82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. Could we have your attention please? The Chaplain for today is Doctor C. Sugar Hampton from the Lawndale Intra-Racial Baptist Church of Chicago.

  Doctor C. Sugar Hampton."
- Doctor Hampton: "Shall we bow our heads? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. O God, Our God, years that have passed and gone, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, we come this morning to this great State Capitol to thank Thee for another privilege of gathering together to make laws that will benefit all the people of the State of Illinois. We pray for Bill Henry. We pray for George Ryan who is the Speaker of the House and who has the responsibility of getting through the type of legislation that is best for all people. We thank Thee for keeping him alive and keeping him strong. We pray for every Legislator. Give them the mind of Christ. Give them Give them the mind to remember the the mind of God. Bless them and this state and in their ever people. endeavors. These and other blessings we ask in the name of the Lord Jesus for His sake. Amen . "
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you very much, Doctor Hampton. The Pledge will be led today by Representative Collins."
- Collins et al: "I Pledge Allegiance to the flag of the United
  States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,
  one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and
  justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Doctor Hampton, I believe that both Representative Henry and I are especially grateful for your words for us especially. And I am that you are for him."

Doctor Hampton: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance."

Doctor Hampton: "I just wanted to.. The Speaker of the House has

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

given me the privilege to thank you again for the privilege of coming down and just sharing with you. I want you to know that our church is open. Any time you have any meetings, whatever they are - because you are God's ministers - so whatever you have to do in helping this state, our church is open. My services are available to you at any time that you need me day or night. You don't have to worry about calling, you know, just give me a ring, night or day. I am ready 24 hours. Mr. Bill Henry can tell you that and anybody else in the City of Chicago can tell you that I am available. May God bless you and Mr. Ryan. Will you give one for me for Mr. Ryan? Come on, Henry."

- Henry: "...Of television station WGN and this great man who has come to share with us. Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. Introduction and First
  Reading of House Bills."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1998, Oblinger et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1999, Hallock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2000, Telcser Daniels et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act, First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Take the Attendance Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. With 171 Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. Would the record indicate that Representative Jane Barnes is present? At the request of Representative Kulas who heads the Order of Mushrooms, I would like to announce that the House is going to stand at ease until the hour of 12 noon today. We have a Conference Committee report that is some 70 pages long that has to be printed,

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

and we're waiting for the printing of that Bill. And when that comes in, we will reconvene and should be out of here in a very short order. So we'll stand at ease...or in recess until the hour of 12 noon."

- Speaker Daniels: "We're having some difficulty with the printing.

  The House will stand at ease until 1:30."
- Speaker Ryan: "The House will come to order and the Members will please be in their seats. All unauthorized people will please depart the floor. Mr. Doorkeeper, would you see that that happens please? On the Calendar on page two under the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 143. Representative Barkhausen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale of credit and the lending of money, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. On the Calendar on page four under Item Veto Notions appears Senate Bill 311. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of the following items of Senate Bill 311, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, page four line 30 through 33.' Representative Matijevich."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have never been one in all of my time here to waste any time of the House. This matter was called yesterday and came a few votes short, and I have been asked by some Members to...who had voted against it to call this again because they, for example, some had thought this was an appropriation to the Dangerous Drugs Commission and

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

weren't aware that it was a passthrough to the Dangerous Drugs Commission so that this very important drug abuse program could be implemented. And the alternative, said yesterday, is incarceration. And I pointed to the Members of the House what the cost would incarcerating 250 persons rather than this residential treatment program. Also, I said that if...if we do have the space for incarceration, too, that the cost is so much that we cannot afford the alternative. So, Speaker and Members of the House, I would ask again that you join with me in an override of the item veto of the Governor and that this amount be restored in full on page four lines 30 through 33, the item veto of the Governor notwithstanding. And I urge your support."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I have a parliamentary inquiry about this. Was this matter voted on yesterday?"
- Speaker Ryan: "I...I didn't hear you, Representative."
- Ewing: "Parliamentary inquiry. Was this matter voted on yesterday?"
- Speaker Ryan: "You're absolutely correct, Representative. It was voted on yesterday."
- Ewing: "Well, I question under our rules, can we vote any number of times on matters or is this a little unusual, I think, to have a Bill that has been voted on several times or more than once in the Veto Session? And I object to that. I think we could be here till Christmas revoting on these."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, Representative Ewing, this is not a final Bill. This is a Motion, and the Motion can be renewed every day. And if that keeps us here till Christmas, then I guess that will be the situation, and I would suggest

82nd Legislative Day

- October 29, 1981
- that you get a red suit and some whiskers."
- Ewing: "Are you....Mr. Speaker, are you telling us that for every one of the Motions that failed we could've refiled them again today?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Yes, that is certainly a prerogative of the Member."
- Ewing: "Well, if we get them filed between now and when we leave, can we stay tomorrow?"
- Speaker Ryan: "That will be the prerogative of the Chair."
- Ewing: "Well, I think that...I certainly think you're setting a horrible example with this, Mr. Speaker. We haven't done this, in my opinion, in the past, and I don't think we should do it on this Bill. I think we'll be here on all the issues voting and revoting and submitting ourselves to undue pressure."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Ebbesen."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."
- Ebbesen: "Representative, you failed to tell us the total amount of money involved, and also, is this in the Governor's budget?"
- Matijevich: "This is \$675,000. It is not in the Governor's budget."
- Ebbesen: "Alright, thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich to close."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I yield to the joint chief Sponsor of the Motion, Representative Getty, to close."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, to close."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, yesterday when this Motion was put, it got 104 of the necessary 107 votes. At

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

that time, I think we were just a little bit short of having convinced several other people, several of our Members, of the importance of providing adequate funding towards rehabilitation in the drug field. This is an area that saves the taxpayers' money and saves the citizens of our state. It saves in two ways. It saves because those people who could be put in meaningful drug programs do not cost the taxpayer anywhere near the amount that it costs to put those same people at \$16,000 a year into the penitentiary. The savings to the people is tremendous in that alone. But that isn't all of it. It also gives the opportunity to rehabilitate those who have been affected by It give us...gives us that one last chance to make a useful and meaningful citizen out of somebody rather than a confirmed criminal. That is the alternative that That is the second saving, savings in human before us. life and savings from Commissions of future crimes. savings to the taxpayers by the passage of this is It was, I think, an unfortunate error i n tremendous. oversight that it was deleted from the budget. I would ask you to restore it."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall the item on page four lines 30 through 33 of Senate Bill 311 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Motion there are 146 voting 'aye', voting 'no', and one voting 'present'. This Motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the items on page four lines 30 through 33 of Senate Bill 311 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. On the Calendar on page four under the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 524. Read the Bill,

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Mr. Clerk. Read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 524, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding.' Representative Kelley."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Kelley."

"Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 524 is Kelley: needed to protect...allow to continue a very important segment of the private school movement here in Illinois, namely the private Christian Church Schools. Most of them are operated as an intrical ministry of their churches. Bill 524 is not unfair competition to private day care centers as you have probably heard from some of our opposition. Senate Bill 524 does not remove fire requirements, health OΓ police requirements, In fact, quite the protection from these schools. contrary, it is an Amendment who puts this protection This Bill, Senate Bill 524, is consistent with the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United Congress shall make no law respective of the States. establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise The real issue is clear. We are reaffirming our thereof. basic belief in the separation of church and state. concept must be maintained if we are to continue to enjoy our religious freedom. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the override on Senate Bill 524. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Motion. I would like to point out to the House that the basis that the proponents use for seeking passage of this Motion is that the present state of affairs represents a unwarranted

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

activities of religious into the proper intrusion institutions. I would point out to this House that we have passed legislation this very Session, and the Governor has signed into law legislation which exempts such activities as Sunday schools. It also exempts such activities as part-time day care facilities. So we have already enacted in this very Session a number of important changes so that bonafide activities of religious facilities are properly exempt. However, this particular piece o f. leigslation does something that I think the proponents would not like to see done. And I hope that everyone who is here today, and I see we have a large number of people down here today on this legislation, I hope they ve because it adds only one sentence to the law. T t. is a very short piece of legislation, as you can see. And would like to read the relevent sentence. It says, \*programs which are operated as an integral part of the local church ministry or religious non-profit elementary school provided that appropriate state health and fire safety standards are maintained. Those are exempt. key phrase is integral part of a church ministry. legislation is to pass, the state will have to define what constitutes an integral part of a church's ministry. Tt. establish regulations that seek will have to discriminate between those programs which are not integral part of a church's minstry and those programs which are. I believe that this is an unwarranted intrusion into the operations of religious facilities, religious institutions. I think that is an encroachment on the First Amendment that we cannot tolerate and I urge a defeat of this Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson." Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

House. I rise in support of the Override Motion. It seems to me that every now and then an issue comes before us which puts our beliefs and fundamental precepts on which this country was founded to the test. And I believe that this is one of those precepts. 524 simply provides the church related educational ministries to freedom of continue to operate without being licensed bу the Department of Children and Family Services. Τt is a freedom which many of us believe the churches have founding of this country. The Bill since the overwhelming support in the House and Senate, and of course, then the Governor did apply his veto to it. But it seems to me that Senate Bill 524 is necessary because every ministry of the church has and falls under the protection of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. It seems to me that...that is bedrock, and that is where we start from. Are we going to deny this or are we going to support that protection? It seems to me that SB 524 is necessary, too, because already the United States Supreme Court has voted 9 to.... 9 to nothing on May 26 church schools are to be treated substantiate that differently because the school is a ministry of the church. I happen to believe, in answer to Representative Bowman, that those definitions, if not already, can be worked out in the future with very little difficulty as to what isn't and what is church related. It seems to me that this is necessary because 524 will keep our church schools free from governmental interference and yet provide necessary fire, health, and safety standards. Those are already in place, and those will continue. That seems to be a big worry of the opponents. Another concern that I have is in licensing rules and requlations. Ho₩ about the enforcement? How about the cost of this whole program at a

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

time when we're seeking to reduce costs statewide rather to them? It has been told to us time and time again that we simply do not have the money to enter I am going to close simply by new and exotic programs. suggesting that already other schools are exempt. the Montessorian schools. They are not licensed in this And there are other way to the best of my knowledge. examples that could be brought forth. But why not, Ladies and Gentlemen, why not support the protections under the First Amendment of our Constitution and why not exempt the Christian schools which already, which already have First Amendment protections and quarantees that our Constitution so ably and so wisely provides? I urge my colleagues, to think this matter over carefully before you cast your vote and decide which road you wish to travel down. More rules, regulations, and licensure or freedom under our Constitution? Again, I urge you to support the Override Motion already presented."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Sponsor's Motion. urge 'no' votes because a 'no' vote to 524 is the only appropriate response from any thinking, caring Legislator, which of course, we all profess to be. All of us are familiar with the arguments in favor of this Bill and most of us find the arguments lacking, full of holes that require the state to judge the validity of religious organizations and practices, holes that would beleaguer the already strained Department of Children and Family Services, and moreover, holes that create unequal protection for children similarly situated in the State. What alarms me is that some Legislators admit they may have

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

to vote for this measure, all the while mentioning that this is probably the worst piece of legislation they have ever supported. Yes, they feel compelled to act against their individual conscience. Fellow Members of the House, I urge us all not to bow to special interest groups but to stand firm for the opinion of our own very best judgment. For when citizens elect a Representative, they are merely choosing a puppet to mirror all that is myopic, selfish and prejudice of any given district. Rather, they elect Representative who they hope will reflect all that is good, just and wise in their community. When to bow to the fierce opinion of an organized minority, is to deny the consti...your constituents benefit of your own ability to decide, when you deny your critically compare and constituents of your own opinion, you are cheating than the people of your district. You are cheating the people and the future of this entire state. Wie have a responsibility not only to the children who are fortunate enough to be blessed with concerned parents who opt for private Christian care, but to all the children of the state. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge 'no' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further debate? The Gentleman from Macon,
Representative Tate. You'll all get your chance. I've got
your lights here. You'll all get a chance to speak.
Representative Tate."

Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise with...with reluctance on this Bill, Senate Bill 524. As many of you know, earlier in this Session I was one of the very last votes that were cast in favor of the Bill. I am rising today in opposition of the Bill after a great deal of thought, and undoubtedly, this is an issue that many of us have struggled with over the last few weeks. Several of

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the proponents have alluded to the First Amendment rights that we receive in this country. In the Bill, I caution many of the Members today, the Bill has a two-edged sword. The first...the Bill could conceivably put our government position where they have to determine what is a legitimate church. And I have no reservations that the churches in my district will meet fire, and health and safety standards and will provide the quality care for the children that we ask them to deliver. But unfortunately I come from a rural district in downstate Illinois and in major metropolitan centers there are many unscrupulous people, and I would hate to see legislation like this that would...could conceivably double the church populations for people that...for opportunists that would go out and try to make a dollar on a day care center. It is an issue that I hope...that I hope and pray that I will make the right decision, and I hope that all of us will do the decision that is in the best interest of the children of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "The Sponsor alluded, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to safety and health standards which are part of this legislation. There is language in Senate Bill 524 that seems to address the question of health and safety standards. However, since the whole point of this Bill is to take the state agency, the Department of Children and Family Services, out of the opportunity of going into any church related day care program, there can be no enforcement of this language...of the health and safety language that is in the Bill. So to say that Senate Bill 524 protects the health and the safety of children in church-run day care programs is a fraud. In no way are

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

those protections ensured. They cannot be if this Bill becomes law. Like Representative Kelley, I believe in the principle of separation of church and state. Representative Bowman pointed out that the language in this Bill will make it important for somebody to investigate whether a given church program is, in fact, an integral part of the ministry. I would say there is even a more obvious problem than that and that is that since this proposal will open loopholes for fraudulent operators to come in and run unlicensed programs, it means that this state or one of its agencies is going to have to involve itself in the question as to what counts and what does not count as a religion. Representative Hudson suggested that that is an easy question of definition. I am sure that the church people who are here with us in Springfield today are not comfortable, should not be comfortable prospect of state investigations as to the content, the quality of your religious programs and your religious instruction. It seems to me that the church groups themselves have the strongest interest in seeing to it that Senate Bill 524 does not become law. The only way to protect the separation of church and state is to keep the state out of issues that involve religion. It is not important to keep the state out of the question of licensing standards for programs that are day programs, or hospital programs, or nursing home programs, or any of those other very fine charitable endeavors religious groups concern themselves in. For anybody who believes in the separation of church and state, the only proper, in fact, the only possible vote on the Override Motion on Senate Bill 524 is 'no'."

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

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

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

I, like my colleague when this Bill came up the first time, I worked the floor to try to get the necessary votes to pass it. But since then, the '60 Minute' program on television on Sunday nights reported some thousands of priests that were ordained through correspondence schools and ministers that were ordained through correspondence National magazines have come out with schools. ordination of these various churches. How can the state, if someone can answer this question, how can the state regulate and decide which is a religious organization or which is a credible religious organization? And if the Sponsor of the Bill can answer that for me, it might be able to help solve my conscience in trying to get this Bill passed the first time whether I did the right thing or not."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kelley."

Kelley: "Representative, I believe the state has already answered your question on what or what not is a religion. Was that your question?"

Conti: "My question is how is the state going to be able to regulate and decide which is a credible religious organization and how are they going to be able to enforce it?"

Kelley: "Well, the courts have already given some direction to that, but however, if a legitimate church would have educational ministry, it would have incorporated documents with the Secretary of State's office plus the law is now..tax exempt...churches are tax exempt. So they have already pretty much defined what is a religious institution. I cannot see where that is anything but a 'sham' argument because the government for years has been defining what is a religious institution and what is not."

Speaker Ryan: "Have you completed your questions, Representative

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Conti?"

Conti: "My question is completed, but I don't think I got my
answer. That's alright."

Speaker Ryan: "I can't help you with that. The Lady from Cook, Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly and to all of our church people who are assembled here in the gallery. I, like others, have been contacted in support to override this piece of legislation and being a devout Christian, as many of you are, I have searched my very being in trying to garner support for this piece of legislation. But I would like to call your attention to a portion of scripture where Jesus was asked by the Pharisees, 'Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not?' And he said 'Why tempest me? Show me the tribute money.', and they brought unto him a penny. He said unto them, 'Whose is this image and superscription?' And they said unto him,...I am cut off, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "You're on. I'm sorry."

Smith: "Then Jesus said unto the Pharisees, 'Render unto Caesar that which is his and unto God which is his.' I compliment the churches for expanding their programs in aiding the education of our children. But this parable that I have just cited to you gives us our guidelines for operation. In the spiritual realm of Bible teaching, there is no separation. There is a separation of church and state. But when the church endeavors to operate a day care center school of learning where the protection of our young are involved, then the church has to enter into an operation that civil requirements are a must. If our churches are going to involve themselves in the motivation of our young whose lives perhaps some day will be leaders here in our societies, then they must want to have the full protection

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

given to them through the state. Being licensed is not a hindrance but a safequard to our children. There are many faulty operations that will. under the auise οf Christianity, operate with dangers to the detriment of our children. I talked this morning by telephone to churches in the southside where I represent. And they are delighted to have the protection of being licensed. helps them to keep up their quality of maintenance and regard their buildings as safe when they are under license. And I say to you, Sir, that to sustain the Governor's veto in this instance does not mean that the church has to lose its autonomy, but merely a guarantee to insure the protection of our children here in the State of Illinois. And so, Sir, I say, I sustain the veto of our Governor."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, did not support this legislation when it was originally before the House and on this subject of the separation of church and state. I don't know how many of you have taken the time to read the Governor's veto message, but I and I've read it several times and really I think more for the purposes of getting it into the record, it clearly states, I think, and addresses itself to the subject of the And the Governor has said that the First Amendment. United States Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the First Amendment with respect to the freedom to believe and the freedom to act. The freedom to believe is absolute, and a person's relationship with his God is his own business, not that of the state. The freedom to act is not absolute, and when a religious organization chooses to enter into the arena of public service, then that service

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

is subject to the same examination as others who venture into public service. Under the Federal Constitution, states retain general powers to protect the health, and the safety and the welfare of their citizens. religions does not preclude reasonable exercise of regulation. The Illinois regulations for day care center licensing do not restrict or interfere with the teaching of religious principles and standards. The regulations now only address themselves to the important issue such as fire safety, the staff-child ratios, qualifications of the staff. adequate space, nutrition, health, and basic operational procedures. These are vital concerns when one acknowledges that children in day care spend a majority of their waking hours away from their own parents. regulations were developed by a Committee representing a broad spectrum of the community including church operated day care centers. Now we get into the area of how can we regulate some and not others. To me, I think the Governor's veto message spells out very clearly on the subject of the First Amendment and I would encourage everyone I know. I am going to stay in the same posture that I was originally in sustaining the Governor's veto by encouraging everybody to vote in opposition to this Motion."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask that we never intertwine the affairs of the state and the church.

This has been a precept since the founding of this country.

I think we ought to give little heed to the admonition that give unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's. I suggest at this time it is not the state that is interfering in the affairs of the church, but the church that is seeking to interfere in the affairs of the

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

The children of this state are our most precious state. asset. We cannot allow anyone, or any group or any organization to dig into the public till without public scrutiny, without public suspection, and without regulation. I suggest that we have all seen a vast number of church front organizations. Not those interested in the teachings of God, but those who have gone simply for dollars or simply for some other outlandish or weird belief, however it may be. But that belongs in the private domain and the domains of those individuals. But I suggest that we cannot here allow our children to be fed Kool-aid by Jim Jones, the looneys, the 'Al Rokins', or any other organization and particularly at state expense. I suggest that we are now entering the arena of politics with particular piece of legislation. And in politics you live by the sword and you die by the sword. And so be it. I suggest that the church entities in this state are willing to stay in the area of faith, and belief goodness. And this is truly a noble area. But once they enter the arena of politics of the state and state dollars, they are asking for regulation, and this I disagree with. I suggest to you that in this arena of public combat we must judge this issue solely on its merit. And on its merit, the Governor in his wisdom deserved to be sustained. Anything less is simply an attempt to appeal to some form of partisan or perhaps political advantage, which you find in the final analysis, will never stand up. Courage must begin in your heart and courage begins in your vote. And I ask of you that you judge this only on the merit and let us vote to sustain the Governor and sustain the children in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."
Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Sponsor two

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

questions."

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates that he will yield."

- Oblinger: "Pirst of all, will this Bill cover the following situation which is in my community? Our church sponsors a day care center, but it is run by the YWCA and is not part of the church at all except that that is where it is located, and we have a number of those. Will this Bill pertain to that?"
- Kelley: "I would think not, Representative. This Bill is intended for the intricate part of a church ministry. And I would...would think that means in the church, run by the church, not one that is farmed out for the YMCA, YWCA, or Boys' Club or whatsoever. They would lose control, I would think, under that situation."
- Oblinger: "No, I was told by a number of people who were in favor of the override that if the church sponsored the day care center and hired somebody else to run it they would be under this Bill. And this worries me. The second question, if a church sponsors a day care center and it is part of their religious training, but they receive state and federal monies, will they be under this Bill?"
- Kelley: "I would assume at this time they would be. But I think there will subsequent legislation to remove any church operated day care center that receives federal or state subsidy. That is my intentions now working with the group."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, these two questions have worried me and have caused me to do a great deal of thinking on this Bill. We have a number of day care centers that are located in churches and sponsored by churches just because there is no other facility in that area in which the day care center can be held. They really are not an intrical part of it, but the church had to

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

sponsor it. Therefore, I would wonder if this Bill does cover it. I understand it does. A number of our day care centers here in Springfield receive almost all of their funding from federal funds. They should be licensed because they are now accepting money from a state political entity and should be licensed. But under this Bill, even though they received all their funding, they would not be exempted. They would be part of the Bill. I would like these two questions resolved before we even vote on this Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman." Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill flies in the face of everything this Legislature has done for children over a period of 20 years. This Legislature was one of the first ones in our nation in the early 60's pass legislation protecting children from child abuse. Wе want to keep children safe. We want to keep children from being harmed whether it's at the hands of their families or other caretakers. Just as recently as the last three years Republicans and Democrats have worked together to provide appropriate funding so that we can have an improved child system of protect...system to protect children abuse against child abuse. Just this last year by overwhelming majorities of both Democrats and Republicans we passed legislation to improve our day care laws, to provide help, to keep families together and to reunite families, to make it possible for children to find permanent homes through in the adoption laws. This Bill which improvements encourages child abuse rather than protects children against child abuse is contrary to everything that the General Assmbly has worked for. We need to strengthen the authority of DCFS to intervene when children's lives are at stake regardless of the religious beliefs or blood

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

relationships that exist with the caretaker. Don't be mislead about Senate Bill 524. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

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

Take a moment and look around you at the people in the gallery. We have had a lot of people pass through the gallery this Session of the Legislature. I have never seen a cleaner, better looking, sharper group of people than we've got up there today."

Speaker Ryan: "We will not allow any demonstrations in the gallery. That will have to stop, folks. We can't have any more of that. Proceed, Representative."

"I see a lot of young people up in the gallery, too. is the product of the church schools that we're talking about. They don't look to me like they are suffering from lack of education or being abused. Quite often I know in our local schools, qualified teachers will not teach public school because they don't like the public school environment. They will teach in a church school or a day care center for far less dollars. And I think this means local control over our own destiny. And we have an option. We don't have to send them to the church school. We can send them somewhere else to another day care center or another school. We're not obliged to do so. And we talked about inspections, the health, the welfare and the of these young people. I don't know how other towns do it, but in my town of Tinley Park and the surrounding areas, we have a building department that checks out the buildings. We have a fire department who sends fire inspectors over. We have health inspectors that inspect the kitchens. We have inspection already and I think a state inspection of licensing would be a redundancy. Further, the Governor vetoed the day care Bill because of lack of funds. And how

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

will we find funds to expand the bureacracy even farther than it is now? I feel that church schools are in a lot better shape than many of our public schools, and I would recommend that we keep the state out of the church. Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr...Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous...the Gentleman's Motion prevails. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Kelley, to close."
- Kelley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard some arguments that I think are really not as terrible as some of our colleagues would make us believe. One argument is the licensed day care centers church ministries would somehow automatically offer protection, complete protection safety for our children. I can tell you that's a lot of hogwash. Jim Jones has every license that he could buy. License in itself will do no good. My...one of my esteemed colleagues who I have worked with on day care center spoke about special interest groups. Well, if this group that you see here today throughout the state are a special interest group, then I am very proud to be a part of them and represent them on this floor. It has been brought up that it would put the state in the position of defining what is a church. Well, I think for the past 200 years our governments have been doing that. We offer tax free status to churches. The Supreme Court has ruled times...I don't think that is any big question. also brought up that churches would not be comfortable with

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the idea of going to the state for this definition. Well, let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't believe church and church pastors are comfortable with the thought of going to jail because of our bureaucrats wanting more power to license churches. I think you have been lobbied on both sides. You only know what you're going to do in your own heart. I just ask you one more time, please vote for Senate Bill 524. I thank you for your consideration."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 524 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'.

Representative Robbins, one minute to explain your vote."

- Robbins: "I think the most important thing on this debate has been left out. Who are the children? You look at the gallery around you. The parents chose to put these children in these church schools, and the state has no business running them. If they are not run right, the parents won't put them there. Take the state out of your life. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative White, one minute to explain your vote."
- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in Committee and on the floor of the House I was opposed to this Bill, and I was opposed to it for a number of reasons. First of all, this Bill does not address itself to the proper footage per child nor does it deal with teacher-pupil ratio or qualified teachers, or a qualified educational program. I think for these reasons and more, we should oppose this Bill. And at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to verify the Roll Call."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Friedrich, one minute to explain your vote."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are a lot

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

of bureaucrats in Springfield and a lot more in Washington who think the government has to protect everybody from everything. I don't happen to be one of those. I have not had a lot of pressure from either side on this thing, but in using my head, if we can't trust the children of this state to the churches, who can we trust them to? Would you rather trust them to someone that's out to make a buck running a home or would you rather trust them to someone that's working for free trying to lead these children the way they should go and bend the twig the way it should go. I can tell you this, and it is not compulsory to send your child to a nursery school that is operated by the church. you think the church is going to damage your child, I don't happen to believe that, then send them to some school that is operated as a for profit school. That is And I would fight for that privilege for privilege, too. you to do that for your children. But if we're going to do away with the social programs of the church, and I'm talking about next thing we'll be getting into benevolence, and the next thing we'll be getting into Sunday school. The next thing we'll be getting into the other things of the...Bible schools that are operated in the summertime. Why do you have to think that we have to protect everybody from everything and the government is the only one that has enough sense to do anything?"

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I come from a district in Chicago that has a tremendous number of small storefront churches. These ministers are moral and decent and upright. They support the community in every conceivable way. This Bill transcends Protestantism, Catholisism, Judism. This Bill

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

is necessary because of what's happening in Washington, D.C. today with the budget cuts. I believe that the people who support this Bill are moral God-fearing people, and I join with them in petitioning this Legislature to stand for the rights of the church. The church in my community, in the Black community, has always remained in the forefront social service delivery, and justice, and equality. I believe in justice and equality. I think the church should be commended. I think we should vote 'aye' and override the Governor on this Bill. Don't fear the constituents of your district who are God-fearing and members of the They know what is best for their community. have spoken loud and they have spoken clear. I only for my seat mate who does not understand the church or what is happening now. I ask you to join with me and vote 'aye' and give this Bill the sufficient number of votes to put it over the top."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend Bullock. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen. One minute to explain your vote." Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it really shocks me to have it suggested that the only way abuse can be prevented is by licensing that child everything in sight. I guess that means that because child abuse exists in the homes owned by families throughout this state, certainly not in every home by any means, some unfortunately, that that means we have to license every home owned by every family in this state in order to That is one of the most ridiculous prevent abuse. arguments I have heard on any Bill of this Session. If we give license....If we require homes, day care centers, pre-school programs, whatever you want to call them, if we require them to be licensed and we are concerned about fly-by-nights setting themselves up as churches for that

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

purpose, I can assure you the fly-by-nights will follow the licensure laws to the letter so that they will have state approval written all over them and the parents won't bother to find out what is really going on. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jones, one minute to explain your vote."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it very difficult coming behind Reverend Bullock who hasn't been ordained. And that is a problem we have with this piece legislation. While I see all the people in the gallery who are God-fearing people who are here today in support of the override of the Governor's veto, there are an equally (sic) number of churches and people in the State of Illinois who run day care centers that are licensed who sustained...who favor to sustain the Governor's veto and are not afraid of government regulations. We're talking about the future generation. We're talking about the little children. have in the 22nd District, Reverend Bullock, a group called the 'Al Roukins' who call themselves a religious church organization that is run by gangs. And you know what I'm We got the 'Rostdefarians' who is a talking about. religious organization who worships marijuana. Now, we cannot afford to entrust the future of our children to groups like these even though I know, even though I know that the people here who are supporting the override have good intentions. But it is the product...the purpose of the State of Illinois to protect the children, and the Governor was right in vetoing this legislation because it protects those persons who cannot protect themselves, and I urge a 'no' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick, one minute to explain your vote."

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

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

won't need but about one minute to tell you the Gentleman across the aisle, whoever he was, that said the last 10 or 15 years at what all we've done. He ought to look at his public schools in his area where the teachers have to wear bulletproof vests or they have to have guns to keep peace in the school. You look this group of people over. teacher has to have a bulletproof vest, not a teacher to stand with a club to try to keep peace in the school, not a student up there...did you see a knife? Did you see a gun to see these kids down here today? They didn't run over you. If they ran into you they said, 'We're sorry. Excuse us please. Let me tell you something. The greatest asset Illinois has got is the Christian school today and what you bunch of liberalized liberals are doing with this Bill, you're killing it and you're 'wrestering' Illinois as not a God-fearing state but a state that the Satan loves, and you'll die in remembrance some day when you face your judgment and when they talk about separation from church and state...when you talk about separating church and state, and my dear friend Margaret over there, love you I do, and you're a Baptist preacher's wife, and I know that you're wrong. Honey, he said, 'Give unto Caesar that which is Caesar's' and he said 'Give unto God that which is God's', and God gave me my children. I would love to have any one of them as mine. And when you turn them down, you're making the mistake of your life whether you're a Democrat or Republican."

Speaker Ryan: "Mr. Doorkeeper, if there are any further outbursts from the gallery would you please clear it? Representative Steele, one minute to explain your vote."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to urge more green lights on this measure. I want to tell you that many of these schools perform a great service in our community at

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

nominal costs. They are run by non-profit organizations and for the most part they do provide a great service in our various communities at very nominal costs. And if they are closed, many of that same fine service would not be available elsewhere. I think it is unfair. I think it is unnecessary to place a maze of restrictions and regulations on these service-oriented church sponsored schools. All the precautions for fire protection, all the precautions for health safety are taken care of. I think that we should get more green lights and more 'yes' votes in support of this needed legislation."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, one minute to explain your vote."

Pierce: "Hr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Governor of this state is so interested in the safety of children in day care schools, why didn't he provide the money? Why does he...why do we have to override his vetoes on adequate money and funds for day care centers? Why does he concentrate...why does he concentrate on schools such as these represented here today with the people themselves...the people themselves are willing to pay for day care? He can't have it both ways. He can't refuse...can't refuse appropriations for day care centers and then come down on those who are willing out of their own pocket to pay for day care for their children on a not-for-profit basis. The Governor is a hypocrite on this issue. He doesn't provide the funds for day care centers, and yet he cracks down on those who wish to educate their children in private not-for-profit religious day care centers, and I think this message should be taken to the Governor when he stops...when he stops drinking beer out of a slipper or champagne out of a slipper."

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

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

one minute to explain your vote."

We have heard a great deal on both sides of this Bill today, and most of it not pertaining to the Bill. In my judgment, we are involved in a tempest in a teapot. House Bill 525 which has been signed by the Governor into law, I think, clearly defines the issue between day care centers, and schools, and independent schools, and that this Bill, in fact, would only confuse the issue. I have received only one piece of correspondence on this from my district from a Christian day care center and the Director of that day care center said I believe you should vote against this Bill. I believe this Bill would only confuse the issue, and that all day care centers and nursery schools need to be licensed. And I would urge you to vote to sustain the Governor's veto, and I plan to do that today."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, one minute to explain your vote."

Wolf: "No, Mr. Speaker, just a parliamentary inquiry. What order of business are we on at the moment, Sir?"

Speaker Ryan: "Explanation of vote."

Wolf: "The Gentleman from Lake previously explained his vote, but

I noticed he hasn't taken the time to vote. I wondered if
he was going to."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."

Ropp: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Someone has said sometime ago that we have government to serve people, to do things for them that they themselves cannot do. Here we have a very perfect example of churches doing things for themselves and certainly it is not a position where we're confusing public service with government service. One of the greatest missions that I

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

think churches have and is so written is that they serve people. They help people become better people living in communities serving each other. This is an attempt, in my opinion, to continue to have young people at the very grass roots learn how to be good citizens without being controlled by government. The very basic principle in which the Pilgrims came from the foreign countries to the United States is for religious freedom. We are, at this point, about to infringe on that very basic principle, that philosophy of freedom of religion from the state. I urge you to vote green on this override."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Griffin, one minute to explain your vote."

Griffin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the risks on either side of this, as in many pieces of legislation, are apparent. But I think the risks are far greater that would threaten the rights of people at the local level, that is at the level of their own churches to decide what are important issues to them and how they are going to conduct their educational programs. Our whole school system as well as religious community, I think, has some basic principles to ask about in this legislation. The Governor in his veto message indicated that there were certain regulations, regulations only address such important issues as fire safety and so on. Fire safety I had But I would like to ask everybody here in the General...in the Legislature if you think that staff-child ratios, qualifications of staff, or nutrition, health, and basic operational procedures are issues that do not involve values or judgments of value that have to be made by the state. In this instance, I think we're asking whether the State of Illinois, without a referendum of 11 1/2 million people, has the right to

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

determine what kind of nutrition, what kind of staff-child is important..is important. In the Montesory schools, staff-child ratios is an essential part of whole philosophy and their whole system. The legislation brought up here earlier had to deal with that exemption or it never would have passed. I submit that the church schools have the same issue, the same question. Their staff-child ratios may be a part of their values, a substantive part of what they are trying to do. nutrition an area that many people in this state differ on? Natural food versus synthetic foods. These are value judgments. Are we going to let the State of Illinois..." Your minute is up,

Speaker Ryan: "Your time has concluded. Your minute is up,
Representative Griffin. Are there any other Members that
care to explain their vote? Have all voted who wish?
Excuse me. Representative Macdonald, one minute to explain
your vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. To me it is a sad commentary that we have come to a point where we say that government can do a better job than parents in their decisions of what they can do with their children, how they can educate them, and how they can, their private lives, accommodate what they believe their children should learn. I think it is indeed appropriate when children are...left and abandoned by parents and the churches do not step in than for government to do that for those children who cannot help themselves. But certainly, in this instance, it is appropriate for our churches and able to make their decisions our families to he individually and independently without intervention of our government either at a state level or at a federal level, and I urge your 'yes' vote on this particular Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all explained their vote now that wish? Is

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

there anybody else? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'no', one voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Kelley, do you seek recognition?"

- Kelley: "Yes, poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. So you seek recognition, Representative Jones?"
- Jones: "I don't know if you realize this, Mr. Speaker, but that is dilatory. There is only three absentees shown on the Board, and it needs 107. So there is no need to poll the absentees."
- Speaker Ryan: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Jackson, Kornowicz,
  Richmond."
- Speaker Ryan: "On this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'no', one voting 'present'. The Motion to override fails. On page two of the Calendar under Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 143, Representative Barkhausen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale on credit and the lending of money, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barkhausen."
- Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, I would first like to move pursuant to
  Rule 35 B, I would like to ask leave of the House to take
  this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an
  additional Amendment."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill from Third to Second. Are there any objections? Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn objects. Representative Barkhausen, there are objections. It takes 89 votes if you

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

care to move."

Barkhausen: "I would...I would like to make that Motion and..."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves to return Senate Bill 143 to the Order of Second Reading. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', two voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails, and Senate Bill 143 is now on the Order of Second Beading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Barkhausen, amends Senate Bill 143 as amended."

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

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, became evident today that an additional Amendment to this Senate Bill 143 was necessary in light of an oversight with regard to the action that we took yesterday. I first owe an apology to the Body in the sense that what I said yesterday that what we were doing with Amendment #3 was precisely what was done with regard to House Bill 430 here two weeks ago and that representation wasn't quite correct. There are a couple of technical differences between Amendment #3 that we passed yesterday and the amendatory veto that we sustained on House Bill 430. So what I am attempting to do with this Amendment is to make sure that this Bill now, Senate Bill 143 is verbatim the same as the amended form of House Bill 430 so that we'll meet the same objections that I mentioned yesterday that bond counselors had with the amendatory veto of 430 affecting 438, the usery ceiling removal Bill. I would be happy to answer any questions, and I apologize for taking your time again today with this Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Barkhausen, I had some discussion with a former colleague of ours who represents Savings and Loans regarding a particular Amendment or piece of legislation.

There were some changes made that raised the interest rate,
I think, from 8 1/2 to 9 1/2 percent. Are you now putting it back into the exact language that was...is this the same piece of legislation we're talking..."

Barkhausen: "It...it is the same. It maintains the status quo-What would happen with the Amendment that we adopted yesterday, as you suggested, did raise the interest rate from, I believe, 8 to 9 percent. And this...there were some people..."

Wolf: "This will put it back again."

Barkhausen: "Yes. There were some people that were concerned that that raising of the interest rate upset the status quo, and this is an attempt to bring it back to the status quo."

Wolf: "Okay, so this merely replaces the language as it was inadvertently struck, and it goes back from 8 percent to 9 percent."

Barkhausen: "That is correct, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you."

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

Barkhausen: "I would simply move the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 143, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 143. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

October 29, 1981 82nd Legislative Day

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading."

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Yes, Representative Barkhausen. Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, would it be appropriate at this time to...to move to suspend Rule 35 C so that the Bill may be considered on Third Reading today?"

Speaker Ryan: "What is your request, Representative?"

Barkhausen: "I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, would it be appropriate at this time to move to suspend Rule 35 C so this Bill may be considered on Third Reading today?"

Speaker Ryan: "Yes, it would be appropriate. Do you so move?" Barkhausen: "I so move."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the suspension appropriate Rule so the Bill can be moved through Third Reading today. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I....you've done what I was going to ask, and that is to let me object and get a Roll Call. I also am not a Parliamentarian, but while I'm up I'll make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is this Bill properly before us? It is my understanding there are provisions of Rule 27, and I think Rule 27 C, in particular, which cannot be suspended, and I think that this Bill is not properly before us and probably belongs in the Rules Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "The Bill is properly before the House now on Third Reading, Representative Dunn. It was on the Calendar.... on the Spring Calendar properly. The Gentleman moved yesterday to take it from the table with 107 votes. His Motion prevailed, and the Bill is presently in the proper place in the proper condition. Have all voted who wish? You need 107 votes, Representative. Have all voted who

82nd Legislative Day

- October 29, 1981
- wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. We're now on Senate Bill 143. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale of credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barkhausen."
- Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe I have adequately explained the Bill. If there are any questions, I would be happy to entertain them.

  Otherwise, I would move that the House pass Senate Bill 143 so that it can be considered by the Senate."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 143 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Ropp to explain his vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually I had a question I wanted answered, and I wanted to find out if the provision now in this Bill causes a penalty if you pay off your note early. And in the sake of assisting consumers, why are we trying to do this to consumers? Would the Sponsor answer that please?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, we're beyond that stage, Representative.

  We're now in the explanation of vote. I would imagine if

  you would walk back there and talk to him he would probably

  do that for you."
- Ropp: "Well, if you'll wait until I can answer it then I can go down and vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Mautino to explain his vote."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did have my light on before you called for a vote. Since I believe what we are

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

attempting to do here, we should not put 107 votes on until the Sponsor responds to the fact that what we're doing on home mortgages and commercial notes is adding the prepenalty clause which is eliminated in our previous legislation. Is that not true? If you would respond to that, I am sure you would get 107. If you won't, I don't know how you're going to do it."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barkhausen to explain your vote." Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am sure there wouldn't be more than two or three red votes up there if you understood that this does not in any way alter the status of prepayment penalties which have been allowed in certain situations and not in others. The fear and suspicion that I detect is that prepayment penalties will now be allowed for residential mortgages, and that is simply not the case. It hasn't been the case and it won't the case now. The only case in which prepayment penalties will be allowed are for commercial and industrial loans and loans of that nature, and I have been approached by people in the financial community who were concerned that they won't be able to get credit because prepayment penalties are banned, many of them dealing with issuing short term paper and so forth where prepayment penalties are traditionally written in the contracts and they are upset that we're impeding their...imparing their ability to obtain credit. So, I hope that I've cleared that up and if I haven't I will be happy to entertain any other questions or to answer them in further explaining my vote."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Without this Bill, if interest rates ever do go down, all you have to do is go in and refinance your loan

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

if your lender won't reduce the interest rate. You'll be in the driver's seat. If this Bill passes and interest rates do happen to go down, your present lender is going to tell you that if you want to go refinance at a lower rate you're going to have to pay him a prepayment penalty. Today you don't have to do that, tomorrow you will. Why should you vote for this Bill? Give your people back home a little bit of a break. Times are tough enough. Let's don't tell them when they're paying 19, 20, 21 percent interest that to refinance, if....God help us, the interest rates do come down, that they have to pay an exorbitant prepayment penalty to do so. Let's vote this Bill down. Let's keep 107 votes off that Board for once here. Let's do something for the people instead of to them."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. My understanding of this Bill is precisely what the Sponsor, Representative Barkhausen, suggested. This does not affect residential mortgages. It is only affecting commerical lending practices. If we don't pass this Bill, we'll find that the business for accountants and banks and all the rest of it is done out of the State of Illinois rather than here. Businesses and commercial loans will continue to be made. They just won't be made in Illinois under this piece of legislation. This Bill is exactly the same proposal we accepted in the amendatory veto to House Bill 430 two weeks ago, and it seems to me we ought to enact it as a separate piece of legislation as is proposed in Senate Bill 143."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, briefly. It looks like a lost cause to suggest this, but it seems to me that since we took the lid off of everything, what we are doing is exactly what Representative Dunn said. That is locking in not only the

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

highest interest rates under the argument made by those bankers who wanted that, but who said, 'Well, when they come down you can come back in and get another deal'. You can't get another deal with this Bill. It locks the whole thing in except in one circumstance for all other types of loans. Put the votes up there if you want. The people are going to come back and say when they can't get the loans, 'Why did you vote that way?'. They may not know how you voted today, but they're going to know when they go to that little bank or big bank that you put it to them, and this puts it to them."

- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 529. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 529, a Bill for an Act authorizing the
  Chicago Park District to provide for the creation,
  maintenance and administration of a working cash fund,
  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Farley."

  Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reading of the Bill, on the synopsis that is, in fact, on the Calendar is incorrect. The Bill was brought back to Second Reading yesterday and amended by Representative Madigan. It strikes everything after the enacting clause, eliminates the...the working cash fund and now, with Amendment #1, allows the Chicago Park District to issue revenue bonds for stadium improvements for Soldiers' Field. The purpose is for the skyboxes at Soldiers' Field. I think it was explained yesterday. The questions were answered, and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Senate Bill 529 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. ... One for the Gipper. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no', four voting 'present', and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on page three under the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill...or House Bill 795 First Conference Committee Report. Read the Report, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 795, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. The Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill...or House Bill contains three provisions that I would outline briefly. We have struck from the Bill any and all references to any pension benefit increases, and now we're attempting to deal with three subject matter areas. First of all, the Bill attempts in the public pension systems controlled by this state to provide that the systems may invest in those areas that are now allowable under the provisions that apply to the State Board of Investments. Now, clearly let me make this comment. We do not force anyone to comingle their investments with any other pension system. We do not. ¥е provide authorization for the same investments that the State Board of Investment now has with regard to each individual system excluding only Excluding the downstate firemen and the downstate policemen who have some 579 individual funds through which they wish to keep their own very restrictive investment authority which has worked well of late particularly in our recession. Secondly, and that provision, by the way, is

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

approved by the Pension Laws Commission as is this Bill. Secondly, we attempt to deal with what appears to be an oversight in the passage of two Bills in the past two years that deal with investment authority of state banks and national banks that manage trusts and invest in securities therein. We provide, in those cases, the same type of language that we did when we passed here Senate Bill 851 that Representative Smith and I had this year which passed overwhelmingly that allowed for investment in shared pools of money funds where mortgages were involved. This deals with securities of the same type except where state and national banks are concerned, and that provision was proposed to clear up a possible inconsistency in the investment statutes with regard to each of the systems that proposed by the Chairman of the Commission, Senator Egan. The third and crucial point is this, the Bill amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement We, through an oversight, have failed to cover Fund Act. those people who become multi-township assessors beginning the first of next year. Currently, the townships may authorize, by Resolution, to be a part of the IMRF cover their assessors and certain other people. The people become multi-township assessors where there were townships consolidated, such as in my area and several others in the state, will no longer have any pension coverage under IMRF unless we change the definition participating instrumentality in IMRF to cover these already otherwise covered people. Those are the three They have been discussed and provisions of the Bill. approved by the Pension Laws Commission, it is шy understanding. They are supported by the various pension systems. The Bill was worked out last spring with regard to the investment authority provisions of the Bill. With

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the various systems we were unable, due to the lateness, and the hour, and the need to adjourn by the constitutional deadline, to get the Report called earlier or the Bill passed. I know of no substantive objections or otherwise to the Bill and to that end, and accordingly I ask for an 'aye' vote to adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Ryan: "Time out a minute. The Doorkeeper just gave me a set of keys. They have got a Highland Park address on them from 'Saunaday' Chevrolet Incorporated. Anybody lose their keys, they're right here. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "First of all, what was the origin of the legislation?

How did this all get started?"

Farley: "Well, Representative Ebbesen, the parts involving the investment authority, some of the various systems have worked with myself and others and other Members, understand, of the Pension Laws Commission - although I can't speak for them - for the last couple of years because the Pension Laws Commission, as you know as a Member, as attempted over the years to put together some sense to the investment authority, to each of the systems, and make them similar while still trying to protect against unreasonable types of investment. This has been going on for a couple of years, at least with regard to my involvement. I have dealt with particularly the State Retirement System that But I've had the staff check with covers the teachers. others, as we've gone through the genesis of this Bill, to see if they agree with it. And along the way, they ve dealt with our staff who is behind me, and I am sure with yours in the past to develop the investment parts of the Bill. The part of the Bill in IMRF is simply an emergency due to the fact we inadvertently left those people out of

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

coverage that are in now that are going to be in those systems. The part Senator Egan put in with regard to the...the investments in the state and national banks is something that we've already done, as you know, last year in one investment building with insurance companies and one other prior time in another type of similar security situation. Senator Egan wished to put this in because it is the type that we haven't specifically covered, and we want to make sure that we can. It is really no different in the type of security or have no different insurance than the type of securities that we put in the 851 Bill which came out of here with something like 147 votes."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, but I quess my only comment, especially to Members on this side of the aisle, I notice that the Conference Committee Report is about 59 pages long. It has not been signed by the....two Members on this side McAuliffe. of the aisle, and the one is Roger Representative McAuliffe is not a Member....or I mean is the Chairman of the Committee. Now, my concern everytime we have a Conference Committee Report like this there is always that little emergency. You ve got something you studied for three, four, and five years and you hang a little bit of emergency in there to make certain that that draw...attracts the interest it has got to be done right now, and you hand us this at the last minute. I don't know what's in this. I am assuming everything that you say is true, but what else is in there, I don't know. For that reason, I am going to give it a red vote."

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

Stuffle: "Well, Representative Ebbesen and Members of the House, you have my assurance there is nothing else in there. I already knew that the other systems, as well as the one I

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

mentioned, supported the Bill. But again today we have the staff discuss the Bill, the various systems, to see if there were objections. There have been absolutely objections raised to this Bill. This is something that the Laws Commission has been working for, as you know, for a number of years. 1 cannot speak Representative McAuliffe. our Chairman of the Pension Committee, did not sign the particular Conference Committee Report. I don't know what the reason is. Maybe he wishes to address that. I don't know that he opposes the Bill. I don't find it a particularly interesting situation to be in to have to present the Bill. But I present the Bill because the lateness of the hour in June made it impossible to approach this subject matter with regard to investments we've been working on for a great deal of time - two years to be exact. Because we had an oversight as to the other type of security I mentioned and because there is that clear and compelling, in my opinion, emergency that these in the multi-township assessment positions be people covered. Some of these people have been there for and years, and years, and they simply won't have any coverage unless we make that authorization in the third part of the Bill now. So I would hope that you will give this a green light. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the Bill, and I find a great deal meritorious about it in terms of what it does with investments, in protecting securities, and making uniform those practices as prescribed and suggested by the Pension Laws Commission who, I repeat, supports the Bill. So I would ask you take a look at the Bill notwithstanding the obvious and legitimate concern that this comes late. It would have come at the end of Session had that been possible. My only other option is to once again hold the Bill that has been

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

worked on for two years which has been completely looked at, as I understand, by virtually everyone and supported by the systems and the Commission, and because it also contains that emergency clause. I would ask for an 'aye' vote knowing no opposition to the contrary that has surfaced to me at any time."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is true I did not sign the Conference Committee Report, but not because I was opposed to it. I was willing to have the staff analysist read it and tell me what was in it, and they never got back to me so I inadvertently did not sign the Conference Committee Report, but I am not opposed to the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is 'Shall the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 795? A11 favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no', three voting 'present'. This Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, on the order...on page three under Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 271. Read the Report. Conference Committee Report."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 271, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Advisory Council, Conference Committee Report #2."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 271, Representative."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought Representative Peters
  was going to handle this since he was on the Conference

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Committee. What this does, the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is going...will receive a supplemental of \$49,127,454 from three block grant programs and from two block grants related items. The Department of Public Health will also receive \$4,877,000 supplemental from these three new block grant programs for use as pass through entities, funding for the local and also \$6,203,000 from existing categorical grant programs to two of the new block grant funds. In addition, the Department of Mental Health will receive a \$12,676,600 from block grants for services to the mentally ill and alcoholic clients with \$3,288,000 added for the Dangerous Drug Commissions, and additional supplemental appropriation of \$928.000 is from federal funds. Total grant to all agencies, \$76,172,035."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support the Motion. However, I think it ought to be said because this is the embarking of the block grant process. Something ought to be said, I think, at the outset. And I mentioned it in the Conference Committee yesterday. Virtually no questions were asked by the Members of the Committee...the Conference Committee. The reason we didn't ask any questions is nobody really knows where we are going on the grant...block grant process. And I really believe that in the future we are not only going to ask a lot of questions, we probably will have to enact some laws because there are going to be many unanswered questions with regard, for example, to priorities. The Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, for example, said that a Committee...an Advisory Committee is going to help to set those priorities. Somebody asked the question

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

there any Legislators going to be on that, and he said This comes to what I was saying yesterday in regards no. to Bills and federal funding where we, the Legislature, ought to have some part of the process. One block...one of the items in the block grant the t.o Department of Public Health has to do with \$3,000,000...a over \$3,000,000 to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois Division of Services for Crippled Children. My staff had asked the Department of Public Health for information relative to that item. received information from the U of I, and he wanted to cross-reference that information from the Department Public Health and it was said by an aid of the Department of Public Health that he couldn't get that information. I wrote a letter to the Director to say we want that information. So I say that at the outset that right now as we start the block grant process, we had better start doing it right, because if we don't do it right, for example, and say this. I think all of you know that I speak strongly for the legislative process and what we ought to be doing is checks and balances. The block grant process can be a very strong political tool for any Governor. And I don't care what political party that Governor is from. I don't think we want that to happen. I think that we had as a Legislature, not just the Appropriations Committee, all of us. Because you have a lot at have your localities that if it is set according to political priorities, you have a lot to lose. community has a lot to lose. So I think we have a lot of dangers. First of all, I think it ought to be said that with the block grant approach, number one, there are going to be much less federal funds coming. That causes us some problems. Number two, it has been said that they are going

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

to have no federal bureaucracy and therefore there are going to be no strings attached to state and local I want to tell you that there is some danger to that too because of the fact that at least with the categoricals that there was some accountability. And we, as a Legislature, had better start worrying accountability. It is one thing not having regulations, but it is another thing if we do not have accountability. So I just say these things at the outset because we are embarking on a new concept. I understand four states have said no to the Federal Government. I don't know how they can do that with the status of fiscal funding in any But there are some dangers, and we had better state. worry, prepare and be alert towards this process."

Speaker Ryan: "We have with us on the podium today a former
Member of the Illinois House and presently a Trustee at the
University of Illinois, Paul Stone. Representative
Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, I was wondering if former Representative Stone brought some additional tickets for all of us for the Iowa-Illinois game this weekend."

Speaker Ryan: "That is what he is here for."

Ebbesen: "That's fine."

Speaker Ryan: "That is what he is here for. Come up and file with the Clerk. The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I too have some concerns about Senate Bill 271. I do intend to support it because the three agencies that are mentioned would be extremely hurt by not passing this Bill. However, I have to object on principle and the fact that we received this information only today, that it was hurriedly put together in a Conference Committee to which we had no input and that

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

this process was not brought before the Appropriations Committee where I feel that it most appropriately belongs. After all, this is our responsibility as the Illinois House and the Illinois General Assembly to participate in the decisions that are going to affect our local communities in these very vital areas of Commerce and Community Affairs, Public Health, and Mental Health. I feel that we have some unanswered questions. However, I would like to ask the Sponsor if he will yield for a question. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

- Speaker Ryan: "Will the Sponsor yield? He indicates he will."
- Deuchler: "I would like to know what the...if it would have been feasible to have heard this Bill in the Appropriations

  Committee?"
- Wolf: "Yes, I am advised that the Commission on Intragovermental Governmental Cooperation did hold, in fact, three public hearings on this subject matter during the summer, and that the Conference Committee was, of course, public and posted."
- Deuchler: "I did want to note, however, that those hearings were not...no hearings were held in the collar county areas.

  And I, for one, in my community heard a lot of complaining about that, so..."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."
- Wolf: "There was...there was one in Chicago which I assume would be adjacent to the collar county areas, and I don't know how for that is. Take the RTA."

Deuchler: "Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,

  Representative Matijevich. Alright. Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Yes, Hr. Speaker. First I would have to, at this time, move to suspend Rules 68 D and E so that the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 271 and Senate Bill 1157

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

may be considered. So at this time...68 D requires the Report to be on the Calendar of the Members for one day before being voted upon, and 68 E prohibits the House from considering any Conference Committee Report after June 30th. So I would now move, Mr. Speaker, for the...and also refer to House Bill 795 as well to be included. Senate Bill 271, Senate Bill 1157, and House Bill 795 included in that Motion."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate rules for Senate Bill 1157, and House Bill 795 and Senate Bill 271 so they may be considered immediately. Does the Gentleman has unanimous leave and leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for the suspension of said rules? Hearing no objections, unanimous leave is granted. The Attendance Roll Call shall be used, Mr. Clerk. Representative Wolf, do you wish to close?"
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 271, of course, is necessary to implement the block grant program of all these three agencies, as we mentioned, of \$76,172,035, and I would ask for your votes so that these block grants may be, in fact, implemented."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2 on Senate Bill 271. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 163 'aye', one voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 271 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. More
  specifically, I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry of

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, we're now on the order of business of Conference Committee Reports, and I would like to inquire of the Chair if the Chair has received a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 315."

Speaker Daniels: "What's your question again, Representative Bullock?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a parliamentary inquiry. And the inquiry..."

Speaker Daniels: "State your inquiry."

Bullock: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Daniels: "What is your inquiry?"

Bullock: "My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not the Speaker and or the Clerk of the House has received a filed copy of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 315."

Speaker Daniels: "We have a document proporting to be a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 315. Now, what's your question?"

Bullock: "My question, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, is has the Report... has the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 315 been filed with the Clerk? I'm not trying to belabor the point. I just want the Chair to answer that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, we have a document proporting to be a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 315 that has been filed with the Clerk, but it is not a legitimate Conference Committee Report because it does not have the requisite number of signatures on it. Does that answer your question?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, the first part of my question you've answered. The second part of my question, since you've now acknowledged the Clerk of the House has received and a Member of this Body has filed Conference Committee Report

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

on Senate Bill 315. My second question is, has that
Conference Committee Report which has been filed, that you
have acknowledged has been filed, has it been distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "As I stated to you earlier, we have a document
which proports to be a Conference Committee Report which
does not have the requisite number of signatures. It has

not been distributed nor are we going to distribute it."

- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, now we're going to be here an awful long time and I don't think now is the time for us to disagree, but, Mr. Speaker, I would like, since the Chair is now saying that the Report will not be distributed, I would like for the Chair and his staff to cite for me the rule of this House which..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Bullock. If you'd step up and talk to the Parliamentarian so we don't have a continuing dialogue here, we can do our best to satisfy you and your request. He's right up here on my left.

  Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. ..."
- Speaker Daniels: "And I have suggested to you the best way in which to handle it."
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this. I'm asking the Speaker of this House to cite for me the rule of this House which says that the Conference Committee on the Senate Bill 315 that I have filed is a proported document and is not a valid Conference Committee Report filed under the rules of this House. I'm asking you to cite for me the rule which sustains your statement that it's a proported Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, do you want to step down up front here, please? Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I will step down and speak to the Parliamentarian. I just want your assurance that after we have private consultation that you will get back to me on

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

this matter, giving me a definitive decision. That's all that I'm requesting. I'll be glad to go in a smoke-filled room with you and the Parliamentarian and our Speaker. I've got no problems with that. I just want to know that you will get back to me and give me your official decision."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm trying to assist you, Sir, so that you can accomplish your Report. I will answer you like this. The Report does not have the requisite number of signatures. It is not a valid Report since it doesn't have a majority of those people on the Committee signing it and it is not recognized as a valid Conference Committee Report, period.

Now, if you'd like to come down and discuss it further, we'd be happy to, but that's enough of the discussion.

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I only would say, in trying to put..." Speaker Daniels: "Your time is our time, Representative Bullock." Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I would only say in trying to put this matter to rest that the Chair has acknowledged the Report has been filed and under Rule 68D of this House it clearly states that once the Report is filed, the Clerk shall print and distribute that. Now, someone has arbitrarily decided not to distribute the Conference Committee Report. I'm not attempting to be glib with the Chair. I'm only trying to get clarification from the Chair and the staff that something is not right as it relates to this Report. We can argue at a later date of the validity of the signatures or the valid number of signatures required for the adoption of a Report. The only point that I'm rising on now and the only inquiry that I'm making is that we've complied with the rules of the House and you've indicated the Report was filed but nonetheless someone has arbitrarily seen fit not to print and not to distribute a Report."

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, you have chosen to extend this conversation. We'll answer you again as follows. We have before a document which you claim is a Conference Committee Report. It is signed by two Members of the Conference Committee of the House of the five Members from the House that were appointed. You, I assume, have filed this Report. The Committee itself voted 5 to 5 not to file a Report. This is not a valid Conference Committee Report and is not recognized as such. Now, if you want to continue the dialogue, we'll continue as long as you want."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I only want to ask five Members of this Body to join with me in filing of written dissent on this particular matter. I don't want to belabor the point. think the rules of this House are silent as it relates to the requisite number of Conference Committee Members file a Conference Committee Report. There are no rules addressing that issue. You know that's the case and Parliamentarian would tell you. I'm asking five Members of this Body to join with me in formal protest. We will file a written dissent so that the record will show that we attempted to address a critical issue in this state the involving youth and Commission ο£ Delinquency Prevention in order that we can move on with the business of the House. I think the Chair is in error..."

Speaker Daniels: "Fine. There are five Members who will join you. You may come up to the well and file your written dissent to what has occurred. That is within your right. We're going to move on. Thank you, Representative Bullock. Representative Fawell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Fawell: "I move to remove from the Speaker's Table and take for immediate consideration House Joint Resolution 27."

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved to take from the Table House
Joint Resolution 27. Does she have leave? Representative
Schneider objects. There has been an objection raised,
Representative Fawell, by Representative Schneider. Do you
wish to make such a Motion? Requires 107 votes."

Fawell: "Yes. I do."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. The Lady moves to take from the Table
... from the Speaker's Table House Joint Resolution 27 to
place before this Body for immediate consideration. It
takes 107 votes. All those in favor will signify by voting
'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.
Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "On the Motion, Mr. Speaker and Members. We're involved in trying to deal with Conference Committee Reports and other related matters of significance. We have in front of us a Motion to go to the Order of Resolutions which will deal with things trivia and otherwise. Why we are spending the last day of the Session and this Fall for that is beyond me. I think we're wasting our time. I would encourage Members to vote 'no' so that we can get back to the Conference Committee questions and solve those and then finally go home. This is certainly a waste of our time and I would encourage again the Members to stay on a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell, on the Motion."

Pawell: "I would like to take just a minute to explain what this Motion is. It's a very enoculous Motion. All it is is just a feasability study for the new Route 53 PAP 431.

DuPage County has been sitting on some land for approximately 20 years waiting for the state to build a road for us. We have tried time and time again to have it built. We are finally getting to the point where we would like to see if it is feasable to go the toll routeway which

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

will not cost the state anything. This has been a request from my County Board. I have talked to my colleagues in DuPage County about it. If you look at the board you will only see that there is just one Representative from DuPage who is against it. Everyone else is for it and I would please solicit your 107 votes. It is merely a study. That's all."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Lake,

Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "This is a very important study that should be made. We all know that we have a difficult financial problem confronting us as a state with respect to our highways and the need for our highways. This calls upon the Department of Transportation to conduct a feasability study for a specific route in its present form in the Dupage County area. If we aren't able to vote for increasing the gas tax or finding other revenue and there are highway needs, we certainly ought to have all the information possible and available as to alternate ways of constructing needed highways. I would urge the requisite number of additional votes to go on this so the subject can be considered. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Motion is directed toward hearing this immediately, as I said a minute ago. It's a question of whether or not you want to go to that Order of Business. But on the concept or the substance, what we're suggesting is that you have another study on a highway that has been studied since 1960 which is now no longer feasable without General Revenue Punds. If you live in the northern part of the state, the alternative, according to this study in addition to going

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

around economic impact, environmental impact and other studies that are required, what we're saying here is that since you can't do it with General Revenue Funds, you might as well stick to users with tolls. Now, those of us in the northern part of the state have been faced with that problem over the last few years and now the person from that area, an area that we represent in common at time, is saying that, 'Well, we can't increase your taxes, but we'll certainly give the toll costs you of approximately 20 cents per mile over that tollway. So I ... not 20 per mile, I'm sorry. From Army Trail Road to I55. If you think that's good for business, if you think that's good for the constituents of that area, you are wrong and I would argue again that the study is one that is duplicative of the many that have always been done by either the Department of Transportation or by special Resolution in the early '70's and in its origins in 1960. We're wasting our time again on a Bill or a concept that needs not be addressed. It's been addressed. I think you ought to stick with a 'no' vote on this matter."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'aye', 32 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. The Lady's Motion prevails. Representative Fawell moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 27. All those in .... We have to wait for the machine to clear. Representative Fawell has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 27. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Lechovicz as 'aye' I'm told. Well, Ted, if you walk up the aisle there, we'll wait for you. Have all voted who wish?

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 97 'aye', 36 'no' and 5 voting 'present' and... Representative Zito 'aye'. 98 'aye', 36 'no', 5 voting 'present' and the Resolution is adopted. Introduction and First Readings."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2001, Ralph Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act. Riret Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2002, McClain-Neff, a Bill for an Act in relationship tο the construction. reconstruction and maintenance of the State Maintain Highway System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2003. Greiman, a Bill for an Act in relationship to contracts for legal services by state agencies. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2004, DiPrima-Beatty, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Area of Medal of Honor Grove of the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2005. Collins-Capparelli, et al, a Bill for an Act to provide for the transfer to the park district of interest in the State of Illinois on certain lands. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2006, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. First Reading of the House Bill 2007. John Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the House Bill 2008, Macdonald, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, communication to the Speaker."

Clerk Leone: "From the Secretariate of the State from the Vadigan addressed by: 'It is my pleasure to forward herein an official expression of gratitude from the Secretariate of State of His Holiness for the Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois and forwarded to him recently renewing my thanks for your

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

kindness. I am Dear George. Very gratefully yours, John Cardinal Codv. Archbishop of Chicago. From the Secretariate of State: 'Dear Mr. Speaker. His Holiness. Pope John Paul II has directed me to express appreciation for the Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois on the occasion of the attempt of his life. He is indeed grateful for this thoughtful gesture and he values highly the support of your prayers. In expressing his gratitude. His Holiness invokes upon you, all the Members of the House of Representatives and all the people of Illinois the gifts of God's love and His peace. Sincerely, His Eminence. E. Martinez."

Speaker Daniels: "Agreed Resolutions. Read the Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 584, Madigan-Collins-et al; 585, McClain-et al; 587, Ryan; 588, R.J. Meyer; 589, DiPrima-et al; 590, Kornowicz; 592, Ropp-Vinson; 593, Yourell; 594, Yourell; 597, Giglio-Balanoff-Collins; 598, Peters-et al; and 600, Giglio-Collins."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, Agreed Resolutions."

Collins: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Agreed Resolutions.

House Resolution 584, Madigan-Collins, proposal submitted
by Senator Percy to exempt the Great Lake ports from a
federal rule requiring that 50% of all government cargo be
shipped on freight or zone by the United States. House
Resolution 585, McClain-Madigan, et al, Robert E. Meyer has
recently retired as Assistant Superintendent at Quincy
Public High School, a position he's held since 1964. House
Resolution 587 sponsored by Ryan, that we do hereby commend
and honor James M. Dean for his continuing work as a Boy
Scout. We congratulate him on his promotion as Eagle
Scout. 588, Meyers, R.J.-Macdonald-Virginia (Frederick),
the House joins the entire community of Rolling Meadows in

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

honoring Joseph Papp who is retiring from Training Officer for the Rolling Meadows Public Works Department. Resolution 589, DiPrima-Ryan-Madigan, this year the Austin Bank of Chicago is celebrating its 90th birthday making it the oldest bank in Chicago west of the Loop. Resolution 590, Kornowicz, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Zurawski of celebrating their Golden Wedding Anniversary. House Resolution 592, Harry Hahn of Mt. Pulaski, Illinois was selected as hands-down winner of the Abe Lincoln look-alike contest among 18 contestants who journied to the heart of Lincoln Land from as far away as New York. House Resolution 593, Yourell, William McAdam of Boy Scout Troop 49 sponsored by Lemont received the Eagle Scout Award at a court of honor held on October 25, 1981. House Resolution 594, Yourell, Timothy Wall of the Boy Scout sponsored by the Men's Club of the United Methodist Church received the Eagle Scout Award at a court honor held October 7. Giglio-Balanoff-Collins, House Resolution 597, July of 1981 marks the 25th Anniversary of the Mother of God Parish in Burnham, Illinois, House Resolution 598, Peters-Giorgi-Leverenz, an investigating commission shall be impowered hereby is authorized to investigate the operation of bingo games in order to ascertain the validity of the above made allegations to determine what abuses, if any, exist in the reviewed current standards of regulation enforcement power concerning the license of legal and parlor games in the State of Illinois. Giglio-Collins, ready availability of viable private-sector rail freight service is one of two major underpinings of industry in the state and has allowed the City of Chicago to become one of the preeminent manufacturing and industrial centers of the world. So, therefore, be it resolved is hereby created, consisting of 8 Members of this House, 4 to each be

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

appointed by the Speaker and the Minority Leader to investigate (sic, House Resolution 600). Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Conti, has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Now, Representative Giglio, you wish to discuss one of the Resolutions?"
- giglio: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to keep everything germane and let the people know.

  The last Resolution that Representative Collins and myself is one, Resolution 600, pertaining to the local rail service assistance for the Calumet industrial area. It is my understanding we need unanimous consent to create .. pass this in suspension of the rules in order for this to go and; therefore, I would ask for your consent."
- Conti: "If he's creating an investigating commission, it needs unanimous consent. The last one. Giglio and Collins."

Speaker Daniels: "Which number was that, Representative." Giglio: "600."

Conti: "600."

Speaker Daniels: "House Resolution 600. Gentleman,
Representative Conti, moves for unanimous leave of the
House for immediate consideration. Any objections? Okay.
Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, would someone,...the Sponsor please explain that Resolution again?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Let's back up a little bit. We're going to take care of the Agreed Resolutions. Are there any other discussion? Representative Kelly, is that on the Agreed Resolutions? Representative Kelly."
- Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had a Resolution which was not on the Agreed list..."

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Alright. We're going to take care of the ones that are here first. We're going to take House Resolution 600 out of the Agreed Resolutions. Now, Representative Conti moves for the adoption of all other All those in favor will signify by saying Resolutions. 'ave', opposed 'no'. The 'aves' have it. The Resolutions House Resolution 600. On that are adopted. Resolution. Representative Brummer says he has no further Somebody has talked to questions or dissents. Gentleman, Representative Conti, moves for unanimous leave for immediate consideration of House Resolution 600. objections? Hearing no objections, leave is granted and the Attendance Roll Call is used. Now, Representative Conti moves for the adoption of House Resolution 600. those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'aye', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and House Resolution 600 is adopted. Representative Kelly, have you filed Resolution?"
- Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did. It was Resolution... House Resolution 591."
- Speaker Daniels: "It's presently with the Committee on Assignments, Representative Kelly."
- Kelly: "I'd like to see if I could receive leave. I don't think it's that controversial and I'd like to get leave of the House to have this Bill immediately heard."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Representative Kelly, I'd like you to talk to your leadership and leadership on the other side of the aisle because it was knocked off the Agreed Resolutions. See what you can work out. Would you please do that, Sir? Thank you. Representative Conti."

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Conti: "There has been a... Someone has complained about that

Resolution being Agreed on the Agreed Resolutions. If you

want to put this on unanimous consent.

Speaker Daniels: "While we have a short laul here in the proceedings, I'd like to introduce to you a Gentleman from the 46th District, State Senator from South Pargo, Jens 'Tenathis'. Pargo North Dakota."

Senator 'Tenathis': "Thank you. I didn't really expect this honor and I really didn't make any preparitive remarks, but I am just thrilled to death to be up here today. If any of you folks get to North Dakota, you're certainly welcome to come to our legislative Houses, both the Senate and the They said that they improved the House in North Dakota when I moved out of the House and over to the Senate and they also said that they improved the Senate. always kind of play that little gag. I'm sure you've all heard it a thousand times. Anyway, I think you're all aware that North Dakota has just surpassed Kansas as far as being the wheat state of America and we're also known the new energy state because we're developing a tremendous amount of new oil and our late night, of course, is being produced now with a mine mouth operation and with that some of the same Parliamentarian arguments that you people are having here today. I thank you very much. Any any of you come to North Dakota while we're in Session, be sure to stop at the Capitol and I would like to have you here on the floor with me. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate 'Tenathis', you'll find out that the House is the working Body in the General Assembly in Illinois and we're glad to have you here in the House. House Bill 819. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Peters. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that the House concur with the Senate in

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the passage of Senate Bill 819, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, Representative Peters."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 819, as you all know, this is the enterprise zone Bill. We did take one run at this and passed it early on in the year. We did have extended debate on it last year. The Sponsor, Senator Totten and myself, along Representative Ryan, Pullen, Lechowicz, Braun and others interested here in the House have attempted to bring together the 107 votes in order to override this veto. failed on the first go around. I filed the Motion to attempt that one more time as is in keeping with the rules. But after a hard count on our side of the aisle conversations with the individuals interested in this Bill on the other side of the aisle as well as my conversations with Senator Totten who is the Senate Sponsor, I feel, as we all feel, that at this point it is futile to proceed with any further discussion of this issue and we will be back at it next Spring as opposed to burdening the House with any voting on it at this moment. To those of you who did support the concept, my thanks, the thanks of Senator Totten and Senator(sic, Speaker) Ryan and we trust that we can continue to enjoy your support and increase that support next year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. We have some work to accomplish, but we will adopt the Adjournment Resolution now. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk please read the Adjournment Resolution?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 62, resolved by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois the Senate concurring herein that when

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, October 29, 1981 it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1982 at 12:00 noon, and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 30, 1981 it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1982 at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I offer and move the adoption of House

Joint Resolution 62 which is the Adjournment Resolution
just read."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 62. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and House Joint Resolution 62 is adopted. Representative Kelly."

Relly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know what's causing the problem in getting immediate consideration as I requested on this Resolution 591, because this Resolution should have been on the Agreed Resolution list to begin with. I can't see where what you would call..."

Speaker Daniels: "The number of that Resolution, Sir, is what number?"

Kelly: "591."

Speaker Daniels: "House Resolution 591?"

Kelly: "House Resolution 591, right."

Speaker Daniels: "And you wish to move that the House grant leave for immediate consideration?"

Kelly: "I would, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. And that requires 107 votes."

Kelly: "That's alright."

Speaker Daniels: "Or unanimous leave. Does the Gentleman have unanimous leave? There is an objection over here."

Kelly: "Maybe I can explain what it is before there's objections raised. Briefly..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kelly. Gentleman,

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Representative Kelly, moves for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 591. On that Motion, Representative Kelly."

- Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Resolution 591 is a Resolution which is a call to Congress asking Congress to recognize the great job that the women have done in raising families and being mothers. Ιt asks that Congress look into other ways that they can provide increased benefits to the mothers. This much in line with what the Pope John Paul had made a statement on recently and certainly it would be in the best interest for particularly those that are concerned about interested and commending and congratulating the mothers in the home. And all this does is ask Congress to commend mothers and to look into ways that they might provide benefits and possible changes in eligibility requirements for their Social Security and any other benefit program, and I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? On the question, Lady from Cook, Representative Nelson."
- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think that the whole idea of this Resolution sounds discriminatory. I am a mother. I'm very proud of that fact. You guys have seen my two children here with me on the floor, but I also think that we certainly would want to honor fathers and I do not understand the purpose of this Resolution, and I have no intention of voting for it until I've seen a copy of it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Kelly, has moved the House place before it for immediate consideration House Resolution 591. It takes 107 votes. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. This is for consideration of the Resolution. On that question,

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

on the Motion, Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I looked at a copy of the Resolution and I think, for the most part, it's very nice language. I do just think though that since it gets into the question of Social Security and how we would hope that the Congress would address the problem of Social Security it's something that ought to be taken up in the Executive Committee or some other appropriate Committee, and I would hope that we would send it through that process. I think, basically, it expresses some fine concepts, but when we start getting into those kinds of questions I think we have a Committee to deal with it and we should send it there."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the record. I don't want

my vote to be taken as a vote against either motherhood or

fatherhood. I want my vote to be taken as a vote against

benefits."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson votes against benefits of being a mother. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, had I been writing this Resolution it wouldn't have come out quite in this form and I think probably, while on the one hand it could stand some perusal and some study and I really like the thought of this House studying issues relating to offering options to women so that women that want to stay home and raise children will truly have that option, and that women who want to work would truly have that option. But since we're not going to be back until January, I believe this is generally speaking a good Resolution and I'm going to vote 'yes' so that we would have an opportunity to debate it today and vote on it."

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

82nd Legislative Day

- October 29, 1981
- wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 112 'aye', 15 'no', 8 voting 'present'. Gentleman's Motion for immediate consideration is hereby adopted. Gentleman, Representative Kelly moves for the adoption of House Resolution 591. On that Resolution, Representative Kelly."
- Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be satisfied to have the same record Roll Call and anyone who would like to join us, they'd be appreciated too. Thank you, very much."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Kelly, moves the adoption of House Resolution 591. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 110 'aye', 11 'no', 15 'present'. The Resolution is adopted. The House will stand at ease for five minutes. We're waiting for the completion of some paperwork. As soon as it comes in, we'll proceed."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Robbins: "Robbins' Deli is still open. Bananas, apples, cookies.

  Everybody's welcome."
- Speaker Collins: "The House will come back to order. Messages from the Senate."

### 82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Mr. Wright, Secretary, 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bill 561 together with attached Amendments hereto and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 561 passed the Senate as amended October 29, 1981, Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

- Speaker Collins: "Supplemental Calendar #1, the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 1157. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk... or the Report."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 157(sic, 1157), a Bill for an Act
  making appropriations to the Illinois Performing Arts and
  Pilm Commission. Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, asks unanimous consent for immediate consideration on the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1157. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1157 was signed by all ten Members of the Conference Committee. The Bill... The Conference Committee has a number of supplemental and transfers mostly federal funds which had not been spent which have reappropriated. I think all of you have seen both the Conference Committee and a staff analysis of it. larger amounts are 6,153,900 to the Department of Aging, 3,000,000 of which are carry over funds awarded in FY '81 and unspent by the area agencies. A little over three million in reimbursement monies for the nutrition program for seniors, six million dollars to DOT, some of which is

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

the motorcycle rider safety program and .5 million for the St. Louis Rail Gateway Terminal Reconstruction Project. A million six, the Court of Claims Fall awards, a little over three million to the Department of Revenue for five new programs for which were based on law that we passed and won mandated by a court decision, and four million six in the day care compromise. And I'm happy to report to all after our hard work two weeks ago, we now have a compromise reached by everybody and all are satisfied. Mr. Speaker Members of the House. I move the adoption of and Committee... Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1157 and urge your support."

- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Lady from Champaign,
  Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I find that
  my copy of the Conference Committee Report on page 63 has
  some areas that I am not able to read and I wonder if the
  Clerk could read to me the language of line three on page
  63 please."
- Speaker Collins: "Mr. Clerk, do you have that? Wait a moment.

  He'll read from the original. Is there further discussion?

  We'll get that for you, Representative Satterthwaite. The

  Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield for a few questions?"
- Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."
- Vinson: "Representative Matijevich, on pages 32 and 33 perhaps some subsequent pages of the Conference Committee Report I see language appropriating money for certain judicial purposes. Can that money or is it intended for that money to be spent for judicial pay raises?"
- Matijevich: "No, Representative Vinson, that was at the request of former Member Joe... Joseph Fennessy who is now a Clerk

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

in an Appellate Court District. There was a miscalculation and it's a piddily amount of about 4,000 something and if you know Joe Fennessy, we could have done this through a transfer, but that wouldn't have satisfied Joe Fennessy. He was so nervous that he wanted to make sure that the Clerks in his Court were treated the same as the other Appellate Court Districts. There were two and another Appellate Court District, one in southern Illinois that were miscalculated. So, that's all that is. It's a total amount of 4,000 some dollars. Sam."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Collins: "The Clerk has the original now and can respond to Representative Satterthwaite."

Clerk Leone: "Reading from line three of page 63 of Conference

Committee Report 1157. 'Protection and Advocacy System for

Developmentally Disabled.'"

Speaker Collins: "Lady from Champaign."

Satterthwaite: "And would the Clerk please do the same thing for line five?"

Clerk Leone: "'Disabled Protection and Advocacy Act of 1975 for the objects'."

Satterthwaite: "Excuse me. For what?"

Clerk Leone: "'... for the objects', and then following on line six, 'set forth below'."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, then, speak to the substance of this Section."

Speaker Collins: "Proceed."

Satterthwaite: "I will support this Conference Committee Report because it has a number of issues in it that we have spent a long time in trying to resolve. However, this particular Section disturbs me to some extent because it would appear that we might be sanctioning the portion of this Bill that gives to the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission some

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

federal dollars for a protection and advocacy system for the developmentally disabled people in our state. It is my understanding that although there has been an application made to the Federal Government to have that agency so designated as to be the recipient of those funds there has not, in fact, been an approval at the federal level to have that agency designated. And so, simply to put it into the record, I would like to have that noted that we are at this point sanctioning something that has not had yet federal approval and, in my opinion, should never have federal approval although I think that it is fairly likely that that approval will be gained. I'm sorry to see that that is happening because I feel that there is an inherent conflict between the Guardianship and the Advocacy roles of that Commission and feel that it will not adequately protect the rights of the developmentally disabled. as I say, there are so many things of good merit in this Bill that I will support it in spite of that objection."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to read for the benefit of the Membership the memorandum of understanding between the Governor of the State of Illinois and the Statewide Coalition that had lobbied so hard on behalf of Section of this Conference Committee Report, the Section pertaining day care and donated funds. It's very brief, but because of the interest of the large number of Members the agreement, I would like to indicate what the elements are. For fiscal year '82 it restores 4.608 million dollars to the four lines that were at issue. For fiscal 1983 agreed to the appropriation level for the four lines in DCFS and DPA budget will remain at the agreed to level of total 52.04 million dollars which is the same as fiscal

### 82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

182. The second point, a separate line item for transitional day care to the Department of Children and Family Services budget will be provided in the fiscal '83 There will be no phase-out of the donated funds initiative program in fiscal year '83. Further, 700,000 dollars which is added back to the Department of Children and Family Services day care line will be expended on employment related day care. And lastly, the initial review of the allocation of the donated funds initiative program will give priority to the restoration to programs operating in fiscal year '82. The next review will give priority to those providers with whom the state had a contract on July 30, 1981. It is signed for the Coalition by Joel 'Carp' and for the Governor by John Washburn, Director of the Governor's Office of Legislative Affairs. Those are the essential elements. I'm sorry that we unable to reach an agreement such as that prior to the House vote. The House vote was necessary to keep negotiations going and I can assure you that the Coalition is appreciative of all Legislators who voted to keep the negotiations going and having voted on the initial veto Override Motion. Thank you for the Coalition. The agreement is signed, sealed and delivered and I urge an affirmative Roll Call."

- Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? Representative Pierce, are you contemplating your past, present or future? Is there further discussion? Representative Matijevich, to close." Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate your favorable support."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1157?'.

  Those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Unknown: "Turn me off."

Speaker Collins: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting \*present\* and this Report having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared adopted. On Supplemental Calendar...Supplemental Calendar #1, the Order Concurrence appears House Bill 143. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, asks unanimous consent so this Bill may be considered immediately. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mcauliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you..."

Spaker Collins: "Just a minute, Mr. McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 143, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code together with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Collins: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 143, as it's now written with Senate Amendment #2, is really the same as House Bill 1535 which was passed out of the House and the Senate and the Governor vetoed it. ... amendatorily vetoed the Bill. I failed to accept his amendatory veto so we had to find the vehicle to put the Bill back in. This is how we've done it. It's the money for the police training board and it funds local law enforcement training throughout the whole state. So I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 143."

Speaker Collins: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 143?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final

82nd Legislative Dav

October 29, 1981

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 143 voting 'ave', 3 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 143. House Bill 143 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1982 at the hour of 12:00 noon with time for a Perfunct that the Clerk may need."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves that allowing five minutes for Perfunctary Session for the Clerk to take necessary action, the House now stands adjourned until noon, January 13, 1982. Those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Motion passes and the House stands adjourned."
- O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills. Clerk House Bill 2009, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 2010, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Corporation Interest Rate Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2011, Alstat, et al, a Bill for an Act to the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Rill Catania-Collins-Pierce-Jones-Giorgi-Henry-Currie-Braun-Pullen Matijevich-Stewart-Hallstrom, a Bill for an Act relation to community day programs. First Reading of Bill. General Resolutions. House Resolution 575. Barkhausen et al, House Resolution 578, Madigan et Resolution 582, Steczo-Matijevich et al, House House Resolution 599. Levin-Cullerton et al. Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions. House Resolution 569 with respect to the memory of Mrs. Dorothy DePriest of East St.

82nd Legislative Day

October 29, 1981

Louis by Representative Younge. House Resolution 570, with respect to the memory of Thomas Fitzpatrick Representative Keane. House Resolution 576, with respect to the memory of Raymond Miller by Representative Saltsman. House Resolution 579, with respect to the memory of John Alexander by Representative Hastert. House Resolution 586, with respect to the memory of Orrie Pettv by Representative Saltsman. House Resolution 595, respect to the memory of Jerome F. Srejma, S R E J M A, by Representative O'Connell. House Resolution 596, respect to the memory of Gary Michalek, M I C H A L E K, by Representative O'Connell. Representative Conti moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions and they're adopted."

Clerk Leone: "Being no further business, the House now stands adjourned till January 13, 1982 at 12:00 noon."

OCTOBER 29, 1981

HB-0143	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-0795	CONFERENCE	PAGE	40
HB-0819	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
HB- 1998	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1999	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-2000	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-2001	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2002	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2003	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2004	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2005	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2006	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2007	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2008	1ST READING	PAGE	58
HB-2009	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-2010	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-2011	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-2012	1ST READING	PAGE	75
SB-0143	2ND READING	PAGE	32
	3RD READING	PAGE	36
SB-0271	CONFERENCE	PAGE	45
SB-0311	VETO	PAGE	3
SB-0524	V ETO	PAGE	6
SB-0529	3RD READING	PAGE	39
SB-1157	CONFERENCE	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	50
HJR-0027	MOTIONS	PAGE	55

### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - DOCTOR HAMPTON	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	59
HJR 62 - ADOPTION	PAGE	64
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	68
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	75
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	76
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	76

PAGE 1