill 305. House Bill 305 as passed by the House attempts to eliminate the need for duplicate licenses issued to an insurance agency as well as each broker. Senate Amendment #1 makes technical changes requested by the Licensing Division of the Department of Insurance. Amendment #2 clarifies a present Section of the Insurance Code which prohibits banks and their subsidiaries affiliates from being licensed as insurance agents or brokers. The Amendment adds bank holding companies to the present Section. The intent of this Amendment is to clearly indicate that bank holding companies are contained present prohibitive Section. The Department of in the Insurance already interprets the Section to apply to They Department has holding companies. have...The indicated that this change will not, I repeat, will affect the present insurance operations that a bank or bank holding company may now be engaged in. It is the intent of this Amendment to apply to individual policies such as auto insurance, home owner's insurance and business insurance and not the group insurance that banks and bank holding companies are presently engaged in in the State of Illinois. I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor kindly take the

Bill out of the record momentarily? I'm sorry. What? On

Amendment #2. I have no...I'd like to discuss Amendment #2

that was adopted in the Senate with the Sponsor, if I may?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative?"

Swanstrom: "Will we get back to this Bill?"

Speaker Peters: "We will get back to it, Representative. We will get back to it as soon as you ask me to get back to it.

How's that? Okay?"

Swanstrom: "I'll take it..."

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

- Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 308,
 Representative Jaffe-Leinenweber? Out of the record.
 House Bill 319, Leverenz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 319, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to Fire Protection Districts together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 would detail the exact tax out of the Municipal Code Section 11-7-1 that could not be levied. As we passed the Bill out of the House 158 to zero, what we did with the Senate Amendment was to specify..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative. Representative

 Swanstrom, yes. Representative Swanstrom and the Gentlemen

 around you, if they would take you to the rear or out

 because this is going to be a loud conversation in front of

 me. I can see that. Now, you may not want to go with

 them. That's a decision you make. Proceed, Representative

 Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Senate Amendment as a technical clarification to the Bill identified the specific Section of the Illinois Municipal Code with regard to the tax. I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 319."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bluthardt?

 Excuse me. Would the Gentlemen standing around
 Representative Bluthardt please leave that area? Your
 conversation is over the microphone. Mr. Selke? Please
 move."
- Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

 Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."
- Bluthardt: "Is the effect of the Senate Amendment specifically

- 74th Legislative Day

 Cover the special fire tax that is levied by

 municipalities?"
- Leverenz: "Yes. It was suggested by the Municipal League that that be detailed and that is the fire protection tax levy of a municipality."
- Bluthardt: "All right. One other question. This would have no affect on the situation that existed between the Leyden Fire Protection District and the Village of Franklin Park, would it?"
- Leverenz: "I don't know the answer to that question.

 Representative Conti brought that to light the last time and at that time, I did state on the House floor that that litigation was over and this just, as far as I know, prevents a similar situation from reoccurring again. Where the dual taxes are both levied it really forces the municipality to carry through on a disconnect from the Fire Protection District."
- Bluthardt: "All right. A question I had, was this...is prospective in its nature, so that in those cases where a court has determined that the area of a Fire Protection District that's been annexed by a municipality should not be disconnected from the Fire Protection District. A municipality would not be able to levy a tax in that instance, is that correct?"
- Leverenz: "The specific tax, as outlined in the Senate Amendment, for the Fire Protection Tax for that municipality, yes, that is true."
- Bluthardt: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Greiman, the Chair can hear you here and Representative Topinka, the Chair can hear you here. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 319?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Okay? On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 319 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 308, Representative Leinenweber. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 308, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to contractors and material mens liens known as mechanics liens together with Senate Amendment \$1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 308 was a Bill suggested by the Supreme Court which would reduce costs. It amended the Mechanics Lien Act, the provision which allows the person to demand a suit be commenced to enforce a lien after service of a lien. The Act provided that that must be done by personal service. It was felt that in line with most other types of notices, that registered or certified mail would be appropriate. The House passed this Bill I think with either unanimously or pretty close to it. The Senate Amendment would require a return receipt. It's sort of a typical Senate Amendment.

It won't hurt the Bill and I would urge its concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 308?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'...Tony? Those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 165 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does concur

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 308 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 322, Representative Daniels? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 322, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to prohibit the sale offering..or exposition of sale of fireworks together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 322 amends an Act regulating the use of fireworks. It
provides that illegally possessed fireworks without a
permit for public display...The Senate placed an Amendment
on the Bill which is referred to as the 'Kim Sangmeister
Amendment', which removed from the definition of fireworks
'sparklers'. I'd move to concur."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 322. Is there any discussion?

Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. What is a ...What is the definition of a 'sparkler'? I've ..I've seen all sorts of different types of sparklers. Is that defined in any way, shape or form?"

Daniels: "The Amendment removes the definition."

Mulcahey: "The Amendment removes the definition of sparkler?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Mulcahey: "Are sparklers legal or illegal in Illinois?"

Daniels: "The Amendment would make them legal."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate
Amendment 1 to House Bill 322. Those in favor will signify
by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McAuliffe, 'present'. 'Present'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the House has concurred with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 322, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 337, Representative Mautino. Will the Gentleman in front of Mautino please clear the way?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 337, a Bill for an Act relating to the use of guide dogs by deaf persons together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 337. What Senate Amendment #1 did was take all of the substantive language of the three Bills on the same subject, those introduced by myself, Representative Braun and Representative Deuchler, amended them into 337. The Amendments basically change the definition of deaf to the term 'hearing impaired' throughout the Bill. It adds language concerning the Human Rights Act to include the definition of a handicapped person with a physical characteristic that necessitates the persons' use of a quide or a hearing dog and it clarifies the language prohibiting discrimination in the rental of homes on the basis of the need for a guide or a hearing dog. I move for concurrence in Senate Amendment # 1. "

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 166 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 339, Representative Lechowicz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 339, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechovicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 339 is House. technical Amendment requested by the Cook County State's Attorney's office. The Senate Amendment does not basically change the Bill but it does tighten the language somewhat to make it clear that the Bill is aimed at the use of violence and the threats of violence against a person's family as well as the person himself when those unlawful techniques are used to recruit members or gangs. The Amendment also modifies the penalty to conform to the The sentencing structure of the Code of Corrections. Amendment makes the violation a Class 3 felony which carries a sentence from two to five years. I also that if aggravating factors are found in a particular case the sentence for a Class 3 felony increases to five to ten I think this is appropriate and the State's Attorney's office feels that this will allow the stronger enforcement and more appropriate sentence in individual cases. I move the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 339 and will answer any questions the membership may have."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

June 28, 1981

74th Legislative Day

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Lechowicz, as amended, will this Bill discourage members.. membership and legal organizations? I ask the question because I am concerned over the potential for any chewing effect on legitimate organizations."

Lechowicz: "No, it will not. The Bill is not aimed at membership in any organization or type of organization. The Bill only prohibits certain unlawful methods used to compel or coerce membership in organizations. The Bill is no way is directed against membership in itself."

Darrow: "If this Bill becomes law can it be used to combat street gang recruit? Is that the primary goal of the Bill?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, most definitely. One of the main purposes of this legislation is to combat illegal method especially violence and threat to violence employed by gang members to recruit new members."

Darrow: "Thank you. This appears to be a very good piece of legislation. I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Griffin."

Griffin: "Yes, would you yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Griffin: "We heard this before Judiciary II and I think we're all concerned about the problem. I just wanted to know in terms of the protection of civil liberties of people the constitutional provisions for gathering in organizations and groups if there are any dangers that could be come about through a misapplication or misinterpretation of this and what safeguards you may have incorporated to avoid this."

Lechowicz: "Well, I believe the Senate Amendment #1 takes that into consideration. And I read to you the Amendment into the record. 'A person who explicitly or 'impliantly'

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

threatens to do bodily harm or does bodily harm to an individual or to that individual's family or uses any other criminally unlawful means to solicit or cause any person to join any organization or association regardless of the nature of such organization or association, it is guilty of a Class 3 felony."

- Griffin: "Some people on this side have asked if this would include labor organizations."
- Lechowicz: "I'm sure, in fact, that was discussed in Committee.

 It was discussed on the floor. It was discussed in the Senate and based upon the language that is content of Senate Amendment #1 to 339. It may, if they explicitly or 'impliantly' threaten to do bodily harm to any individual.

 And I believe that they should be included if that's the case."
- Griffin: "One last question. You mentioned in our analysis that speaks about, 'organization must have an illegal purpose.'

 How do you..."
- Lechowicz: "That language was removed in the Senate Amendment and it caused some concern as far as the State's Attorney's office in Cook County and the questions that were asked by Representative Darrow were also at the request of the State's Attorney's office. In case there is a question in court on this matter so the legislative intent is quite clear."

Griffin: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

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

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

Representative Lechowicz, to close briefly."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's been

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- adequately discussed. This Bill passed the House 157 to nothing. Beginning with the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 it deserves the same type of a vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 339?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Ewell, to explain his vote."
- Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill really deserves 177 votes if all Members were present. Ten years ago when I put in the origin, original Bill and, however, I limited it to those seventeen years of age and under. This is a tremendous step forward. It deserves absolutely the vote of everybody here to show where this Body stands on gang and gang recruitment of juveniles. Thank you."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all... Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 170 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present' and the House does... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 339. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 341, Representative Deuster. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 341, a Bill for an Act to provide for the safety inspection, licensing and regulation of the amusement rides and attractions together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."
- Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this
 was the Bill that left the House and simply required that
 those carnivals and amusement ride and attraction people
 have liability insurance. Senate Amendment #1 makes three

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

small changes in the Bill and I am asking for your concurrence. One, it changes the administration of the Act from the Department of Labor to the Department Reason for that, originally the Bill, Insurance. introduced, called for some inspection. I think it's appropriate that since they're just filing a policy of insurance it would be with the Department of Insurance. Secondly, the insurance would be in the form of a policy rather than cash or other security as is consistent with other requirements in the statutes. Three, it removes the requirement that the insurance policy be a company licensed in Illinois, and the reason for this is quite often this type of carnival insurance may be placed through Lloyds of London or through the surplus lines procedures with a company that might not be licensed. I would urge the adoption of ... or concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Henry."

Henry: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Henry: "Representative Deuster, this Bill was before us in one of the Committees. There was a question regarding fees. The fees for inspections, are they included in Amendment #1 and 2?"

Deuster: "Oh yes. This Bill has nothing to do with inspections or fees. That's all out. All it does is require that these people have liability insurance."

Henry: "Does it say the amount of liability insurance they should have?"

Deuster: "The liability limit is the same as it was passed the
House and the Senate in that form which was the top
liability limit of one million dollars."

Henry: "Okay."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur?'. Any

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 34121 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'nay', ! voting 'present'. This Bill having... The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 341, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 349, Representative Jaffe. Representative Barnes on House Bill 349. Representative Davis, House Bill 349. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 349..."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Yes."

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

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 366,
Representative Greiman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 366, a Bill for an Act concerning abuse between family and household members together with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. Senate put three Amendments on. Amendment #1 makes some corrections of spelling errors and makes certain modifications to satisfy the concerns of the police and sheriffs and county clerks in the administration Ωf Act, and I think makes for a better Act. Amendment #2 provides some standards for judicial findings and clears up ambiguities as to the conditions of any bail bond. Amendment #3 merely adds the word psychological in front of

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

psychiatric so that you have a choice of the full array of scientific talent. I urge the adoption ... the concurrence of House Bill 366 for these three Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Greiman, I don't have the Amendment but I do have out analysis and Senate Amendment #2 makes provision... or #5, part of that Amendment I guess in provision on permitting inter-spousal suits for intentional torts prohibits admissability into evidence such as suit of a finding in any divorce case. Now, you had a Senate Bill which I think did that and there was some problems with the drafting. Does this Amendment, in your view, will this be different than the Senate Bill? I think it was Representative (sic, Senator) Marovitz's Bill."

Greiman: "No, Sir. Representative(sic, Senator) Netsch's Bill.

There are slight language differences. I think the
Governor can sign both Bills and the other one would be
effective depending on how he signs it. We'll take that up
with him so that they will be covered."

Leinenweber: "... May I suggest you bring that to his attention
that the preferred language is in the other Bill?"

Greiman: "Netsch... Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3?". Am I correct, Sir? Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 366. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 163 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 366. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 368, Representative Robbins. Out of the record. House Bill 373, Representative Sandquist. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 373, a Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move we concur in Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill 373. The original Bill was the one which preserved the three tier system in the sale of alcoholic beverages and the Senate Amendment \$1 permits the sale of alcoholic liquors in the new State of Illinois Center in Chicago which is going to be ready in 1985. I had a Bill to do that and it didn't get in soon enough so it was put on as an Amendment. I'd ask the concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bowman: "Why? Why is it necessary to be desireable to serve alcoholic liquor in the new State of Illinois building?"

Sandquist: "I believe the present intent is the first three floors of that building are going to be commercial and they'd like to have a very nice restaurant and that would require the sale of alcoholic beverage to go on. I think that's what the plan is."

Bowman: "I see. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 373?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 373, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 377, Representative Hudson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 377, a Bill for an Act to eliminate obsolete references to junior colleges in various Acts together with Senate Amendments 3, 4, 5, and 6."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendments #3, 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 377. The effect of Amendment #3 is technical in nature. It changes 'President of the Board' to read 'Chairman of the Board'. Amendment #4 Deletes the word 'school' in front of technical also. 'treasurer' thus making it read 'treasurer of the district' rather than 'school treasurer of the district'. Amendment #5 is technical also. Deletes the word 'junior college'. Amendment #6 adds in Chapter 74, paragraph 81 to the list public corporations. It of adds public community colleges."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 377?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 167 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 377. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

declared passed. House Bill 382, Representative Stuffle.
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 382, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Pension Code together with Senate Amendment #1."
 Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, this is the Bill that the House passed out that dealt with the non-garnishment of pension benefits in the downstate police pension system that put it in the same line as the other pension systems. The Senate added an Amendment to the Bill which simply says that you can recover where a person is overpaid as to the amount of pension benefit that they should be receiving and I would move to concur in the Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 382. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 164 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 382, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 385, Representative Schraeder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 385, a Bill for an Act to protect farming operations from nuisance suits under certain circumstances together with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, point of inquiry. I want to concur on Amendment 1 but not on 2. You just want to hold it and put it with the other group or how do you want to handle that?"

Speaker Peters: "We can proceed with it now."

Schraeder: "Thank you. I'd like to move concurrence on Amendment

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

- #1. It just adds some language to the Bill that doesn't do much other than make some clarifying statements, and I'd move the concurrence of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Peters: "Okay. This is just a vote on the Amendment now.

 The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1.

 Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 385. Representative Schraeder on Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 385."
- Schraeder: "I'd move nonconcurrence on Amendment #2. That
 Amendment is a Bill that was defeated in the House
 Committee overwhelmingly and I see no purpose in taking up
 the time of the House. I'd move reject Senate Amendment
 #2."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman now moves to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendment 2 to House Bill 385. Those in favor will signify
 by saying 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it.
 Amendment #2 is nonconcurred in. House Bill 386,
 Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 386, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Illinois Veterinary Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate
 Amendment #1 was technical in nature and extended
 provisions for those who are currently exempted from the
 Veterinary Act. It would be exempted from the injunctive
 language that was in the original House Bill. I would move
 for its concurrence."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bill 386?. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 165 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 386, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 393, Representative Catania. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 393, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Insurance Code together with Senate Amendment #1."
Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 393 was approved in this House with 147 'yes' votes prohibiting discrimination based on marital status in renewal of homeowners and automobiles insurance policies providing that a notice of insurance non-renewal must be mailed to the insured within 30 days of the intended date It was amended in the Senate at the of non-renewal. request of the Department of Insurance to provide for implementation of the legislation we passed last year establishing the Illinois Insurance Exchange. It specifies the powers and duties of the Exchange Board and creates a procedure for quick access of funds to pay claims in the event of insolvencies and makes some other technical It was on the Agreed Bill list in the Senate and changes. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Peters: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is... the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 393?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 393, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 403, Representative Levin. Representative Telcser. Bowman. Out of the record. House Bill 405, Representative J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 405, a Bill for an Act to amend the Game Code together with Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There Wolf: are a number of Senate Amendments. I will explain them one at a time. None of them are controversial and I know of no opposition. Taken out of the Bill was the provisions that the Department could expend contractual funds to purchase the wild animals for evidence. That was removed from the The effect of Senate Amendment #1 adds an Amendment Bill. to the Civil Administrative Code on the sale of obsolete buildings, increases time for leasing land with or without appertainances which has obsolete buildings from two to years, increases time for leaves of concessions from 10 to 25 years and adds the Department may lease lands to persons or public or private corporations for a period not to expend 40 years for the construction, maintenance and operation of service facilities. Senate Amendment #3 amends various statutes of the Fish Code. Provides that the proceeds of sale that auction of forfeited property shall be deposited in the Wild Life and Fish Code, revises certain quotas, provides that it shall be unlawful to sell any fish taken by sport fish devices, adds a fee for

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

day for the fishing in Lake Michigan by hook and line, a one day fishing license for residents which is similar to that which we now have for non-residents. Senate Amendment #4 provides that the proceeds of the sale or the auction of forfeited property shall be deposited in the Wild Life and Fish Fund, increases the reciprocal wild turkey permit for non-resident, increases the fee to 30 dollars the reciprocal fee or not less than 30 dollars. It's currently \$15.50. Allows year round hunting of skunks, striped skunks, trapping season will remain from September 1 to March 1. For you downstate goose and duck hunters in your district, it extends the lead shot extension for two years to January 1 of 1984, provides for a reciprocal fee on trapping of fur bearing mammals."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion?"

Wolf: "Wait. That's number four, and number five, the concessions on the leases shall be on a percentage basis.

Number six provides that... you got enough. The Department of Conservation is in favor of all these Amendments. They support all of them. I move we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and Amendment #7 is the Clyde Schoate Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bower."

Bower: "Yes, I just wanted to ask Representative Wolf if this was the omnibus conservation Bill of 1981."

Wolf: "Yes, it is, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Did the Gentleman say he was not concurring in Amendment 2?"

Wolf: "There is no Amendment 2."

Bowman: "There's none?"

Wolf: "Wait a minute. Hold on."

Speaker Peters: "There is no Amendment 1, Representative. I

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

think it is 2."

Wolf: "My sheet didn't show a 2. I beg your pardon. There's no
1. It's just #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7."

Bowman: "Okay. So the Gentleman is moving to concur in Amendment

2. Is it... Will the Gentleman yield for a question then
on Amendment 2?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bowman: "Okay. According to my synopsis here it says that this increases the time of lease of concessions from 10 to 25 years. Why is that needed? Twenty-five years for a lease concession seems to be an awfully long period of time, especially in a period or an era of rapidly rising prices. We may want to re-negotiate."

Wolf: "If you notice, in another Amendment, that we provide for graduated leases. The thinking behind this is that it is very difficult to get people who lease property for concessions to make any improvements and that's why our state parks aren't in as good a condition as those in Indiana and Kentucky and others. It was felt that by giving a longer lease the person leasing that would be more inclined to spend some money to renovate and improve the premises and another Amendment, which was sponsored by Senator Gitz, provides that they shall provide for percentage leases."

Bowman: "Is the 25 year period mandatory or permissive?"

Wolf: "Permissive."

Bowman: "Okay. And the graduated lease arrangement would permit that the reimbursement to the state would change over time.

Is that the idea?"

Wolf: "Yes, it's a percentage lease so in case, you know, things go up, prices go up they would get a percentage of it."

Bowman: "Oh, percentage lease. I see. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Winchester."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Winchester: "Representative Wolf, is there any provisions in that

Bill for the extension of the steel shot?"

Wolf: "Yes, I did mention that there's an extension..."

Winchester: "That's okay. Thank you."

Wolf: "Till January 1, '84. Two year extension."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Question's answered.

Any further discussion? There being none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,
and 7 to House Bill 405?'. Those in favor signify by
voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is
open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 161
voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay' and 1 voting 'present' and the
House does concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7
to House Bill 405, and this Bill having received the
Constitutional Hajority is hereby declared passed. House
Bill 411, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 411, a Bill for an Act in relation to meetings together with Senate Amendments #3 and 5."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Clerk."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the open meetings Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Give the Gentleman your attention."

Reilly: "This is the open meetings Act. The Senate added two, I think, good and fairly simple Amendments. Senate Amendment #3 clarifies that there is no problem. This Act should not create a problem for the commission form of government, clarifies that when those people are acting in their Executive or administrative capacity they're exempted. And Senate Amendment #5 is a technical correction making consistent the wording in the Act. It was suggested originally, as I recall, by the House Democrat Staff and

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

but the whole concept, I think, is just getting carried away. I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to House Bill 411? . favor will signify by voting 'ave', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Wolf, Peters 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to and this Bill having received the House Bill 411 Constitutional Majority hereby declared is Representative Grossi, we will get back to Representative Swanstrom and then pick you House up. Representative Swanstrom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 305, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I will renew my Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 305. I explained them earlier. Very simply, what we are doing in this concurrence is extending language which presently exists in the statutes to include multi-bank holding companies, and I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Pirst of all, I'd like one question of the Sponsor. I've seen two different definitions. One is saying multi-bank holding companies and the other ones say bank holding companies. Which are we talking about?"

Swanstrom: "Multi-bank is being added to the present language."

Piel: "Okay. I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Bluthardt: "Which is what? 500 dollars and up to a year in prison?"

Reilly: "I think that's right. We don't change the penalty any."

Bluthardt: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question. I didn't get that quite straight, Jim, on the way our analysis reads it says, change the definition of meeting from members discussing public business..."

Reilly: "That was tabled."

Ewing: "That was tabled. So there isn't any change in that then."

Reilly: "The only changes are Amendments 3 and 5."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion. Representative Dick

Kelly. The quest... Representative Reilly, do you wish to

close? Representative Jack Dunn."

Dunn: "The Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "Let me create a brief... Let me create a brief scenario,
Jim. I used to take my trustees to lunch usually on
Saturday. Four or five trustees, police chief, the village
manager. We would discuss village business. Perhaps they
had been out that morning looking at the roads or different
projects we had going. They might make a recommendation
from time to time on just how they thought things ought to
go. Would we be in violation in that kind of an
environment?"

Reilly: "No. I don't mean to evade the question, but no more so if this Bill becomes law than already. I think that's depending on exact circumstances and the intent. That may be a violation of the current Act. Nothing in House Bill 411 would make that better or worse."

Dunn: "I think the Amendments are a step in the right direction,

74th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1981
- detail, but yes, they have to keep minutes."
- Bluthardt: "So if two elected members met and discussed the need of repairing a sewer main that had broken, they would have to keep minutes of that discussion."
- Reilly: "If that's a meeting and if they've notified the media and so on, yes, they must keep minutes."
- Bluthardt: "Under your proposal it would be a meeting. If they didn't give notification, it would be in violation of the
- Reilly: "It depends, as I've tried to explain all along, on whether they're meeting for that purpose and..."
- Bluthardt: "We're admitting that."
- Reilly: "Alright. Fine. Then, yes, it's a meeting and, yes, they have to keep minutes."
- Bluthardt: "If they go further... If they don't keep the minutes, what is the result of that? Can their action by nullified then by an action in court?"
- Reilly: "No, because in the hypothetical you've given me this is an open meeting. They've notified the media and the only things that can be nullified in court are actions taken in closed meetings."
- Bluthardt: "So that the provisions requiring minutes of all meetings is not that type of violation that could be set aside by court. Would there be any personal liability as a result of failure to keep minutes of those meetings?"
- Reilly: "Would there be what? I'm sorry."
- Bluthardt: "Personal liability."
- Reilly: "Not in any way that I can see."
- Bluthardt: "Is there any liability on the part of a public official for failure to abide by the law as you propose it?"
- Reilly: "It is now and would be, as we propose it as I recall, a

 Class C misdemeanor. We don't change the penalty any."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Miller: "I appreciate the Sponsor's sincerity in trying to distinguish between these. I think that he's on the horns of a dilemma; however, and he's going to put every other municipal official on the horns of that same dilemma and, though this legislation is very well intentioned, it's going to really become a very, very burdensome and difficult factor in the lives of our municipal officials. I know it's greased. I know it's going to fly out of here, but I think it's a real travesty."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman yield for another question?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "You know, pursuing the line of questioning of Dwight Friedrich, say the two trustees of a village meet and they are a quorum of a quorum and they ve complied with the law as to notification, publication, whatever else the law requires. Would they have to keep minutes of that discussion under your proposal?"

Reilly: "They have... only let me make sure I understand the question. That hasn't changed any. I mean, this was involved in the debate when we had it here. Let me make sure I understand. You're saying they have notified the media and it's an open meeting?"

Bluthardt: "Yes."

Reilly: "Okay."

Bluthardt: "They've complied with the law as you propose it."

Reilly: "Yes, part of the proposal is that they have to keep minutes. That's correct. The minutes; however, it's very clearly spelled out in the Act and we covered this in the debate here in the House. The minutes only have to describe very generally what the subject matter of the discussion was. They don't have to go into any great

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

between?"

Reilly: "Well, what the distinction is... what we're saying is that if they meet to do something that... The problem with, you know, unique to the commission form of government is that they are both Legislators and administrators, Executives and the distinction is between those two. just says that... It doesn't attempt to define it in every single case. It just makes the generic distinction saying that if they meet in their administrative or Executive capacity, and in 99% of the cases we'd have a pretty clear case... pretty clear idea of what that is, that they are not subject to the Act. In other words, if they get together to decide, for example, how many people are going to ride the trucks, the snow plow trucks during a snow emergency, that's clearly something they can do without calling a meeting."

Miller: "If they were to decide whether or not to repair a fire truck or to purchase a new one, would that be Executive or legislative?"

Reilly: "I would think Executive. Now, if they decide... If they
try to work out the details or an ordinance and buying...
somehow buying the council, I think that might be
considered administrative, but if they're just deciding as
an administrator would which is the best, you know, what's
the best deal for my department, I think that's clearly
Executive."

Miller: "And that would not fall within the language of discussing?"

Reilly: "Correct. Because administrative and Executive actions of commission form of government people are exempt from the Act altogether."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

was concurred in by the Senate. I'd be glad to answer any questions; otherwise, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #3 and 5 to House Bill 411. I believe this required 107 votes."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Friedrich."

- Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield? The Bill, as it went to the Senate, would make illegal two city councilmen talking together about a street project. I noticed an Amendment to change that to discussing... eliminate discussion as to deciding. It was defeated. So if they're discussing it's still illegal. Right?" Without calling an open meeting."
- Reilly: "If they meet for the purpose of discussing that and two is a majority of a quorum, then that would be correct. But if they just casually... It's the same argument we had before. If they just casually meet or they meet at the drugstore or the coffee shop, that is not illegal."
- Priedrich: "Just so we understand it. If two councilmen out of a city council of a Mayor and four councilmen meet and discuss the street improvement, that's illegal."
- Reilly: "If that's the purpose for which they met and if that's a matter that the body is going to decide as opposed to something they in their Executive capacity are going to decide, that's correct. In most cases, that would not be correct."
- Friedrich: "All I can say, the Bill isn't any better than it was when it left here. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Miller."

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Miller: "Representative Reilly, with the respect to the commission forms of government, the changes to differentiate between their Executive functions and their legislative functions, how are those differentiated

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

may. Presently, the Illinois bank holding companies sell certain types of insurance and that was the reason I wanted to find out if it was just the multi-bank or both that he There's different subsidiaries in was speaking about. Illinois in the Illinois banking. Bank holding companies may currently be licensed to sell insurance provided that they have... that the type of insurance that is sold by these companies is regulated under a regulation Y which is under the governing of the Federal Reserve Board. The types of businesses which bank holding companies may enter are closely regulated by Federal law. To me, I think we're getting into an area that we don't really need to. seems these are regulated under Federal law. This did come In Alabama the Alabama Association of up in Alabama. Insurance Agents versus the Federal Reserve Board and I don't need to go into all the numbers, etcetera, etcetera, but the court ruled that property damage and liability insurance are directly related to the extension of credit and, therefore, may be sold by bank holding companies pursuant to regulation Y, which they are governed under at the present time. The Supreme Court refused to review the case, review the lower courts decision, thereby, upholding their decision of the lower courts. The thing that worries is if today we're saying that a holding company cannot offer insurance and we're strictly limiting them by this Amendment, tomorrow what's it going to be? It might be banks and it might be another area. It might be travel agents can't sell airline tickets because it's infringing with the FAA in some sort or another, and I definitely feel we have a, you know, potentially Pandora's Box here that we're opening by the passage of this. There was something that was sent out by the Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois and I noticed one thing which sort of shocked me a

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

little bit. It was sort of in the headlines. Reasons why you should not ... why the holding company should not be licensed insurance agents or brokers and them I got down and there was another line that was underlined and it basically brought in the coercive pressures. I'd like to express to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that this is against the law at the present time. situation where, I mean, if they were to do it at the present time whether it was a regular bank or a bank holding company, savings and loan, credit union, against the law. It's not a situation where this is going to bring this into a potential... a potentiality of bringing it more into being. It's against the law and presently on the Governor's desk we have House Bill 1440 which passed out of here 147, I think, to 2 or something like that which even strengthens this up more that banks cannot put this type of pressure on the consumer. I would ask for a 'no' vote on the concurrence of Amendment 1 on 305."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, first of all, I'd like to ask for a division of the question so that we take each Amendment that was put on in the Senate one at a time. Second..."

Speaker Peters: "You're right, Sir."

O'Brien: "Secondly, I'd like to indicate that I should have realized back in the Insurance Committee in the House when we had a hearing that this was just going to be nothing but a shell Bill until it got over to the Senate which is exactly what it turned out to be. I rise in support of the comments of Representative Piel and would like to indicate that the Bill, in its present form, would also exclude one bank holding companies in addition to the multi-bank

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

holding companies of which there are not that many. And, of course, everybody is aware that that law just passed and hasn't even been signed by the Governor at this point. I think that we are going in the wrong direction with this Bill and that, if they're beginning to exclude one bank holding companies, pretty soon they will be excluding other types of businesses in the State of Illinois and other types of associations. And, for that reason, I would ask everybody to vote against this concurrence on Amendment #1 and Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment 1 and 2 simply brings the bank holding companies in compliance with the present state law. I think it's understandable that these banks and these holding companies are not in the insurance business. They do hold master policies on group insurance credit life insurance and things of this nature. They're not in the business of selling homeowners insurance, individual life policies and so forth. It's been clearly defined that that is left up to a licensed insurance agent. I think that probably they're trying to reach their arms out. The Amendment simply brings them in compliance with present state law, and I would urge your adoption... concurrence with Senate Amendment 1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address Senate Amendment #2,
but will there be a division of this question on how we
proceed on that debate, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, we will vote on each of the Amendments."

Schuneman: "Perhaps it would be in order to vote on Amendment #1

and then debate Amendment #2. Would that be the proper procedure?"

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Speaker Peters: "We can do that. Representative Swanstrom, do you move to concur in Senate Amendment #1?"

Swanstrom: "Yes, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

- Speaker Peters: "Division of the question. The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 305. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. It's a Roll Call vote. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 67 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 305. Now, on Senate Amendment #2, Representative Schuneman."
- Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 simply seeks to confirm..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Schuneman, Senate Amendment 2 is what we are on."
- Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 simply seeks to confirm what the state law is at the present time as it respects banks in Illinois. The state law says that banks shall not be licensed as insurance agents except, I believe, in towns of less than 5000 population. What is being sought in Amendment #2 is simply to apply that language to the bank holding companies. Now, the bank holding company law which was passed by the Legislature and has not even been signed by the Governor yet poses what many of your insurance agency friends througout the state consider to be a threat to their existence. They are not particularly interested in seeing these large multi-bank holding companies who are in a preferred position to exert influence in the purchase of insurance contracts on homes and businesses and a great myriad of insurance coverages. They're in a position to exert great influence on insurance buyers and prospective borrowers on the purchase of

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

We don't want to insurance. see multi-bank holding companies allowed to get into the insurance business which presently denied to the banks. Now, banks are handling some kinds of insurance. Credit life, for example, this Amendment doesn't effect that at all. They can still continue to do that. But it really is kind of shocking to within just a few days of this Bill being me that here, passed by the Legislature before it's even signed by the Governor, we've got the multi-bank holding companies in here trying to expand their operations into the general insurance field. I think it's something that we should stop. I think you should support Amendment #1... or Amendment #2. Now, one of the previous speakers mentioned the fact that there had been some federal law on this matter and what he said was technically correct. federal law does provide that banks can be licensed as insurance agents, but what he failed to tell you was that they can only be licensed as insurance agents if controlled by state law. And most states have acted to take the banks out of the insurance business because of the factor that I mentioned earlier that they feel that they're in a position where they can extend and use undue influence prospective borrower. I think it's a perfectly reasonable Amendment. I think it's something we all should support. I urge a 'yes' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, this Bill was recently called out of the order by request of the Assistant Minority Leader and I want you to know that, for the first time in my years in the Legislature, I was privileged to attend the Session of several Nembers of the House and several lobbyists who attempted to mediate what appeared to be a difficult

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

problem for both sides. I think you would have been pleased to hear the discussion that went on in that room. It was completely free and open without any...It was completely free and open without any venom and. unfortunately, however, we were unable to come to any agreement. It was simply a case of those who are in the process, in the business of selling insurance, who were fearful of the possibility οf running into huge organizations who not now, but who may in the future, be selling insurance. I know that those of you on the floor, this can be a very difficult question to decide, but the fact remains, it is something that we must face up to at I suspect that in the future other colleagues sitting in here may change the law, but at the present time, I would respectfully ask that you concur, regretfully to some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I respectfully ask that you concur with Amendment does give the individual insurance broker a much better chance to compete in his professional livelihood than is the need for on the part of the international or the multi-bank holding companies. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Speaking on Senate Amendment \$2, this Amendment is designed to give the holding company banks the same treatments under state law that all state banks have had and had for a number of years. They're allowed to handle certain types of insurance pertaining to such as life insurance, pertaining to contracts and so forth and they've... and the state law has permitted them to. Now, these holding company banks are banks and I see no reason why we should exempt them from something that all the rest of the banks, state banks, must follow. Therefore, I would

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

hope that we would all support Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I think I may be the first one to speak in the House. support of Senate Amendment #2 who has been a very active supporter of multi-bank holding companies. I supported multi-bank holding companies because I felt it necessary trend in our banking law. I felt that people throughout the state should have a full complimentive banking services that are more sophisticated banks in our major metropolitan areas are allowed to offer. I was impressed by the fact that some of these banks have a higher loan to deposit ratio than some of the smaller banks and they have trust services and other services that some of the independent smaller banks have not had. I was not, however, aware that multi-bank holding companies would used as a means for these institutions to be going immediately into the insurance business. I think we ought to be taking this one step at a time. In legalizing multi-bank holding companies, I think we've made a very large stride already and we ought to stop for a moment and catch our breath before authorizing these institutions to go full scale into the insurance business. It is for that reason that I would ask for your concurrence in Amendment #2 which simply provides the same restrictions on multi-bank holding companies going into the insurance business that have applied traditionally to banks in Illinois. It does nothing to upset the status quo as far as what banks can do already and marketing credit insurance or what other institutions, finance companies and the like can do in the insurance field. It is simply an attempt to preserve the status quo for the time being. One of Gentleman speaking on the other side of this issue said

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

that we should nonconcur in this Amendment because it is clear that this Bill was, as originally introduced, simply a shell Bill. However, at the time that this Bill was introduced, multi-bank holding companies had not been approved by both Houses on the Legislature, and DOM is behind us it becomes clear that there are implications in our creation of multi-bank holding companies that we were not aware of at the time. It is for that reason that I would ask you to preserve this status quo. Let this issue come back in another year where it has a full hearing which we have not had a chance to give it I would ask you to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "May I move the previous question?"

Speaker Peters: "Let's get the list. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Swanstrom, to close."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want everyone to be perfectly clear on what we are doing with Senate Amendment #2 and I want you to listen carefully. The intent of that Senate Amendment #2 to House 305 is to clarify present prohibitions to the extent Bill that banks or bank holding companies are not able to be licensed as insurance agents or brokers to sell individual insurance policies such as auto insurance, homeowners, business insurance and etcetera. It does not affect group insurance insurance policies. This Bill was heard in the appropriate Senate Committee. There was no opposition registered. It went to the floor of the full Senate. There was no opposition registered. Now, within two or three days of the close of our Session, AMBI, Household

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

Finance seem to think that they have a great deal of problems with this Amendment. I don't know what they're running scared of other than the fact that, with the passage of Senate Bill 578 which is the multi-bank holding company, if that should be signed by the Governor it would open up various business ventures for those people. appeal to your basic reasons of fairness in this. are doing is extending present day language to include holding companies. I think it's a multi-bank I think the Bill is Amendment. a doog Amendment. Representative Piel alluded to an Alabama case. I don't know where AMBI picked that up. It is not applicable, whatsoever, to what we're talking about and all we are doing by this Amendment is including multi-bank holding companies in the present day statutes. I would renew my Motion for concurrence on Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 305?'. This is not on the Bill.

This is on the Amendment. Concur in Senate Amendment 2.

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

Henry: "Yes, thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill came before the Insurance Committee which I serve on it came through with good intent. We had some suspicions that it was going to be a shell Bill and this is it. What this really does to everyone, I want you to understand, is if you make a loan and at the same time you're making a loan, a person can issue you sick and accident policy which would pay off the loan in case you're ill. You are now removing that with Amendment #2. So, therefore, I oppose Amendment #2."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Sponsor explained very carefully that credit life would still be permitted by banks and presently and will be under this. The trains coming down the track. You saw them come down the track the first time last week with the holding companies and here she comes again. The next time it will be something else. They gobble up the little banks and now they're going to gobble up insurance agents and next year there will be something else. Now, the plea last week is all we want to do is to make service available to the people and for credit and banks and deposits and loans and so on, and here we go now with a whole new ballgame. So get ready for next year. It will be something else. It will be real estate then it will be something else."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just would like to take this opportunity to remind the Members that on the debate of 666, I cautioned you that the adoption of that Bill would cause a shift in the wealth, in the concentrated wealth of the State of Illinois and low and behold, before the Bill is even signed by the Governor the multi-national forces are marshalling their forces to go after the insurance companies. I must remind you that the insurance companies capital reserves is second only to the United States at 492 billion dollars, and if you vote this, Ladies and Gentlemen, they'll have that next year."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Brien, to explain his vote."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to oppose this

Amendment and just indicate that it is presently not

necessary to...(cut off) Hello. Thank you. It is not

necessary to ban them because it's presently in the law.

What we are doing here is we are prematurely voting to

prohibit multi-bank holding companies and single bank

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

holding companies from the possibility of going into possible, the insurance business. Also what we are doing; a vote for this is a vote against competitive buying. This will allow us to have competitive insurance rates. Maybe it will be on mortgages, maybe it will be on autos in the State of Illinois. This is a premature vote right now since we don't know exactly what the banking industry or one bank holding companies or multi-bank holding companies are going to do. I'd encourage everybody to vote 'no'."

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

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. After listening to the debate on this very critical
issue, the only safe vote for the brokers in the House,
those insurance brokers would be a 'present' vote because I
understood from one of the previous speakers that if this
Amendment passed, it would increase the business for the
independent insurance brokers and agents. If there is
anything that is a conflict of interest, that is a conflict
of interest. So, if you are an insurance broker and you
have spoke on this issue, then I would suggest that you
vote 'present' and retain your integrity."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."
Huskey: "First place, let me say I'm not an insurance broker.

But let me say in many cases you go to a bank for a loan and a lot of times when you go to this bank for a loan in the future, should this become law, you're appearing before this bank and an insurance policy may be what you have to buy to get the loan. I think this should be voted 'yes' and that you don't have to buy these insurance policies.

That you have a choice to go where you want to go to buy the insurance policies and not from the bank. So a 'yes' vote would be the vote to vote so you don't have to buy an insurance policy at the bank in order to make it contingent

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

to get the loan. In many cases, this is what it could be.

I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Woodyard, to explain his vote." Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Amendment certainly has created a lot of House. confusion I think in a lot of Members' minds when it's a simple Amendment. Presently, the Department of Insurance does not license bank holding companies and this certainly clarifies that, that they will not, and I don't see what's so hard to understand about that. The fox is back scratching on the chicken house door, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A week or so ago that fox got that chicken house and hasn't even had time to digest what it gobbled up and is going to gobble up in the next year in the acquisition of banks. Now, I urge an 'aye' vote on this ."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hudson, to explain his vote." you, Mr. Chairman(sic, Speaker), Ladies and Hudson: "Thank Gentlemen of the House. I think it should be remembered this Amendment will not, repeat, not take any authority away from any bank which it now has. In addition to that, I would like to make the point that the argument for multi-bank holding companies seemed to be, as I recall it, the ability to compete fairly. That's all they wanted. Now, as I see the multi-bank holding companies extending their activities into the insurance business, I think they are going to end up competing unfairly with companies. All of the worries and all of the crocodile tears about fair competition will be forgotten. If they can seize upon this as an opportunity to extend their activities into the insurance business where they do not really genuinely deserve to be to the extent that they... (cut off)."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

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

- McBroom: "No, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, not to explain my vote. Mr. Speaker, it's five minutes to seven. Some of us were under the impression that we were going to adiourn at 5:30. 6:00. I've listened to and I want to explain that there's no Member that I have more respect for than Representative Hudson. So, this remark is directed to We've listened to ten or eleven him. explanations of votes. The count has been 69 or 70. Ιf Representative Swanstrom would call for the absentees. don't think even if he would get 89... someone is going to verify it. I think there should be some direction as to what the disposition of this particular measure, Chairman(sic, Speaker)."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote.

 Representative Robbins, it's on."
- Robbins: "Okay. Thank you, very much. I just want to say I didn't speak against going into bank holding companies. Since we have given them the right to take over our little banks and to charge our people more interest, I think they should have the right to charge more insurance. I may be making a mistake in voting for this Amendment, but why give a bank that can pay its top officers three quarters of a million dollars the right to insure you. Now, is this fair? Do you think this is the kind of man that you want running your insurance company too?"
- Speaker Peters: "On this question... Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

 On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 81 voting 'no'.

 The Gentleman's Motion fails and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #2. There is nonconcurrence on Senate Amendment #2. Now, we have, before we adjourn, Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, that was a failure of a Motion to

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

concur. Now the Gentleman has to make the Motion not to concur."

"Representative Swanstrom now moves to nonconcur Speaker Peters: in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill... Senate (sic, House) Bill 305. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Senate Amendment #2 is nonconcurred in. We have these couple pieces of business that we've got to get out of here before we adjourn. So, listen carefully now, and if we just have order for about six minutes worth we'll be out of here. With leave of the leadership on both sides, the Chair would like to pick up Senate Bill 1236, Representative Hoffman, which is of an emergency nature in terms of some funding for the educational system. Does the Chair have leave? Leave is granted. Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1236. It's on concurrence. 1236."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act... House Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate the leave. This Bill has to be signed by the end of the month and it provides for an extension of the Adult Education Act to October the first 1982. It's presently now expired July 1, 1981. The School Problems Commission has been working on some changes in that. We put a sunset in it the last year and have been able to get our work done and ask for an extension to October 1, '82."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being..."

Hoffman: "Move to concur."

Speaker Peters: "There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in...' Mr. Clerk, Senate Amendment 1...'in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1236?'. Those in favor

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have Have all voted who wish? Take the all voted who wish? record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 voting 'ave', 1 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1236. This having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, in order to insure that we have the Calendar ready on nonconcurrences, the House will... the Chair will now call nonconcurrences which simply take an 'aye' or a 'nay' vote so that we are in the posture to get the Calendar ready and sent over to the Senate so they can act and we can get them back here on time. The first one is House Bill 27... Senate Bill 27. nonconcurrence. Representative Getty. Is it House Bill? House Bill 27. Out of the record. Alright. House Bill 28. Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton on House Bill 28. Out of the record. House Bill 49. Representative Bowman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 49, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in regards to estrays and other lost property with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I thought this was all agreed we were going to do all of the nonconcurrences that were sent up there on one voice vote."

Speaker Peters: "Well, there's one or two of them in here that are half of one and half of the other, Representative. I think if you just bear with us, we can get them done."

Matijevich: "I'm bearing with you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill amends the Lost Property Act. The

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Senate added an Amendment with another Section. We need to have some additional language. I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 49. Those in favor will signify
by saying 'aye', opposed. This House nonconcurs in Senate
Amendment #1. Representative Robbins, House Bill 368.
Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I move to nonconcur."

- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 368. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 368. House Bill 508, Representative Catania."
- Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate had an Amendment that it neglected to put on this Bill, and I'd like to nonconcur so we can get it on."
- Speaker Peters: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments

 1, 2, and 3 on House Bill 508. Those in favor will signify
 by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The House does not concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3
 to House Bill 508. House Bill 795, Representative
 Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, there's a technical problem with the Senate

 Amendment. I would move to nonconcur in that."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 795. Those in favor will
 signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The House
 refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 795.
 House Bill 811, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a cost containment Bill and there are nine Amendments, Senate Amendment 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

There are some discrepencies and technical differences and also some policy differences. So I'm going to nonconcur on the whole...."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to House Bill 811. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in the ab for mentioned Amendments. House Bill 811, Representative Reed. 871, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, mine's one of those that we have one of each."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Reed: "I'd move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 871. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Reed: "Senate Amendment #2 deals with all those lovers of wild life and the coyote. I think it's acceptable to ... coyote? Is that how you say it? At any rate, one cannot pursue a coyote from a snowmobile. Senate Amendment #2, I move to concur on."

Speaker Peters: "Lady moves to concur, only to concur, in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 871. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 871. House Bill 1030, Representative Donovan. Representative Donovan."

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Donovan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate

Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1030. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 1030. House Bill 10... House Bill 1391, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to non..."

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

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1391, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act together with the Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Yes, the Calendar's incorrect as the Clerk has just indicated. It's the Sanitary District Bill. I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "In what Amendment, Sir?"

Beatty: "In Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1391. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1391. House Bill 1421, Representative Henry. Gentleman here? Out of the record. House Bill 991, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 991, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 991. Those in favor will

74th Legislative Day

June 28. 1981

signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 991. House Bill 1263, Representative Zito. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1263, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Zito."

Zito: "Mr. Speaker... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would first move to concur in Amendment 1, 2, and 3 of House Bill 1263."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1263. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1263. On Amendment #4, Representative Zito."

Zito: "Yes, I would now move to nonconcur ..."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1263. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #4. Last one, House Bill 696, Representative Levin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 696, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code with ... together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate
Amendment #1. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye',
opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have
it, and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #1.
With leave of the House, may the Chair handle his own Bill

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

the podium? Thank you. House Bill 985. from Representative Peters moves to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2, to House Bill 985. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 'ayes', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 985. Representative Peters now moves not to concur in Senate Amendment #3. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 985. Representative Telcser. What's the number, Sir?"

- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not concur with

 Senate Amendments to House Bill 447. Amendments 1 and 2."

 Speaker Peters: "House Bill 4...."
- Telcser: "Amendments 1 and 2, to House Bill 447. Non concurrence."
- Speaker Peters: "447. The Gentleman moves that the House non concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2, to House Bill 447.

 Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2, to House Bill 447. Is that it? Representative....Telcser for the purposes of a Motion."
- Telcser: "Alright now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,
 before I put the Adjournment Motion. I would like to
 remind those Members who have gone home last night..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative. If we can just pick
 up one more on page 8, and it's a concurrence which for
 some reason, is now...Representative Getty. It's the
 ordinary and contingent expense for the Office of the

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

Governor. Can we do that? Representative..."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would have to defer to Representative

Matijevich, if he is in the sound of my voice, I wish he

would come out...."

Speaker Peters: "Alright, we won't....nonconcur, alright. Well,
Representative Birkinbine on House Bill 1019. Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur on House Bill 1019, something was inadvertently left off..."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 5, to House Bill 1019. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 5, to House Bill 1019. Now, on the Motion, Representative....Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Peters: "Give the Gentleman your attention, it's regarding your allowances."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, any Member who has gone home, last night and returned to the Capitol City today, are some Members are going home tonight, coming back tomorrow. I would like to remind you, you are entitled to travel reimbursement once a week, if you make that trip home and back, if you contact Judy 'Goodie', in my office, she'll see to it that you're reimbursed for your mileage this week. Obviously, if you don't travel home, you're not entitled to it. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I now move that the House stand adjourn until 9:00 A.M., Monday morning, tomorrow morning."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it, the House is adjourned until...9:00

A.M., tomorrow morning. Don't forget the ham and egg fry.

74th Legislative Day

June 28, 1981

State House Inn? State House Inn, ham and egg fry. And don't forget the Mushroom...where's that at, Representative Kulas? State House Inn. Stop by for some eggs, stop by for some mushrooms. Royal Order of the Mushroom meets. Royal Order of the Women meet."

JUNE 28, 1981

HB-0049	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	162
HB-0077	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
HB-0083	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	84
HB-0093	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
HB-0103	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
HB-0109	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
HB-0120	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	89
HB-0130	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	90
HB-0132	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	91
HB-0137	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	92
HB-0145	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
HB-0158	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	96
яв-0159	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	97
HB-0187	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
HB-0190	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-0198	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	102
HB-0218	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-0239	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-0241	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
HB-0242	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
HB-0249	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	108
HB-0256	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
HB-0284	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	113
HB-0289	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	114
HB-0293	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
HB-0305	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	147
HB-0308	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	123
HB-0319	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	121
HB-0322	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
HB-0337	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	125
HB-0339	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	126
HB-0341	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	129
HB-0366	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	131
HB-0368	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	163
HB-0373	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	133
HB-0377	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	134
HB-0382	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	135
HB-0385	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	135
HB-0386	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	136
HB-0393	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	137
HB-0405	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	138
HB-0411	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	141
HB-0447	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	167
HB-0508	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	163
HB-0696	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	166
HB-0795	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	163
HB-0811	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	163
HB-0871	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	164
HB-0985	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	167
HB-0991	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	165
HB-1019	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	168
HB-1030	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	164
HB-1263	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	166
HB-1391	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	165
SB-0232	3RD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0233	3RD READING	PAGE	43
SB-0234	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-0237	3RD READING	PAGE	2
SB-0238	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0271	3RD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0315	3RD READING	PAGE	7
SB-0328	3RD READING	PAGE	10
SB-0339	3RD READING	PAGE	11
SB-0344	3RD READING	PAGE	17

JUNE 28, 1981

SB-0345	3RD	READING	PAGE	39
SB-0381	2ND	READING	PAGE	44
SB-0517	2ND	READING	PAGE	53
SB-0670	2ND	READING	PAGE	68
SB-0956	2ND	READING	PAGE	68
SB-1157	2ND	READING	PAGE	69
SB-1228	2ND	READING	PAGE	76
SB-1236	CON	CURRENCE	PAGE	161
28-1530	CONG	TORKENCE	PAGE	10.1

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND TZORTZIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE LECHOWICZ	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	16
ANNOUNCEMENTS	PAGE	78
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	80
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	169

PAGE 2