24th Legislative Day

Barch 23, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "The Bouse shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Rabbi Israel Zoberman of Temple B'rith Sholom in Springfield. Rabbi Zoberman is a guest of Bepresentative Mike Curran. Would the guests in the gallery please rise to join us in the invocation?"
- Rabbi Zoberman: "Our God of life sustaining values, cherished Legislators, confronted by problematic reality, we are presented with both challenge and opportunity. May you, through wise and caring leadership, be co-workers with God so that healing and wholeness be the lot of all of God's children. And let us say, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp 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 Madigan: "Boll Call for Attendance. Mr. Greiman, are there any excused absences?"
- Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the record show that

 Representatives Henry, Shaw and Vitek be excused for

 illness?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that those Representatives are excused. Is there any Member of the Republican Leadership on the floor? Did I see every hand rise? I can only draw from this that they're in Mr. Daniel's office developing strategy. Mr. Clerk, take the attendance record. On this question, 105 Members have responded as 'present'. There is a quorum. Mr. Clerk, what business do you have? Committee Reports."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Brunner, Chairman of the Committee

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

on Public Utilities, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 22, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass Short Debate Calendar* House Bill 462. Representative Giglio, Chairman of the Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 22, with 1983, reported the back the following same House Bill 446: *do pass as recommendations: • do pass* amended' House Bill 604; tabled in Committee, Representative Flinn, Chairman of the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 22, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar* House Bill 329 and 451. Representative Laurino, Chairman of the Committee Insurance, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 22, 1983, reported the same back the following recommendations: "do pass" House Bill 584: amended' House Bill 406. *do nass 3.5 Representative Richmond, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to which the following Bill was referred, action taken March 22, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' Bouse Bill 357. Representative White, Chairman of the Committee on Human Services, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' House Bill 486; 'do pass as amended. House Bill 599 and 495; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 308; and House Bill 482, 'do pass Consent Calendar .. Representative John Dunn, Chairman of Transportation and Motor Vehicles, to the Committee on which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 22, 1983, reported the same back with the following

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

recommendations: 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 450; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 8, House Bill 499 and House Bill 571; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 530 and 645."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, are there any excused absences?"

 Vinson: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Representatives Ebbesen and

 Dunn."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that those Representatives are excused. Introduction and First Reading. For what purpose does Mr. Vinson seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might bring the chamber to order, because I have a very serious matter that I would like to discuss with you that I think the Membership will be extraordinarily interested in."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, we are almost prepared to introduce the Lanphier basketball team to the Membership, and I...I am told that we'll be ready momentarily to do that. And they would like to come to the podium and be presented, then go over to the Senate for the same purpose."
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not impinge on that ceremonial duty, because those young gentlemen have performed a remarkable feat. But I would like to be recognized after that, because there's a matter of grave concern that I would like to discuss with you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Vinson, you know well that we are all very interested in your pearls of wisdom. You know that."

 Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "There's some objection down here, though, Mr. Vinson. Would the Members please direct their attention to the podium? Would the Members please direct their attention to the podium? We are honored today to have with us the championship basketball team from the state

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

basketball tournament, that team being from Springfield, the Lanphier Lions. And for purposes of introduction, I will now recognition Representative Josephine Oblinger, a former teacher at the school."

- Oblinger: "Thank you very much. First of all, we want to express our appreciation to the Speaker for allowing us to be here, and I want to express my appreciation to Representative Curran, in whose district they really are, but who has said I may do the honors today. And I certainly appreciate it. It is true. I taught at Lamphier High School for 11 years, and I want to introduce two people who are here, and one who is not here but deserves special recognition. First of all, I would like to remind you that the principal is Phil Schmidt, who was one of my former students. The second one I would like to introduce is Mr. Arlyn Lober, who athletic director, with whom I taught. And finally I would like to introduce the head coach of the Lanphier Lions, who was a student of mine, Bob Nika. At this time, I would like to ask Mr. Nika to say briefly a few words to us and then introduce the members of the team."
- "Well, first of all, I'd like to take this opportunity Bob to thank you for being invited here today. Mrs. Oblinger and you people on the floor, this is a great privilege. remember six years ago we played Peoria Central in and, at that time, Bruce 'Boyl', who was a former Lamphier graduate, was coaching at Peoria Central, remember... I seen him about a week after the tournament, and he says, 'We went to Springfield last week and we went down to the State Capitol, and boy, were the players impressed. So, I... there's no doubt about it. I was probably looking forward to this as much as the players were. We really feel that ... that we really feel great right now just being here, having the opportunity to come

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

before you people. At this time, I'd like to introduce the players. I've been pretty high the last couple of days with the excitement, so I hope I can remember their names. All right, on the left here, my son, Moose Nika. behind him is Kevin Gamble. Mark Alstott. Ed Horton. Way back in the corner behind Horton, Danny Poggi, our manager. Darrin Kelly. Clark Douglas. Clarence Briggity. Poggi. Way in back, Karen Jones, our manager. And next to her, another manager, Sheila Gold. Right here. Craig. Tyrone Pettit. Mike Wolosick. Jerome Taylor, and he won't be la... li...he won't like it being called last, but Leslie Lee. Our assistant coach, Al Gieseking, and the other assistant, Dave Downey. Again, thank you very much. We really appreciate this, and I mentioned yesterday, went down to the City Council, and probably the thing that the kids liked as much as any is they're out of school, and any invitation they get is great. But, all kidding aside, we're really impressed. Thank you very much."

- Oblinger: "At this time, Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the Resolution? The Assistant Clerk. Then there'll be two other things happening. There will be a cheer led by the cheerleaders, and then I will recognize Mr. Yourell, who I understand has something."
- Leone: "House Joint Resolution #20. Whereas Lamphier High Clerk School of Springfield, Illinois has long had a record excellence in athletics; whereas, Lamphier High School won its 1983 IHSA Class AA regional basketball title by a score of 54 to 43 over Griffin High School, won its sectional title with scores of 64 to 52 over Quincy High School and of 58 over 50 over Urbana High School. MOB the supersectional titles by scores of 64 to 45 over Lockport High School, its quarterfinal game over Lincoln High School of East St. Louis, its semifinal game over Harvey Thornton

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

High School and its final over Peoria Central High School; and whereas, Lamphier High School finished the 1982-1983 season with a superb 30 to 3 record; whereas, Philip Schmidt, the principal of Lamphier High School: Lober, the athletic director: and Robert Nika, the head coach, who has coached the Lions for nine years, along with David Downey and Allan Geiseking, the assistant coaches, gave direction and inspiration to the team; and whereas, Lanphier High School student body wholeheartedly supported the team throughout the season; and whereas, the players and the cheerleaders made this championship possible; players summed up the Lanphier whereas. one of the philosophy saying, 'We're like brothers out there, and the coaches are like our fathers. #e a11 have to come together. It's what separates great teams from good teams. We're all good friends. When we see each other court, it's like we're on the court. If we play from the heart, we can win. . Therefore, be it resolved, of Representatives of the 83rd General of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that wholeheartedly congratulate the Lamphier Lions in winning the IHSA Class AA basketball championship for the year 1983 and for the spirit and character which led to this victory; and be it further resolved, that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the school and the coaches, the players, the cheerleaders, the managers formal token of our congratulations on this splendid achievement."

Oblinger: "Thank you very much. And now, cheerleaders - and I know what they go through. Whether you believe it or not, I had the cheerleaders for five years at Lanphier and learned to stand on my head doing it. So, come on and do it. We will. Go ahead, we'll cheer. Thank you. And now

24th Legislative Day

March 23. 1983

I will formally move that we adopt House Joint Resolution #20. All those in favor say "aye". Thank you very much, and all of you have been put on as Cosponsors. All 118 Members are sponsoring this. Thank you for letting us be here. We enjoyed it."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Bepresentative Brookins."

 Brookins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize two guests of ours from the City of Chicago, two funeral directors that stayed over from the breakfast this morning. Mr. James Couch, Jr. and Mr. Harry Carter, that's in the mezzanine, in the balcony."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for purposes of an introduction.

 We're privileged today to have visiting with us in

 Springfield some 55 members of the Five Star Club in

 Granite City, Illinois, an area represented by

 Representative Jim McPike and myself. Would you welcome

 them to Springfield, please?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie, are you seeking recognition?"
- Currie: "In the Speaker's gallery, we have today the 22 members of the senior graduating class of the Moose Heart School from the Fox River Valley/Aurora area, represented, I believe, by Suzanne Deuchler and Mr. Hensel. We're glad to see you all here."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair now recognizes Representative Vinson.

 Would the Membership please give their attention to Mr.

 Vinson? He has that look in his eye again which tells me that we should all sit on the edge of our chairs. Mr.

 Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not a humorous matter. It's a matter that I believe is of graver import than anything I have encountered in the years that

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

I've been a Member of this chamber. This chamber, I believe, all of us believe and hope, is a representative chamber. It's the chamber of the people. Members are here and recognize that they are here to be accountable to voters, and taxpayers and citizens back home. The essence of that accountability, the essence of the Constitutional duty that they take on when they become Members of this individual vote that they cast on chamber is the legislation, which occurs in this chamber. That is why the Constitution contains several detailed provisions regarding the operation of this chamber: that the meetings be public; that there he a systematic Journal and that that Journal be public; that votes on passage of Bills be recorded votes, that any citizen, any taxpayer, any voter in the state can get a copy of that Journal and can examine those votes. From a practical point of view, Mr. Speaker, no Member here would want to cast a vote in this chamber, a "yes" vote for instance, and then to discover back in their district that somebody had a copy of the Journal which indicated that they cast a 'no' vote on that Bill. I think that that is a frightening prospect for any Member of this chamber, and certainly a frightening prospect for the whole purpose of this General Assembly. That has happened, Mr. Speaker. would refer you to a Roll Call on House Bill 69 on Third Reading, which occurred on Barch 10, 1983. discover that six members of this chamber cast votes of a particular form, either 'yes' or 'no' votes, and then when that Roll Call was journalized, their 'yes' or 'no' votes were reversed. And they were represented in the Journal as having voted actually opposite of how they pressed the button on the floor. Now, Mr. Speaker, you adopted rules, a particular rule that I approved of this year, prohibits changing of votes after you depress your switch,

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

after the Roll Call is recorded. And I don't believe that any Member, in fact I'm positive, that no Member asked to have their votes changed in violation of that rule in this instance. What happened was that there discrepancy, believe caused in the Clerk's Office, between what bappened on the actual Roll Call and what has been journalized. could be, unless it is absolutely discrepancy corrected and guarded against, one of the most dangerous flaws of proceedings, one of the most dangerous errors that could ever occur in a General Assembly representing the people's will and operating under a written Constitution. Speaker, I am prepared, at this For that purpose, ar. point, to do two things. Number one, now in the Clerk's well is a Notion to reconsider the vote by which that Journal was approved so that we can expunge this error and correct it. And I would like to move for consideration of And then, subsequently, Mr. Speaker, that Motion. believe that it is imperative that this General Assembly create a special Committee, bipartisan Committee, ο£ Members from both sides, to examine, inquire and to supervise that process so that every Member here can be absolutely assured that they will never be in the position of having cast a 'yes' vote on the Roll Call and then discovering in the Journal that they are represented as having voted 'no' on a major issue. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you would cooperate in both of these instances, because I believe that this is, indeed, a grave error that must be corrected and that must be absolutely quaranteed against in the future."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, before we move to a consideration of your Motion, I do think that the Membership should be told by the Clerk's Office precisely what happened and what gave rise to the problems. So, Mr. Clerk, if you could

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

explain to the Membership the problem that developed, which is the subject of Mr. Vinson's commentary."

Clerk O'Brien: "Actually, all the Roll Calls in the Journal that you stated are incorrect, in that this was the first that Representative Taylor was in attendance in the House. Taylor And on our Roll Call, we put Mr. in Representative Pouncey originally was. However, in the Legislative Information System. their reprogrammed the Roll Call to put him in alphabetically. So, for that one day, while we were taking votes in House with Representative Taylor in Representative Pouncey's place, they were running through the computer the Roll Call alphabetically. So, all the Boll...all the votes after Representative Pierce and before Representative Terzich are in error. They reflect the person above them."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Mr. Clerk. I. too, believe that that was the source of the error. don't believe there was any deliberate effort to malign or to misrecord any Member's vote on that day or, knowledge, on any other day. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to have some process which quarantees the accuracy of those journalized votes. not enough to say that innocent error occurred, and that by correcting these votes, innocent error will no occur. We have to have a proofreading process which we can rely on and which the public can rely on, and that is the purpose for my second matter which would be the creation of a Committee which would supervise that proofreading process, and which would inquire into the problem and which would actual...absolutely quarantee to us, to the Members of this chamber and to the public, the reliability of those records in the future."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, there are other Members seeking recognition. And while they address the Body, your written Motion to reconsider Representative McPike's Motion to approve the Journals simply contains the language to approve certain Journals without reading. Do you think you would like to develop this with more specificity so that we don't reconsider Journals where this problem does not exist?"

Vinson: "Well, my problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that believe that when this particular Journal was approved, it was part of a Motion to approve several other journals, and I don't believe that you can reconsider a vote which has comprised several motions or several...they could have been don't think you can break it down in devised. T reconsideration. And I believe what would have to be we would have to reconsider all of Mr. Pike...Mr. McPike's Motion. And then, if there is reason to believe that there is no error in regard to the other ones, we can deal with that at that time. But I don't believe that you can divide a Motion to reconsider, when the original Motion was not divided."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian informs me that you are correct, so that we will be required to move to a reconsideration of the Motion in general. Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "May I ask if the Journals that were approved were the ones with the error...the ones in Mr. McPike's Motion?"
- Speaker Madigan: "I believe that one of the Journals that was part of the Motion was in error."
- Friedrich: "Well, I would like to ask if those Journals which
 were printed in error have been retrieved. The reason I
 ask that is that, unfortunately, the public would never
 understand, and I had this happen to me one time. Your

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

opponents run around with a copy of the journal, and they...they don't bother to tell you that that's the incorrect one. I just wondered if those have been retrieved. I think it would be helpful, because this is a serious matter."

- Speaker Madigan: "I think your point is well taken. Mr. Clerk, could you address Mr. Friedrich's question?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, the incorrect Journal will be taken out of the Bill Room, and the correct...when the corrected Journal is printed, it will indicate that it is a corrected Journal on its face."
- Friedrich: "Well, I appreciate that, because if someone shoots you accidentally, you're just as dead as if they shoot you on purpose. I certainly don't suggest that there was any intent on the part of the Clerk, but unfortunately, the result could be the same."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rushed back to my seat,

 because I heard the tone of Representative Vinson's voice."

 Speaker Madigan: "Yes."
- Greiman: "I thought it was a Death Resolution for a current Member, and I was hoping it wasn't me. Certainly there has been a, you know, a clerical error. We want the record to be correct. I would join with him, certainly, in a Motion that would give us an opportunity to correct that record. But I take it that all of the other matters of Committees and whatnot are not in his Motion. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker? Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Could you restate your question?"
- Greiman: "Yes, it only...this Motion, as filed, only applies to Representative McPike's Motion to approve the Journal and not the other matters, or that he will, in a more formal way, address any desires that he have with respect to

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Committees. Is that correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "That's correct, and I would think, Mr. Greiman, that we're now in a position where we could move to Mr. Vinson's Motion to reconsider Mr. McPike's Motion of March 22nd to approve the Journals as read. I understand that you are in support of Mr...."

Greiman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "...Vinson's Motion, and on Mr. Vinson's Motion for reconsideration, all those in favor signify by 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. Mr. McPike's Motion to adopt certain Journals as approved has been reconsidered, and that shall be the posture of the McPike Motion and of the Journals until the Clerk can correct the journals. It would be my intent. Mr. Vinson, to provide immediately appointment of an ad hoc Committee to review the Journal and to report to the House before we would entertain Motions to approve the Journals as read. I would propose that the ad hoc Committee would be composed of three Members. I hereby appoint Representative Matijevich and Representative Cullerton as the Democratic appointees to that Committee. I would call upon Mr. Daniels to make an appointment now if he wishes, or later if he wishes. then I would think that the Rules Committee should move to formalize that arrangement. For what purpose do you recognition?"

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this is a partisan matter nor should it be treated as a partisan matter, and I would ask you to change your Committee structure so that there be two Majority Members and two Minority Members. I believe it is a simple matter of guaranteeing Members' rights, and I can't imagine why you would be concerned about a partisan advantage with regard

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

to such a Committee. I think it should be removed from having any taint of partisanship."

- Speaker Madigan: "Yeah, well, we'll take that suggestion under advisement, Mr. Vinson. For now, we had this ad hoc Committee in place. We can proceed forthrightly to formalize the creation of that Committee by action of the Rules Committee and subsequent action of the Membership.

 For what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there is in the well of the Clerk a

 Motion to create such a Committee that would have an equal

 distribution of Members, and I believe that I would like to

 move that Motion at this point, Mr. Speaker, because I

 think it's most important that this involve absolutely no

 partisanship."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, it is not the plan of the Chair move to an adoption of your proposal in this regard. we can simply move ahead with what we have and move to the regular Order of Business, or we can engage in some parliamentary debate. I would suggest to you, Sir. your point has been well taken. We will move expeditiously to correct the problem, but I do wish to suggest to you that we do have other business of the House that can be attended to in due order without engaging ourselves in a parliamentary debate that really, in my judgement, not serve a useful purpose. And I just implore upon you to...to understand my reason and to agree with me. Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask then and I do this in some spirit of deference and cooperation to you that you discuss this matter with the Minority Leader this afternoon, because it is a most grave matter, and I would ask also that you direct the relevant parties who either work for you or who are in your Membership not to attempt

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

to approve any Journals until this problem is dealt with." Speaker Madigan: "Correct. I hereby direct Mr. Matijevich and Br. Cullerton not to move ahead with the deliberations of the ad hoc Committee until we have resolved this matter between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader. And I hereby direct the Parliamentarian, Mr. Getty, Webb, the former Parliamentarian, immediately after Session to devise a structure which will permit us to prevent this from reoccurring. Thank you, Mr. another ceremonial Ladies and Gentlemen. We have We are very pleased to have with us today introduction. who is visiting the Counsel. General of Ireland. Springfield, Mr. Liam Canniffe, who has served in various positions with the Irish Government as head of Department of Finance, the Department of Foreign Affairs. Secretary of the Irish Embassy to the Holy served as the Sea in Rome. He has also served in the Department of Poreign Affairs, and today is the Counsel General of

Counsel General Canniffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen this august House, I am here today because I wanted to see Springfield for myself. Even though I am two Chicago, I must admit I haven't been down here until now. But what I see is very heartening. As you know, being Irishman, I like debate, and more than that, I like politics. What I see here today in front of me is exactly what I would expect to see back home in Ireland in our House of Parliament. It hasn't changed one iota. and feel very much at home. I think I should explain what I do General, I'm responsible for 20 in Chicago. As Counsel states, most of them in the Midwest, but some of them go as far as Texas and Louisiana. I probably...the best way describe a Counsel General's work is to say that you're an

Ireland, and I give you Mr. Liam Canniffe."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

information officer for your Government. And, of course, you're responsible for citizens that you...that live within I am very fortunate in that I have quite a number of citizens within my area. And not only have I that, I have a lot of people who have some 'affiliaty' my country. And between my citizens and people who like us and between people who have something in common with us, I find myself very busy. And I am very pleased about that. Basically, what I try to do is I try to encourage people to I try to encourage people to invest in to Ireland. Ireland. I try to encourage people to trade with Ireland. And most of all, I try to encourage people to like us Irish don't have very much problem with the latter people. T There are 44 million people with Irish birth part of it. the states, and a lot of them seem to appear to live around the Midwest. The other problem, and which is a much more problematic one, is the thing I have to deal with which is the least...the least nice part of my...of my business here. And I have to explain my government's This is the biggest position about Northern Ireland. tragedy we have, and it is a tragedy. As you probably know, both communities in Northern Ireland are divided, and they're divided basically because there are no political structures like you know here in this country. The structures don't work. And the problem is that the symptoms of the problem have taken over, and what you have is violence and intimidation, and you have an alienation of both communities. What my government hopes to do is to try and bring both communities together in some kind reconciliation introducing peaceful by government structures which will work into Northern Ireland. We have very many good friends in the United States who help with this. We have a group of people in the U. S. Congress

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

'Friends of Ireland'. And they come from both call the Parties within the Congress. And I, just to finish, will read you a paragraph of their last message which was issued Patrick's Day. And it sums up our feelings about Northern Ireland. It reads, 'We renew our commitment great goal of Irish unity and reiterate our conviction that the only sure role to adjust in lasting peace division of the Irish people. the We seek unity-based and democratic principles, achieve bу negotiation and persuasion, secured with consent freely given by the majority of the people of Northern Ireland, and which forms Constitutional safeguards for the rights and traditions of all concerned. That about sums up the point of view of the Irish Government, and I humbly ask you support it if you can. Finally, standing in front of you today, I wonder what it must be like to be sitting down there in your place. Perhaps had my ancestors come to like so many of their fellow countrymen, I could have been one of you, if I was so lucky. The feeling with me here in America is that there is no conscientiousness of being alien. There's a conscientiousness of being friendly. There's a conscientiousness of kinship, and quite a lot of people feel that about America. Certainly I do and a lot people I have met. And in no more place can you feel that than in Illinois, and I'd like to thank you for it. And I'd like to thank you for your hospitality and for making we welcome here today. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Representative Van Duyne seek recognition?"

Van Duyne: "To introduce one of our local CPAs, Mr. Danny Maher standing right here at my left. But along with that, Mr. Speaker, I've found someone's heirloom, their tie clasp.

I'm holding it up. It has a blue stone in the middle of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

it. Somebody evidently had passed through here and brushed on someone, and it fell off on the floor. So, it's here for their discovery."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for purposes of an introduction. I
would like to introduce the children from Moose Heart, Mr.
Bob 'Huska', Moose Lodge #3 in Wood Dale, Illinois.
They're in the Speaker's gallery, and they are represented
by Minority Leader Lee Daniels."

Speaker Madigan: "On page two of the Calendar under the Order of
House Bills Second Reading Short Debate Calendar, there
appears House Bill 33. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call
your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 33, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading

of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Beading. House Bill 137. Mr. Terzich,
do you wish to call your Bill? The Gentleman indicates he
does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 139, Mr.
Terzich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 139, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 140, Mr. Terzich.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to amend

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. n

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Bouse Bill 286. The Clerk informs the Chair that the fiscal note has not yet been filed relative to this Bill; therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 404.

Mr. Van Duyne, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 404, a Bill for an Act in relation to development and utilization of water powers. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills

Second Reading, there appears House Bill 21.

Representative Topinka, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 21, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I would just ask if the Sponsor could hold this Bill for one day on Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka, there has been a request that you hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading for one day. Representative Topinka."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill has already been on the Calendar for two days. I'd like to know what Representative Cullerton would have in mind and why he feels I should hold it back another."

Speaker Madigan: "Rather than engage in a colloquy between the Members, why don't Representative Topinka and O'Connell discuss this question. I'll return to your Bill as soon as you finish your discussion, Representative."

Topinka: "Very well. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. House Bill 36. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 36, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 49. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 49, a Bill for an Act to makes terms

of Judges appointed to fill vacancies uniform. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 55. Mr. Greiman, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 55, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of
the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 67. Mr. Ropp, do you wish to call your Bill? The Gentleman indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 114. Mr. Brookins, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 114, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 169. Mr. Terzich,
do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 169, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Law Bevision Commission.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Treatment of the party to commerce Hackey

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 170. Mr. Johnson, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 170, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Beading of the Bill.

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Hadigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 172. Mr. Johnson, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Notions filed."

No Committee Amendments."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 187, Representative Currie. Representative Currie, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 187, a Bill for an Act to provide for state grants to certain public radio stations in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 203. Mr. Olson, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Mr. Speaker, there's an Amendment forthcoming. I'd like to hold the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests that the Bill be left on the Order of Second Reading. It shall remain on Second Reading. House Bill 208. Mr. Saltsman, do you wish to call your Bill? The Gentleman indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 230, Mr. Terzich. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 244. The Clerk informs the Chair that the fiscal note has not yet been filed; therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 255, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 255, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Vinson - Stuffle, amends
House Bill 255 on page one..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Vinson on Amendment #1 to House Bill 255. Mr. Vinson."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Vinson: "I would defer, Mr. Speaker, to Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the the Amendment offered by Representative Vinson and myself is an attempt to spread out the pay raises provided for in this Bill for the regional superintendents of schools and their The program in the existing Bill is simply a assistants. strict, straight, one-time increase in the salaries of these individuals. What this Amendment does is to spread out and slightly reduce the overall impact of the Bill The Bill, as I understand it, now it in increments. provides for roughly, basically a 10,000 dollar increase in salaries in one shot, plus the assistants' salaries are phased in at a maximum percentage of whatever salary the regional superintendents have. This Amendment spreads out into four years the salary increases for these individuals, a 5,000 dollar increment and three 1,500 dollar increments totalling over all 500 dollars less than the original Bill, but spread out, as I said, over four years. The importance of this Amendment, I think, is to reduce the cost of the Bill and to recognize at the same time that if we do not provide any salary increase to these people that they will, in fact, go eight years without any increase. They have gone four years without an increase now. They take of...office in August of 1983. Without some incremental changes in salary they would go eight years without a raise because of the Constitutional limitations. I offer the Amendment to you as an attempt to recognize on one the need to reimburse them on a greater level. In fact, because they had...handle, in most cases, multi-county duties, they are paid less than most superintendents of schools and, in fact, as I indicated, also to realize that there is a need to be fiscally realistic in this time of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

austerity. We're kind of caught between things here, but, as I indicated, the problem is that without any increase, it would be eight years. So, the Amendment is an effort to reduce costs and spread out the costs in this particular Bill. And I'd ask for your favorable consideration of Amendment #1 to House Bill 255 for those reasons."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Amendment, the Chair recognizes
Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "First a question and then, I guess, a comment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Johnson: "Representative Stuffle, I have a fiscal note in front of me, signed by Bob Leininger, indicating that prior to the Amendment the total cost for super...for regional superintendents and assistants would be about five and a half million dollars. How would your Amendment change the fiscal impact?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Johnson, I think Mr. Leininger's figure is five and a half million dollars. That would be an immediate cost impact next year, because it's a one-shot thing. This Bill would reduce that cost from 5.5 to 4.5 million dollars in that first year. And, in fact, it would never go above five million and 83 thousand dollars in the fourth year."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I guess we can...most of us can save our comments for the Bill on Third Reading. But I think all the Members on both sides ought to look at the number, HB 255 and, with all due respect to the distinguished Sponsors of this Bill, we're talking about a tax increase, a multi-faceted tax increase, cutting teachers and cutting programs, and we're going to provide a tax in...or we're going to provide a salary increase in some cases up to 32

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

percent when we're faced with the worst fiscal crisis we've had in the history of this state. I think we're making a mistake, and you ought to look at that number so you can remember to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Nelson, amends House Bill 255..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 255 would keep the salary of the Superintendent of the Cook County Educational Region at the I know that some of you saw the Royko piece that was in Sunday's Sun-Times, and for those of you who not see it, there should be a copy on your desk with a cover letter from me. In case you missed it and in don't understand my reason for wishing you to keep Superintendent Martwick's salary at the same level, 1:11 just read you a little bit of it. A suburban teacher recently wrote to Superintendent Martwick asking him for some advise and got back a note from his office that had six misspellings in it and was not grammatically correct. She showed the note to her ten-year-old students and used it as an exercise in how to do grammar correctly, and able to solve the problem. Unfortunately, ten-year-old in her office can't be employed yet patronage worker in Nartwick's office. place of the But Royko goes on to say that these young students were astonished to learn that someone lacking the essential skills could get a job. Their amazement just showed that

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

teacher and her students don't know much about the Superintendent Martwick or his office. Martwick's office has been widely hailed as the most useless governmental office in all of Cook County. And considering how many useless agencies we have around here, that is no small distinction. At election time, newspapers usually endorse one candidate or another for various public offices. when the get to Martwick, then they say, 'This is an office that should be abolished. Martwick, who is a political hack, uses the office to employ 50 or 60 of his political cronies and relatives to shuffle useless papers. And they can't even shuffle papers well. Well, Royko goes on in this same vein, and this is well-known, not only through the Chicago Sun-Times by also to any of the suburban superintendents who have to deal with that office. I would ask you to vote 'yes' on Amendment #2 to House Bill 255. and I would respectfully request a Roll Call vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I just would ask the Parliamentarian to look at the Amendment #2 just to..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton, one second."

Cullerton: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parliamentarian. There's a parliamentary inquiry from Mr. Cullerton. Proceed, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, inasmuch as we have adopted Amendment #1 that deleted certain lines, and now Representative Nelson has an Amendment that affects those same lines, I think her Amendment may be out of order. I'm not sure. That's why I'd like to ask the Parliamentarian. I don't believe it's in correct form."

Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker, Amendment #1,

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

which has been adopted, deleted lines 22 through 26 of the original Bill. Amendment #2 seeks to amend on page one, line 25 of the original Bill. Accordingly, since it has already been amendment by Amendment...amended by Amendment 1, as submitted, Amendment #2 is not in order."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson."

- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that case, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Parliamentarian, may I ask that the Bill be held on Second Reading until I have an Amendment correctly drafted?"
- Speaker Madigan: "I think that question would be more properly put to the Sponsor of the Bill, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to respond?"
- Terzich: "Yes, I think that the adoption of that Amendment...I

 don't know if it was an autobiography or what, but I

 had...I am opposed to the Amendment, and I'm opposed to

 deferring the Bill. I held it on Second Reading for a

 couple of readings already, and I'd like to move to Third

 Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson, it would be my inclination to abide with the wishes of the Sponsor to move the Bill to the Order of Third Beading. I would simply suggest to you that you'll have your opportunity on Third Reading. Okay? Mr. Clerk, place this Bill on the Order of Third Reading. For what purpose does Mr. Johnson seek recognition? Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Prior to your moving that Bill within a matter of a second or two, we filed a fiscal note asking for a fiscal note on HB 255 as amended, since there is a change in the fiscal impact for the adoption of Representative Stuffle's Amendments. As I understand the rules and I would hope just as a matter of courtesy to other Members that we could keep the Bill on Second Reading, get the fiscal note

24th Legislative Day

- March 23, 1983
- and allow Representative Nelson to have one extra day to introduce her Amendment. There is a fiscal note request filed by me on file right now."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, was the request for a fiscal note filed prior to my directive to you to move the Bill to the Order Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "The request was filed at the Clerk's well prior to moving the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 266. For what purpose does Mr. Terzich seek recognition?"
- Terzich: "Well, I have...I have a fiscal note right here. I'll file it right now."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich, that is your prerogative. The Clerk informs me that Mr. Terzich has filed a fiscal note.

 For what purpose does Mr. Johnson seek recognition?"
- Johnson: "Well, before we determine, and I would think, Mr. Speaker, before you would determine whether to move the Bill to Third Reading, I would like to see A) if it's filed by the proper parties designated by the Fiscal Note Act to file fiscal notes; and, secondly, whether it's directed itself to the Bill as amended. Since the Amendment was just adopted within a matter of five minutes, I would find it amazing that Mr. Leininger could have already researched and filed a fiscal note on behalf of the appropriate agency. If...If so, that's the quickest work in the history of Illinois State Government. Mr. Johnson, have you posed a parliamentary inquiry?"
- Johnson: "Yes, I guess I did. Thanks for leading me on that."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Getty."
- Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker, I would rule that the purported fiscal note, as filed, does not comply with the requirements of Chapter 63, Section 42.32 of the

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Illinois Revised Statutes."

- Speaker Madigan: "Therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 266. Representative Nelson, do you wish to call your Bill? The Lady indicates she does not wish to call her Bill. House Bill 267. Representative Nelson indicates she does not wish to call her Bill. House Bill 268. Representative Nelson indicates she does not wish to call her Bill. House Bill 275 shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 302, Representative Topinka. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 302, a Bill for an Act to add Sections
 to the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the
 Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Topinka Bopp, amends
 House..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka. Representative Topinka. Mr. Clerk, could we get the loud speaker system repaired? Mr. Clerk?"
- Topinka: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think my microphone is not working correctly. So, if you'd like to look at that, I'll take it on Representative Piel's mike. The Amendment that we've offered to this puts a limitation on the Bill. It came of a su-out of a suggestion from Representative Ropp and the Executive that we would limit the...the leasing and/or buying or putting money into historic sites, to only those sites that would be on the state or national register of historic places. I think that's fair, and we've included that. And we've also added, at the request of the Department of Central Management Services, that they would have the authority to handle any of the leasing or rental arrangements that might be involved if, indeed, any

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

these historic places were used for any public purposes that the state would be involved in."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 302. Is there any discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 307. Mr. Birkinbine, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 307, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of
the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 317. Mr. Jaffe, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Jaffe indicates be does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 336. The Clerk informs the Chair that the fiscal note has not yet been filed relative to this Bill. Therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 374, Mr. Neff. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 384. Mr.

Birkinbine, do you wish to call you Bill? Mr. Clerk, read

the Bill."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Clerk O*Brien: "House Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are the any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 394. The Clerk informs the Chair that the State Mandates Act fiscal note has not yet been filed; therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 454, Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 455. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Terzich indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. Returning to the beginning of the call, House Bill 21, Representative Topinka. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 21, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Representative Topinka seek recognition?"

Topinka: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, in discussing the matter with Representative Cullerton and my joint Sponsor, Representative O'Connell, we have agreed to hold the Bill until tomorrow until we work out one final little problem."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. The Bill shall remain on the Order

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

of Second Reading. On the Order...On the Order of House Bills Second Reading Short Debate Calendar there appears House Bill 286. Mr. Steczo, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 286, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Second Beading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Has the fiscal note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Piscal note is filed."

Speaker Madigam: "Third Reading. On the Order of Election

Contest Reports on page seven of the Calendar. The Chair

recognizes Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor."

- Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the provision of Rule 9(a) requiring the report of election contests to be carried on in the daily Calendar for two Legislative Days, and that we now consider the report of election contest with respect to the 108th and the 118th Representative Districts."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the rules to permit the immediate consideration of the Election Contest Reports. Is there leave? Leave is granted and the Parlia..."
- Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 90, I move that..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor, would you wait just one second.

 The Parliamentarian informs me that we need leave to journalize the Attendance Roll Call on the guestion of leave since we need a Roll Call on that guestion. So, is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. Mr. Parliamentarian, have we satisfied all of the technical requirements? Thank you. Mr. Taylor."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

- Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 90, I move that the House adopt the report of the election contest with respect to the 108th and 118th Representative District contests, previously adopted by the House Committee on Election."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the report of the Blections Committee relative to the election contests filed in House District 108 and House District 118. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall we adopt the report of the Elections Committee?'.

 All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. For what purpose does Mr. Winchester seek recognition?"
- Winchester: "Taking into consideration, Mr. Speaker, that this may be a conflict of interest, I wish to be recorded as voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Olson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Olson: "Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Minority, this is an agreed Motion, and we support the Amendment...or the Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Olson. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record.

 On this guestion there are 109 "ayes", 1 voting "no". The reports of the Elections Committee relative to the election contests filed in House Districts 108 and 118 has been adopted. Mr. McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "On page four of the Calendar under House Bills

 Third Reading Short Debate, House Bill 27. Mr. Cullerton.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 27, a Bill for an Act relating to certain civil lawsuits. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

House Bill 27 extends the representation and the House. indemnification provisions of current state law to the State Appellate Defender, the lawyers that work for the State Appellate Defender, if they are sued for malpractice representation provided by them in the course of their state employment. The primary statutory responsibility the Office of the State Appellate Defender is to provide legal representation to indigents on appeal. Supreme Court decisions have held that absent legislation, a court appointed attorney for an indigent is not immune malpractice action brought by that indigent. As a result of these cases, in most instances, the only recourse for the disgruntled indigent client is to sue the lawyer who works for the state. This Bill passed full Committee 17 to nothing. I think it's a good piece of legislation. It has passed the House before. It was tied up in the Senate, and I would ask for your support in this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "On House Bill 27, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, I wonder if you would yield for a question,

Representative Cullerton."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton indicates he'll yield."

Greiman: "Representative Cullerton, are there other Bills that

hold...or that hold them harmless for malpractice, medical

or legal malpractice...hold state employees or county

employees harmless for that? Are there other laws? Do you

know?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I'm looking at the Bill right now to indicate that part of the statute that we're amending is an Act to provide for representation and indemnification of state employees, and there are others that are included. For example, physicians who is employed by the Department of Corrections or the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. In fact, our language comes

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

right after that language in the statute."

- Greiman: "How about the State's Attorneys and people like that in handling matters under the Uniform Child Support Act?"
- Cullerton: "I don't know the answer to that."

-

- Greiman: "Well, okay. I would support this Bill. But, I just wondered if there were other places that we should think about legislation that would correct...that would keep the public held harmless."
- Cullerton: "Well, this is in response to Supreme Court decisions that specifically talk about state appellate defenders, and that's the reason for the legislation."
- Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? No further discussion.

 Mr. Cullerton to close."
- Cullerton: "I simply ask for the support of this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Bouse Bill 27 pass?'.

 All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 12 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 171. Representative Johnson, do you want the Bill called? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 171, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading

 of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Representative Catania and I jointly cosponsored this Bill

 two years ago. It passed out of the House with an

 overwhelming margin, and it was held up in the Senate rules

 process. This Bill is supported, on the one hand, by the

 National Organization Against...or National Organization

 for Women, Women Against Rape and so forth, and on the

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

other hand, by strong law and order groups. One of the problems in prosecution of rape cases and sexual assault cases is that oftentimes the victim of the sexual assault rape becomes, in effect, the defendant, and is required to go through an agonizing and often embarrassing process simply to allow effective prosecution. Only... In Illinois, only in rape and sexual assault cases is the court, by common law, permitted to required the victim to submit to a psychiatric or psychological examination, nowhere else, not in robbery cases or ... or burglary cases or anything else. This Bill simply says that the court is not to be permitted to require a victim of a rape or sexual assault case to submit to the humiliating process of a psychiatric examination that really has nothing to do with the case itself. I think it's simply a common sense Bill. passed out of Judiciary 18 to nothing, and I would request an affirmative Roll Call."

- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1712 No Representative Johnson has moved for the discussion. passage of House Bill 171. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 'ayes', no 'nos', 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 171, having received a Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 376, Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 376, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 376 amends
the Downstate Firemen's Article of the Pension Code. It
simply confirms what is already the practice, but not yet

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

the rule. The current practice, which is sensible because it protects the integrity of the Downstate Firemen's Pension Fund is not to allow volunteer firemen to be granted credible service for his or her time as a volunteer. The Bill simply protects the integrity of an important pension fund. It is backed by the Associated Firefighters of Illinois. I know of no opposition to this Bill, and I'll be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to House Bill 376? There being no opposition, Representative Curran has moved for the passage of House Bill 376. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the Have all voted who wish? record. On this Bill...On House Bill 376 there's 111 'aves', no 'nays' and I voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page four under House Bills Third Representative Cullerton, House Bill 1. Do you want the Bill called? House Bill 25, Representative Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 25, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to jurors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you were to review the U. S. Constitution, I think that you would be surprised to know that there is only one obligation imposed on the citizens of the United States. Surprisingly, it's not an obligation to pay taxes. It's not an obligation to serve in the military. But rather, it's an obligation to serve on a jury. And yet, in Illinois, the following persons are exempt from serving as jurors: the Governor, Lieutenant

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Governor, Secretary of State, State Comptroller, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Attorney General, Members of the General Assembly during their term of office, all Judges of courts, all clerks of courts, sheriffs. coroners, practicing physicians, Christian Science practitioners. Christian Science readers. postmasters, practicing attorneys, all officers of the United States, officiating ministers of the gospel, members of religious communities, mayors of cities, policemen. active members of the fire department and all persons actively employed upon the editorial or mechanical staffs in departments of any newspaper of general circulation printed and published in this state, members of the National Guard while they're in the National Guard and for six years after they're out. There's one other people who are exempt from jury. Now the list that I've just given you are people who want to be exempt. They have hired their lobbyists to come down to Springfield to themselves exempt from this Constitutional requirement, but there's one group of people who do not want to be exempt who are, and those are blind and deaf people. They wish to serve on a jury, but the law says that they can't. The Illinois Federation of the Blind and the Chicago Hearing Society came down to Springfield to testify on behalf of this Bill indicating their support for this Bill. have to be aware of what safequards are built into the selection process of a jury. What we're talking about being eligible for jury duty, not being mandated to be on a jury. If you're put in to the pool, you go before a Judge. Lawyers have the right to challenge, for cause, a juror's ability to be fair and impartial. And, specifically, this Bill we say, 'if a prospective juror has a physical impairment, the court shall consider such prospective

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

juror's ability to perceive and appreciate the evidence when considering a challenge for cause. So, right off the bat, if either side wishes to not have a blind juror or a juror on that jury, they can make that request of the Judge, and the Judge has every right in the world to knock them off. But, if for some reason the Judge does not grant that motion for cause, we have in the system what's called preemptory challenges. That means that both sides can knock off a prospective juror for no reason, no reason whatsoever. Now, we had before the Committee, a Judge from Chicago who testified, and I'd like to quote from him, from his testimony in that Committee. His name is Judge Nicholas 'Pamairo', and Judge 'Pamairo', who is a sitting Judge in Chicago, is blind. And here is what he said to that Committee: 'Why should the dignity of any deaf person be attacked, and why should you tell me, 'Yes, you can pay taxes. You can serve as a lawyer. You can serve as a State's Attorney. You can even serve as a Judge, but you can't serve as a juror. It just doesn't make sense to me.' Judge 'Parairmo' told that to the Members of the House Judiciary Committee. It doesn't make sense to me either, and that's why I bring this Bill before the House and ask you for your consideration. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House
 Bill 25. On that question, the Chair recognizes the
 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker, excuse me. I rise in support of this fine Bill. As Representative Cullerton pointed out both here and in Committee, this Bill simply says that, where not otherwise disqualified, a juror need not be disqualified by virtue of that juror's inability to see or inability to hear. There are many,

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

many cases that would require the members of the iurv seeing evidence, seeing demeanor of witnesses, seeing exhibits that would be displayed. There are many, situations where a juror may, of couse, have to hear, not just have translated into sign language, what is presented. But at the same time, there are many, many cases where that may not be necessary at all. And in those cases where the plaintiff, the defendant, the prosecution defense and the Judge thinks that it is no invalid disability to have a blind or a deaf juror, in those cases and in those cases alone, they should be permitted to act This puts them on a par with everyone else when as jurors. the situation does not say that their physical disability their physical infirmity is otherwise disqualifying. This doesn't require blind or deaf jurors to sit in a panel of jurors, but this says, where there is no objection to where the nature of the case is one that doesn't require a juror to see evidence or see a witness, where the nature of the case doesn't require the juror to hear his ears instead of hearing with his eyes what is being said, in those cases and those cases alone they should permitted to sit as jurors. This is a good Bill. This is a progressive Bill. It harms no one. And in fact. helps many people who are disabled, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "On House Bill 25, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes. Mr. Chairman (sic) and Members of the House, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pointed out, most notably the lead Sponsor on this, Representative Cullerton, this Bill absolutely causes no harm to anyone. In fact, it enhances the ability of handicapped people to be able to participate in the system. It costs nothing

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

extra. It gives them an opportunity, and I certainly would encourage the Republican Members to join with those on the other side in helping this pass through."

Speaker acPike: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. I'm also a Joint Sponsor on this and urge its support for it. I will be very brief, because we seem to be on a roll here. But, I do want to point out that there has been deaf persons who have served on juries already successfully in Cook County, and in Kankakee County a jury foreman was blind in one instance and served successfully. They have been doing so at the sufferance of local officials who have... and local Judges who have seen fit to impanel them. I think that, since we have had some successful cases here in the State of Illinois, that we ought to... to open up the law for others, and I would just urge an "aye" vote. Thank you."

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

Winchester: "Would the Gentleman yield for a guestion, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

winchester: "Well, it appears to me that in most trials, the attorneys, probably on both sides, are not going to ask that a blind or a deaf person be seated. But by passing this law, aren't we then forcing those people who receive notifications to appear for jury duty to have to come down to that courthouse only to make a trip, only to be told that probably they're not going to be seated? So aren't we, in a sense, putting those people to an inconvenience and perhaps even having to cause the county government to pay additional dollars for bringing those folks into the courthouse only to be told that they're going to be preexempt?"

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Cullerton: "Well, first of all, I don't agree with your premise that most lawyers will not accept deaf or blind people on a jury. As a matter of fact, I think it would only be in rare cases where physical evidence was crucial to the outcome of the case where they would be excluded. However, I might add or reaffirm that the long list of people who are exempt - they're the ones that don't want to serve on a jury. It's the deaf and the blind people who have said that they do wish to serve on a jury. They're not saying that they don't want to be inconvenienced by going down to They're saying they do want to fulfill the courthouse. their Constitutional obligation to come and serve. So. quite the contrary, this Bill is in response to their request to be on a jury. And, as far as whether or not lawyers would want them or not want them, I disagree with your premise. I think that, in many cases, most cases, they would be gladly accepted."

"Well, you are an attorney. I am not. Winchester: Perhaps you know better than I do that most attorneys would want to have blind or deaf, and perhaps you know better than I that, in most trials, it's not necessary to see or hear important documents. I'm just simply a layman, not a professional, not an attorney, but I do have to disagree. I think that that would cause a problem, and all I see this Bill as doing is requiring that the blind and the deaf be called to ... to appear for consideration for jury duty and nine chances out of ten, perhaps ten out of ten, be denied. We put those people to an inconvenience by bringing down to the courthouses, and we've also caused that person to receive compensation for that trip down to courthouse which would have been unnecessary otherwise. would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, Representative Van Duyne."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to steal a line from Representative Brummer. He says justice is blind, and now he's going to make it true. But, in our analysis though, it reads in the first paragraph, Representative Cullerton, that... in the second line, 'well informed, in possession of their natural faculties and not infirmed or decrepit'. Am I to take that to mean and is it correct that that's... that's wiped out now?"

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

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Van Duyne: "So, you're saying that I don't even have to be in possession of my natural faculties to be on a jury."

Cullerton: "Natural faculties refer to your senses. We're talking about deaf and blind people."

Van Duyne: "Well, mental... mental faculties, too, I would presume. Okay. That's enough. It also says in the second paragraph that... It seemed to be in contrast. Representative Topinka said there would be no cost. Why do you put the cost in the county, and how much is it going to be? And how many people are going to have to be hired?"

"Right now, the law says that the county has to pay Cullerton: for deaf interpreters or people who are parties to any legal proceeding of any nature. So, theoretically ... I shouldn't say even theoretically. When a deaf person serves on a jury as has happened contrary to the present law - it has happened, the county has to pay for an cost interpreter. That's the only that could be possibly... conceivably come as a result of this Bill."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I d like to address the Bill if I may.

Pirst of all..."

Speaker McPike: "On... On the Bill."

Van Duyne: "In the first paragraph, and he agreed to this, that

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

you don't even have to be in possession of your natural faculties, and I consider that to be your mental faculties. I think that's a detriment to the Bill, outlandish to say least. Secondly, it's been said that there's no cost, and there is a cost to the county - a direct cost - and haven't even determined what that cost is going to be. I can visualize it going on, and on, and on. People have to be taken care of. They ... If the jury is impounded, they have to be taken care of day and night. And so, I can see where this would be a prohibitive cost. Secondly, it says in there that - it seems to be contrary - that in the last lines it says, 'directs the court to consider prospective jurors* perceptual abilities when ruling on the challenge for cause. And, if that's to be true, I see no reason for the first part. So, being a member of the county board in my county for ten years, all I can see in this Bill that... is trouble lying ahead. The counties right now are on the brink of bankruptcy. If it have been for revenue sharing all these years, they would have already in insolvency, and I can see no real reason for this Bill, for the life of me. I don't want to serve on a jury, and I can see no difference between me and the blind man. I don't see why he'd want to serve anyway, and so I... I ask you for a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

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

Dunn: "The language in the current statute indicates that a juror must be possessed of his or her natural faculties. What has the caselaw interpreted natural faculties to mean?"

Cullerton: "I doubt that there's ever been any Appellate Court cases on this particular language. My understanding, by

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

the natural faculties, is your senses."

Dunn: "Is there anything in the current statute which would actually prohibit a blind or a deaf person from serving on a jury, unless the phrase or term 'natural faculties' is interpreted specifically to prevent those people?"

Cullerton: "No, my understanding is that the only thing that prohibits a deaf or a blind person from serving on a jury is this language right here, and clearly a person not in the possession of their natural faculties covers blind people and deaf people. So, that's why I'm trying to strike this language."

"Well, the reason I asked the question is that I... Dunn: think, highlight that that is your interpretation. I don't know what natural faculties mean. Perhaps it means... refers to a level of mental competency. And if that's what it is, then there is nothing in the statute which prohibits a blind or deaf person from being selected at the present And what I would suggest to the Members is that, if that is the case, and there have not been many blind or deaf jurors selected for juries, it is a situation where the matter just hasn't come up very much. Now, maybe the Sponsor will say to us that the reason that it hasn't come up is that there is a belief out there that blind and deaf people are prohibited from serving on juries. And I don't know whether that is... that is so or not, but I think important to consider this aspect of the question as we vote on this matter, because the Bill, as amended. shift the legislative intent of this process. As I read. it will be to... to incorporate an attitude that, at the present time, blind and deaf people are prohibited from serving upon a jury. And with the advent of this legislation, the language in the statute, which the Sponsor says prohibits this service, will be deleted and inserted

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

in the statute will be language which instructs the court to consider, on a mandatory basis. It says, 'The court shall consider physical impairments when such... shall *If physical prospective juror has a con..... а impairment, the court shall consider such prospective juror's ability to perceive and appreciate the evidence when considering a challenge for cause. This leads me to ask the question, when will there be a sufficient ground laid for a challenge for cause on the basis of blindness or deafness after the passage of this Bill in light of the legislative intent that's going to be created here? And to follow that up, I would ask the Sponsor how ... how a trial attorney, on either side, is going to get himself or herself in a position to challenge a juror for cause under this new statute on the basis of blindness of deafness?"

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you for those questions. First of all, let's make it clear. The law right now says that jurors must be in the possession of their natural faculties. clear, right now, that blind people and deaf people are excluded, and the reason why they don't get called is because, on the questionaires that are sent out to blind and deaf people, it says, 'Are you blind or deaf?'. when they put that down that they are blind and deaf, don't get summoned. Number two, the issue of a challenge Right now there are no standards at all in the law. As a matter of fact, in the civil area, I could find language at all that even allows for a challenge for So, what we're doing is just making it even clear that any party may challenge jurors for cause, and we specifically say, if a prospective juror has a physical impairment, the court shall consider such prospectives ability... juror's ability to perceive and appreciate the evidence. We make it easy for the Judge say that

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

there's enough cause here. The Judge doesn't have to give a ruling as to why he's ruling someone off for cause and clearly, on preemptory challenges, there's no reason at all that has to be given. So, I hope that that answers your question. They are excluded now. They... We have to remove this language so that they can be included and eligible, and the language, with respect to the cause, just says that the law is clear that if someone wants to kick off the prospective juror who's deaf or dumb.... or blind that they can be kicked off for cause."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Briefly to the Bill. During the Committee hearings on this particular piece of legislation, there was a n indication that legislation had been introduced in previous Session which would strike a middle ground, legislation which would define certain cases in which would be clear that those people who are unfortunate enough suffer from the loss of eyesight or the loss of hearing could, obviously and well, be capable of serving on juries. What we have before us now is an emotional Bill. It's a very difficult Bill to vote against, but it will place everyone in the courtroom who feels that this is... case at hand is not a proper case for a particular person physicial impairment due to blindness or because of a deafness to serve on a jury, it will force one or the other the attorneys to interrogate that juror sufficiently to lay a foundation to challenge a juror for cause, or will.. and it will then impose upon a court an additional duty to ... to extract testimony from someone who has come down, as Representative Winchester has indicated, to the courthouse with the anticipation of serving on a jury. don't know whether we are creating a situation that will

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

give people false hopes or not. The concept of the legislation is meritorious. It looks to me like there could be a middle ground that would serve the purpose of justice and serve the purpose of those who wish to serve on juries, even though they may suffer from a physical impairment, by drafting different language. I think this is a Bill that, well-intended as it is, may create more problems than it really solves."

- Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Mr.... Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

 The question is whether the main question shall be put.

 All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carried. Representative Cullerton to close."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The issue here is whether or not blind and deaf people shall be excluded as a group from serving on a jury. As indicated, there are safeguards provided in the law that say that they won't have to serve where their limitation makes it impossible for them to serve. I say that it's time to put meaning into the right of a jury of your peers. It's time to say that deaf and blind people are first-class citizens. It's time to say that they have the same rights as others. I would ask for your support for this good piece of legislation."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 25. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

 To explain their vote, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Chicago, Representative Alexander."
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To this House in general, in

 Cook County I've just placed a call back there there

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

are a 150 interpreters who are being paid per diem day. Of those number of persons, 23 of them speak various languages because of the influx of persons into our community. Six are on staff full time. They do a great service to the County of Cook, and I rise in support of this Motion... I mean, this Bill, because it is an injustice that some of our citizens are being discriminated from being full citizens."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, briefly in opposition, the Sponsor indicates that it deals with the blind and the deaf. He seems to ignore the... the fact that he is striking language dealing with infirmity and dealing with decrepit individuals. There is a great deal of vagueness about those who may be mentally The entire issue of whether the incompetent to serve. Mandates Act is applicable and reimbursement to the county for the cost is not addressed. In my judgement, it would impose a substantial additional cost OB the... on the county. As Representative Winchester indicated and I think the Sponsor did, many of the jurors are not going to be accepted anyway. And, with regard to the issue of an interpreter, that individual going to have to be available there simply because the juror was called, not because the juror was finally accepted, but you're going to need an interpreter with regard to a deaf individual to go through the voir dire, to go through the initial examination and to go through a determination of whether that juror is going to be accepted or not. And then, many times, that juror is not going to be accepted probably for various reasons, and the county is qoing to have, not only incurred the cost of calling that juror, but also going to have incurred the cost of paying

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

for the interpreter so that the juror could be there to...
to be questioned, or the prospective juror. For those
reasons, I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On House Bill 25 there are 81 'ayes', 29 'nos' and no 'presents'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 57, Representative Olson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 57, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relationship to fire protection districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Gentleman... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the genisis of this Bill comes from Illinois! Marriott rural fire protection districts. We have some 300 500 districts that are affected by this potential legislation, and I'd like to give to you a chronological sequence which brings us to this point. To the Amendment #1 which was adopted on the floor. the Committee appointment... Amendment said that any district which, in past years, has, by referendum, invoked a levy to provide emergency ambulance service, they may not invoke an additional five cents by virtue of this Bill. This Bill is permissive. It's not mandatory. The estimated cost per year in an average district will be about eight dollars. Some districts already are diverting their firefighting budget allocations to pick up shortfall and recovery ambulance service monies. For example, I'm aware of a district in my... my 70th District that last year diverted 19,000 dollars from their corporate funds to pick up their losses incurred in providing emergency ambulance service. To set this in perspective, in 1979 under an Attorney

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

General's opinion S14-10, a question was raised by Crawford County to this effect. Provisions of emergency ambulance service - Counties must provide within their boundaries emergency ambulance service if such service is not provided by another entity. The opinion of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois was this: 'In response to your letter in which you asked whether a county must provide ambulance service in the event none other is provided by either private enterprise or other local government, it is my opinion that it is required to do so. That sets a precedent. In this General Assembly in 1981 under Public Act 82-0529, House Bill 1065, which was signed into law by the Governor on September 16th, Bill was passed which got the counties, townships and municipalities off the hook, and the key phrase legislation was. 'Nothing in this Section is intended or shall be construed to require or mandate any county or county board to provide any emergency ambulance service. Let's skip down to revenue step... statute Chapter 127 1/2, 38-5. This is in place in 1981. That's, 'In the event adequate and continuing emergency ambulance services do not exist, fire protection districts should be authorized to provide and shall cause to be provided ambulance service as a public responsiblity. What we have here is a example of the state mandating and not providing the fiscal arm for organizations to provide the service. I would just point on a note that all of you should keep in mind that on our weekly visits to Springfield, we pass through a number of fire protection districts all of which are mandated to provide emergency ambulance service, and I think we would well understand that one day we might require the service of this organization. And let's hope they have in place good equipment and skilled paramedics who can respond to

24th Legislative Day

- March 23, 1983
- our call. We feel very strongly about this program. We would be pleased to address any questions that anyone may have. $^{\rm m}$
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
 Bill 57. On that question, the Gentleman from Effingham,
 Representative Brummer."
- Brummer: "Yes, I... I think I understand this from looking at the synopsis and language of the Bill, but this does provide for a tax increase without a referendum. Is that correct?"
- Speaker NcPike: "The Gentleman indicates he will yield.
 Representative Olson."
- Olson: "That is correct, Representative Brunner."
- Brummer: "Is there any provision even for a back-door referendum?"
- Olson: "We decided not to go with the back-door referendum..."
- Brummer: "Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? The guestion is, 'Shall House Bill 57 pass?'. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. I'm sorry. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. In explanation of vote, the Chair recognizes Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'no'. I wanted to speak, but I was a little bit too late. I was reading my analysis here, and it says in the House Amendment #1, it seems to say that it even authorizes the district to levy a tax that supersedes a losing referendum. And if I could just read this, 'to levy a special annual tax for emergency ambulance service by a rate not exceeding 5... .05 in the event that a special tax to provide an ambulance service has not been approved by a referendum of the voters of the district'. And I can only interpret that to mean that if they had a referendum and it lost, that they could

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

supersede that losing referendum and still invoke the...
the tax. So, I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The importance of this is private ambulance companies in the State of Illinois have went broke throughout every district that's available or they've been available in. And when these private ambulance services go broke, it's blessed on these fire protection districts. And they don't have the monies to provide this type of service, even though it's forced on I think this is a good Bill. I'm for referendum also, but until somebody needs this services, they don't seem to worry too much about it. I encourage you to vote 'yes' on this Bill. I've also had cities call me asking that they be included - city fire departments call me to be included - which we did not do. We just had East Peoria Private Ambulance Service go broke, and they're no the emergency services now have And ambulances being blessed on that city, and they don't funding for it either. But, they're not included on this. I urge your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "Well, actually, a parliamentary inquiry. I was just concerned with what the new rules would provide with respect to placing a Bill on Postponed Consideration. 47?"

 Speaker McPike: "Just a minute, please."
- Johnson: "I think maybe some of the Members' indifference to

 Representative Olson might be interested in that figure."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson, it requires 47 votes for

 a Bill to go on Postponed."

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Lee,

Representative Olson."

Olson: "Mr. Olson, would you please put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker McPike: "Postponed Consideration. House Bill 79,
Representative Wolf. Out of the record. House Bill 233,
Representative Currie. Out of the record. Representative
Currie on House Bill 235? Representative Currie."

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 235, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 235 amends the Illinois Human Bights Act to include, as a civil rights violation, sex harassment on the issue of sex harassment has been well addressed by studies, some conducted by Sangamon State University of State Government employment, others by groups like Working Women's Institute, Redbook magazine - the list is lengthy that sex harassment on the job is bad business. T think it's been made clear by decisions as, for example, by our Governor to establish an Executive Order, his Executive Order of 1980 that barred sex discrimination in the Code Departments of Illinois State Government. Unemployment Government, under the Equal Opportunities Commission, has established guidelines regulations about sex harassment for those businesses that respond at the federal level. House Bill 235 was made clear in our state statutes that, in public and private employment, sex harassment on the job is prohibited and would apply appropriate penalties through the Department of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Human Rights and through the Commission on Human Rights. I would appreciate your support for House Bill 235."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill
235. On that question, the Gentleman from Adams,
Representative Mays."

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

Speaker McPike: "The Lady indicates she will yield."

Mays: "Representative Currie, currently under Illinois law and under the Human Rights Department and the Human Rights Commission, have not all sexual harassment cases brought before it been considered as sexual discrimination?"

Currie: "Presently, the Illinois Department of Human Rights understands that it may interpret its authority to deal with sex discrimination to include instances of sex harassment. The Department of Human Rights support this Bill, as does the Commission, on the grounds that there is some ambiguity in that decision. It's based on a council's opinion. Councils can change. Only through that opinion is the Department able to establish rules and regulations. It would become much clearer if we were to establish this program in the state statutes themselves. In addition, same sex harassment or harassment when the victim is a male can clearly not be covered under an interpretation of sex discrimination prohibition which the Department presently uses for these cases."

Mays: "Has the Department's conformance or actions ever been questioned in the past, in the three years that it's been established?"

Currie: "Until recently, the Department promulgated no rules and regulations regarding sex harassment. It's impossible to track whether the Department has adequately dealt with charges brought under the rubric of sex harassment, because they have not separately tracked those cases as against

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

those brought under a general sex discrimination prohibition. The Department, of course, Representative Mays, is of the view that it will not increase its burden but will clarify and specify its authority, if House Bill 235 becomes law."

Mays: "And, finally, is this to put in our statutes federal rules and regs? Is that all this does?"

Currie: "Not federal... Well, yeah. The language in House Bill 235 carefully tracks the language that has been promulgated by the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, to make it easier for employers to know what their liability is, to make sure that our Commission is... has that kind of background when it hears cases and controversies under this provision."

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays on the Bill."

"It seems to me that, while a council's opinion on a given, Mays: know, expanding se xua 1 harassment from discrimination within the Department might be fleeting, those same rules and regs at the federal level might be fleeting also, and it would be a mistake for us to amend our statute books simply to sup...to conform with rules and regs that were promulgated by a lame duck bureaucrat during the Carter administration. Additionally, in Committee, when I questioned both representatives of the Department of Human Rights as well as the AFSCME person that was there testifying in favor, I asked, 'Has there ever been a case that has been... that has come before the Commission sexual harassment grounds that the Commission or Department has refused to handle? , and the answer was I asked, 'What conceivable case could come up that there would be a question as to whether they could handle it or not?', and he gave me this answer. He said, 'It is

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

farfetched, or it may sound farfetched, but if you get an employer that sexually harasses both male and female, then we could not take it under the sexual discrimination part of the Act. Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems like we're crossing t's and dotting i's in this legislation. Clearly, the Department already has the authority and has exercised the authority and has not been questioned on it to date. It would seem folly to me to conform our statute books with federal rules and regulations that are as fleeting as General Council opinions, as well as Attorney General opinions. I would urge a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady Representative yield to a question?"

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will yield."

winchester: "I have a concern that I'm not sure exactly where I read it or heard it, but it involves the Chamber of Commerce... the State Chamber of Commerce and a concern that they might have. A situation of harassment by a supervisor to a employ... an employee who that person supervises — how would the employer... what recourses does the employer have over... over an instance where he was not involved himself or no direct responsibility? What recourses does the employer have who... who is not aware of sexual harassment by a supervisor to an employee that that person supervises?"

Currie: "If the issue is two co-workers, I think the Bill and the rules and regulations that will be promulgated by the Department make clear that if the company has a policy, a practice, a review process for dealing with complaints of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

sex harassment, that review policy would have to be instituted before it would be appropriate for the complaint to come before the Commission."

Winchester: "What if a company..."

Currie: "When the issue is a supervisor, as against an underling, it may depend on how high a level of supervisor. It would seem to me that if the company promulgates rules and regs as Governor Thompson has, for example, for all state agencies, then that individual would be expected to go through that administrative procedure before bringing a complaint to the Commission. The problem, I think, only becomes a real one, Representative Winchester, if a company does not do anything at all, takes no affirmative action to see to it that employees throughout the company understand that it is a prohibited practice within that company for people to engage in sex harassment and thus interfere with the ability of the workers at every level to get on with the job."

Winchester: "So, the bottom line, Representative, would be that
the employer would have no responsibility, could not be
held responsible for any actions conducted by employees or
co-workers under his employment."

Currie: "But the... But the company would have a responsibility
to make clear to the co-worker how to take the complaint
through the company's own administrative channels."

Winchester: "Okay, one last question. I understand, or I note,
that a fiscal note was requested and has been filed. Can
you tell me how much additional dollars this might cost
that the Department of Human Rights... additional dollars
that they might need to implement this additional program?"

Currie: "The Department tells me that they do not expect an additional caseload burden because of enactment of House Bill 235. Based on the experience of State Government

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

under Executive Order #1, I would say that the number of complaints that reach the point of a Commission hearing having to do with sex harassment have actually declined. In effect, House Bill 235 puts the employer and employee community on notice that sex harassment on the job is bad business. It encourages the employers to establish internal procedures. It discourages instances of sex harassment, and my judgement, as well as the judgement of the Commission on Human Rights and the Department of Human Rights, is that House Bill 235 will cost nothing additional and may even save state administrative dollars."

Winchester: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."

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

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

Ronan: "Thank you. Representative Currie, I support your Bill.

I supported it in Committee, but I think there's one part that we have to clarify for legislative intent. The definition of sexual harassment appears to be vague, because it's defined as 'unwelcomed sexual advances'. What standard of proof exists for 'unwelcomed'?"

Currie: "We are using federal language under EEOC guidelines. I believe there is already some caselaw that helps interpret that Section. What we're concerned about is sex harassment that is offensive, intimidating, hostile, as well as sex harassment that may result in changes in one's employment position. So that, for example, if somebody is required to exceed to a sexual demand in order to get or keep a job or to gain promotion, that obviously is what is intended by this Bill. If sex harassment becomes such a hostile, intimidating piece of the work environment that the victim cannot get on with the job, that, too, is intended to be

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

included."

Ronan: "I... I still don't think you've answered my question, but

I'll still support the legislation."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Would the Sp... Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will yield."

Ropp: "Representative, since the Governor's Executive Order, are there any known instances of sexual harassment in the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "My understanding is that there have been complaints about sex harassment. My point earlier was that, because the Governor had the good-business sense to say that sex harassment is bad business and promulgate Executive Order #1 in 1980, those instances of sex harassment have been dealt with at the agency level, and my own bet is, my guess is - and this is based partly on information from the American Pederation of State, County and Municipal Employees - that instances of sex harassment have, perhaps, even declined."

Ropp: "Is there a possibility... Does your Bill deal with a possibility that an employee might, in some manner or way, attempt by dress or luring cause an employer to be trapped into this kind of a situation called sexual harassment?"

Currie: "Entrapment is not covered under the provisions of this Bill. Generally speaking, entrapment is not the public policy of the state."

Ropp: "Do you think it ought to be in there?"

Currie: "Representative, the Bill defines what constitutes sex harassment. The question whether in any individual case sex harassment has happened is one that will be determined under this Act by the investigative arms of the Department of Human Rights and by the Illinois Commission on Human Rights. I think I would trust their judgement as to

24th Legislative Day

March 23. 1983

whether there were extenuating circumstances or whether a charge were not based, not well grounded in fact."

Ropp: "Alrighty, thank you."

Currie: "Yeah, in fact, the language specifies 'unwelcomed advances'."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative
Mulcahev."

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

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will yield."

Mulcahey: "Yes, Barbara, that last statement might be true but yet, on line 216, it says, 'Such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance'. Now, if a secretary is sitting out there with a skirt up around her knees and a low-cut blouse on, and she is interfering with my work performance, is she quilty of sexual harassment?"

Currie: "Well, was it an unwelcomed sight to see her sitting...

so sitting there? I think it has to be an unwelcomed
advance, Representative."

Mulcahey: "or... Or creating creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment. So, in other words, I have to make that determination whether or not I am offended?"

Currie: "I think you would be able to make that determination.

If she's intimidating you, then you may have grounds for complaint."

Mulcahey: "Well, what if she's not intimidating me just..."

Currie: "Then I don't think you have a ground for complaint under the language of House Bill 235."

Mulcahey: "And, if I feel that she's interfering with my work performance, then I could probably... then there's grounds for it. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That would be my interpretation."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

24th Legislative Day

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook to close, Representative Currie."

March 23, 1983

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. T think it is our job to cross the t's and dot the i's. Present legislation. present rules and regulations governing sex harassment in employment, public and private, are not adequate. The Department of Human Rights, the Commission of Human Rights, NOW, the Nurses Association, APSCNE, the AFL-CIO, the Illinois Education Association. the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Women's Agenda, all these support the Bill. The Bill would make statutory the obligation and the right of the Illinois Department of Human Rights to consider cases of sex harassment on the job. It would ensure that victims same sex and victims male would be included in that coverage as well. I hope you will vote 'yes' on House Bill 235."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 235. On that question, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 16 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 235, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 246, Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima, do you want the Bill called? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 246, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now what this Bill does is as follows: when a veteran is injured to the extent that he's disabled permanently and becomes a paraplegic, the government builds him a home and then, thanks to the Legislature here, in the last 12 years

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

I've passed two Bills that amounted to 30% exemption on their real estate tax. So, in other words, they don't pay any tax on their homes. Now, there's a woman that lives in Blmwood Park in my district. She was married to a paraplegic. Now, he passed away, and as a widow, she would still be entitled to the benefits of that tax exemption. But she married a veteran, but he was not a paraplegic. Therefore, that left her out. Now, this fellow died. So, now what she wants to do is be reinstated on the roles. This is the only one in the state, and I would appreciate a favorable vote. The only one in the state."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 246. On that question, is there any discussion? question is, 'Shall House Bill 246 pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 105 'ayes'. 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 246. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 257, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. House Bill 299, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 299, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Currie: 299 would prohibit age discrimination i n apprenticeship employee programs up to the age of 40. This is a Bill that passed the House last year under the sponsorship of Representative Catania with 148 'yes' wotes and 6 'no' votes. It was stuck in the Senate Rules and I hope that you will support this Bill this time. There is a second provision in the Bill that would

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

enable people who are discriminated above the age of 21 on financial transactions or housing issues or in terms of public accommodation to prevent that as well. The Bill has support of the Department of Human Rights, the the Commission, the Illinois Commission on the Status of Women many women, in particular, who miss out on apprenticeship training programs now, because they are spending the years between 18 and 24 bearing babies and bringing them up. And they would like an opportunity, too, to find employment in the building trades."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 299. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Bepresentative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "May I question the Sponsor, please?

Speaker McPike: "The Sponsor indicates she will yield."

Oblinger: "The way it looks now, Representative Currie, there are a number of people who are employed in the automobile industry, the steel industry who will never be called back to employment. They are 40, 41 and 42. We're denying them, under this Bill, the training. Why is this?"

Currie: "Well. I don't think that we're denying them training. There's no prohibition, under this Bill or under any other that I know, that denies people the opportunity to operate training/retraining vocational programs of any kind for people up to any age. The kind of apprenticeship program that we're dealing with in House 299 are basically those in the construction trades: electrician, plumber, other kinds of physically difficult work. And although I would be happy if this Bill had no upper age limit at all, my guess is that there are many men and women up to the age of 40 who would certainly welcome this opportunity. This Bill would not prohibit anyone from running an apprenticeship training program for people

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

that age. This Bill, we think in the Commission on the Status of Women and those who voted for this Bill in House Committee, think that this half-loaf is better than none at all. With the age up to 40, we're including most of the people who want to be bricklayers, who want to be carpenters, who want heavy duty in the construction field. And if, Representative Oblinger, you want to introduce the Bill that would take it all the way up to 70, I will certainly support you."

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

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Our young people up to 40 - and I'm going to call you all young up to that age - have had the benefit of computer training and high technology training as far as we know now. It's those who are over 40 who haven't, and maybe they're the ones that are in the construction business who cannot continue in that business, and I think they should be allowed to have the training. I do not like to see age limitations placed on peoples' ability to earn a living."

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, the Gentleman from Hardin,

Winchester: "Would the Lady yield for a guestion?"

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will yield."

Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "You may have explained this already, but I'm not sure. I've got to get it straight in my mind. Presently in labor unions, I think specifically the Electricians' Union, you cannot get in that labor organization unless you are a son of a member of that union. Now, what this Act does is opens that wide...wide open and says that anybody and everybody who is qualified to be an electrician can become a member of the Electricians' Union. Is that correct?"

Currie: "No. What it says is that present practices that apply

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

in some apprenticeship programs operated by union or labor may not discriminate on the basis of anybody up to the... on the basis of age up to age of 40."

- Winchester: "Well, why doesn't your Bill go further? I happen to think that it's wrong that anyone who is qualified and wants to participate in a union, because that's the only way they can get a decent job is being a union member, and they can't because the union says, 'No, we're not going to let you in it because you don't meet either a race requirement, or a religious requirement, or you're the wrong gender or whatever. You can't get into it.' Why doesn't your Bill address that issue?"
- Currie: "We're talking in this Bill about apprenticeship programs that may be operated by unions or may be operated by employer groups. What we're dealing with is the question whether they can, as they now do, say that those programs will only be open to people between the ages of 18 and or 18 and 25 or whatever the specific program is. Bill says they can't say, if you're 30 years old, that you're too old; and therefore, you are barred from participation in the program. There may be other problems dealing with... in the area of union apprenticeship programs. This Bill seeks to address the problem that people are denied access on the grounds that, at age 25, or 29 or 33, some of those programs would bar them from participation."
- Winchester: "Okay. Representative, since you have shown great interest in the Illinois Human Rights Act, because this is the second Bill and maybe more that you have sponsored, can you tell me that in the Human Rights Act are there any provisions now to protect people who might want to join a particular union that may have a closed-shop arrangement?"

 Currie: "My understanding is that the Illinois Human Rights Act

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

applies to unions, as well as to companies, as well as to people..."

Winchester: "Okay."

Currie: "...Who offer public accommodations, or are involved in financial transactions, or run housing markets or what have you."

Winchester: "One last guestion. Under... It says,

'Discrimination is prohibited on the basis of race, color,
religion, national origin, ancestory, age, sex, marital
status, handicap, or', or, 'unfavorable discharge from the
military service'. Why would that be a category under this
classification - unfavorable discharge from the military
service?"

Currie: "That is, of course, present law, Representative. It wasn't my law, and if you want to change it..."

Winchester: "Is that federal? Is that a federal law?"

Currie: "... I would be happy to support you in that enterprise."
Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any other... Is there any further discussion? No further discussion, the Lady from Cook to close, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House
Bill 299 is a fairly simple Bill. It doesn't deal with
computer program... retraining programs. It doesn't deal
with new kinds of office work. It deals basically with the
building trades, the heavy construction kinds of activities
that people in this... in our work force are interested in
learning about, in learning how to do and then developing
those kinds of skills. Presently, these apprenticeship
programs — and they are limited — deny participation to
people above the age of, it may be 24, it may be 30, but
certainly deny participation to many young people who might
want to take advantage of those opportunities. This Bill

24th Legislative Day

March 23. 1983

would prohibit denying somebody a spot in those kinds of apprenticeship programs by virtue of age up until the age of 40. This Bill, as I say, is supported by the Department of Human Rights, by the Commission on Human Rights, the National Organization for Women, the Illinois Commission on the Status of Women. It will, and by... and it has no... As far as I know, there is no opposition to the Bill. I hope that it will have your support. As... As I say, it seems to have everybody else's."

Speaker McPike: "Lady have moved for the passage of House Bill 299. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 90 'ayes', 21 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 299, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 318, Representative Jaffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 318, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Consumer Installment Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. 318, the Amendment is now the Bill. And. basically. it does is that it abolishes all confessions of judgement clauses in contracts. It, however, does grandfather in all existing confession of judgements. What we've had over the past several years is there have been many attacks on the confession of judgement by both the courts and the Legislature. and the Illinois Legislature has Constitutional grounds, and the Circuit Court of Cook County curtails the use of confession to where their use is practically non-existent today, by virtue of rules in the... in the Circuit Court of Cook County. The result all this action is to make inoperative confession of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

judgement clauses, and most states realizing that this is really becoming an archaic procedure. It is now moving to eliminate their use, and their use is questionable at best. The confession of judgement clauses create problems and are really no longer effective, and so we put this Amendment on to abolish them grandfathering in all the confession of judgement clauses that we presently have. With that, I would be answer... happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
Bill 318. On that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt,
Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will yield."

Vinson: "Representative Jaffe, in this Bill would you abolish a confession of judgement clause that was entered into subsequent to the drafting of the Bill that was between General Motors Corporation and Continental Bank?"

Jaffe: "Well, first of all, I can tell you the Continental Bank doesn't use confession of judgement clauses anymore, so they have advised me. But you're... But is your question with regard to the time period? Is that what you're asking?"

Vinson: "No. My question is, does your Bill abolish confessions of judgement as amongst any potential parties to a contract?"

Jaffe: "After it's enacted. Yes, of course."

Vinson: "So a party thoroughly competent to negotiate away the right involved in a confession of judgement would no longer be permitted to negotiate away that right. Is that correct?"

Jaffe: "Well, I think that you would find, at the present time, the Supreme Court has been knocking down those cases left and right, and the cases in which they have actually

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

permitted them are so narrow at the present time that very few people actually use them. And you'll find that most major corporations and most major banks are really getting away from confession of judgement clauses, because there's no way to actually go in and use that confession of judgement clause if you do not have service on that person for a trial de novo, which means that they have to start from the beginning anyway. And that the problem that has happened is that who... the person that gets injured is really the ma and pa business who enter into this type clause, and suddenly they find a lien on their property when there shouldn't be a lien on their property. And then they have to go through all sorts of things to eliminate that type of lien. So, I think that, in answer to your it would eliminate it. But for all practical purposes, most people are not using them now, except people who don't realize what's happening by the Supreme Court."

Vinson: "Currently are you saying that confessions of judgement are abolished in regard to ordinary consumers?"

Jaffe: "Yes. In Illinois, we abolished them a long time ago. We do not have confession of judgement in consumer cases anymore. And, in the Circuit Court of Cook County, you don't have confession of judgement clauses, for all practical purposes, on any case, because, by rule of court, they just won't enforce them."

Vinson: "Then, why do we need the Bill?"

Jaffe: "We need the Bill to actually clear up the law."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, I would just make the..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vinson on the Bill."

Vinson: "To the Bill, I would just make the point that the Gentleman has demonstrated why we don't need the Bill. And if, in fact, the only cases around now where confessions of judgement might conceivably be used are cases where the

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

parties have relatively equal bargaining power, then why do
we have to protect people who have relatively equal
bargaining power? I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? No further discussion,
the Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative Jaffe."

- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there's any question that we ought to rid of this, because no one's using it at the present time. And we really ought to clear up the statute books and protect some ma and pa businesses which are, in essence, getting hurt because people are using these types of things thinking in fact they're legal when, in fact, the Supreme Court is not sustaining them. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House
 Bill 318. On that Motion, those in favor vote 'aye', those
 opposed vote 'nay'. In explanation of vote, Re...
 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Preston: House. I rise in support of Representative Jaffe's Bill. Confession of judgement clauses in contracts are onerous at their inception. They've been against public policy in this state and most of the states in the union ever since. What a confession of judgement clause says is that, vou... when you sign a contract that contains such a clause, you are, in advance, enabling any lawyer in the State of Illinois to go into court without your knowledge, without your consent, without your awareness in any way and say that you've violated the contract. You may not violated the contract, but it's saying that you're allowing anyone in the entire state to go in to court and say you have, even though you don't know that the action is being pursued, you don't know that the action is being filed. You've paid every penny that you owe. But because of the

24th Legislative Day

March 23. 1983

language that you... that was in this form contract at the time you signed it, you're authorizing anyone to say otherwise on your behalf. The end result means that there, notwithstanding this confession of judgement, there still has to be an opportunity for you to receive notice before a final judgement can be entered. It doesn't really save anyone any time. It's a craziness in the.. in the law that's been allowed to exist far beyond its usefullness or its intended use, and the only proper vote here is a 'yes' vote to clarify the law to get rid of this onerous contractual provision that is against the law in most of the states of the union and is against the law in Illinois in almost all contracts. So, I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative
Johnson."

Johnson: "Not too many people here probably have had occasion with confessions of judgement in an every day practical sense. So, let me just tell you how confessions You're an owner, a single man or a judgement work. single women owner of a little restaurant. You open up the restaurant and the ,coincidently, you will either sign a lease, or let's assume you sign a contract to purchase the property that you have the business on. You go along for a half. And as you know, there's millions of provisions or can be a variety of provisions in that lease or that contract, of all nature and sort, and all of a sudden your landlord or the seller decides that VOII VE violated one of them. Now, the normal procedure was if you... was and is that you ought to be able to be served. You ought to have to serve the person who's allegedly in default and have them come into court and give their side of the story, and you give your side of the story. that's the way it works. But what happens here

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

fills out an affidavit, runs down the street to a lawyer you never met, who never met you and knows nothing He signs the confession of judgement as your about it. lawyer, and then the lawyer for the other side goes into with that confession of judgement, takes a judgement against you for a quarter of a million dollars. judgement sticks, and you've got no opportunity to defend yourself. A number of courts in a number of situations have stricken these down. Most lawyers don't use them, because they re too risky. But certainly, any sort concept of due process, any sort of concept of proper notice would dictate, I think, that this is an archaic procedure. It's used in two of three states, and it absolutely ought to be eliminated in Illinois, as it around the country. I urge a 'yes' vote from both sides of the aisle for this positive, progressive step Representative Jaffe."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 76 'ayes', 38 'nays', no voting 'present'. House Bill 318, having received a Constitutional Najority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 319, Representative Jaffe. Do you wish the Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 319, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law regulating industrial home work. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to return this Bill to Second Reading so we could put on two Amendments. This is the sweatshop Bill, and I've worked out an Amendment with the Illinois Retail Merchants! Association, with some

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Members on the other side of the aisle, and also with Representative Younge. So, I would like to have leave to return it to Second Reading."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill
319 to the Order of Second Reading. Leave granted? Leave
is granted. Second Reading."

Jaffe: "Okay. Now... now I..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Now I would like to have leave to table Amendment #1, previously adopted."

Speaker McPike: "There's an objection to that. Representative

Jaffe moves to table Amendment #1."

Jaffe: "One."

Speaker McPike: "And, on that question, the Chair represent...

recognizes the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative
Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Gentleman ought to explain the purposes for his Motion, before... before I speak on the subject."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Well, I think if the Gentleman from DeWitt would listen, he would probably find out a great deal. However, purposes we stated beforehand is we have two Amendments. The first is the Amendment wanted by the Illinois Retail one Merchants' Association, together with Representative side of the aisle. Koehler OB your together with Representative Hastert. But Amendment #1 is consequence. So, we just want to table Amendment #1 and adopt Amendment #2 and Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to address Amendments
#2 and #3 at this point, because, at this time, they're not

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

under discussion. I would speak to the Gentleman's Motion to table Amendment #1. Amendment #1 offered the solutary provision in the law prohibiting resale by any person as well as by any employer. And if his concern is the flow of commerce, then I think he would want to prohibit resale by any person, as well as any employer. I don't see any reason to make that change, and that's why I would oppose his Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, and that's included in Amendment #2.

I think everybody understands that. Perhaps Mr. Vinson ought to talk to his Spokesman on Labor and Commerce. I cleared it with him yesterday, talked to Representative Tuerk about it. I've talked to Representative Koehler.

I've talked to Representative Hastert, and I've talked to the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association. So, I would move for leave to... to table Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1.

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Jaffe, amends House Bill 319 on page one and so forth."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "In explanation of Amendment #2, basically what happened is there are four things with Amendment #2. First, it defines a garment as an article of clothing. Secondly, it provides the prohibition against home work. It does not apply to alteration or repair of garments. That's in accordance with Representative Koehler. Three, it permits garments to be manufactured at home by people who are certified to be physically handicapped by a licensed physician or by the Department of Labor. That's in response to Representative Hastert. And four, provides that the

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

criminal penalties in the Industrial Home Work Act applies only to employers, and that's in response to Representative Bowman. And this Amendment has been cleared with the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association, and they want this Amendment."

- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will yield."
- Birkinbine: "On lines 20 through 22 of the Amendment, Mr. Jaffe, where you refer to the certification that somebody is physically handicapped, does that mean that before somebody could engage in any such work at home they would have to first go ahead and get such certification from their physician or the Department and then file it with the Department?"
- Jaffe: "I think that it's very clear. Let me read that language to you. It says, 'Such certification shall be made either, one, by the Department, or two, by a licensed physician and filed and approved by the Department'."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you. My question is one of timing. Does someone have to prove that they are handicapped this way if they are questioned, or do they have to go ahead and establish such certification before they can get around to doing the work they wish to do?"
- Jaffe: "They go to a licensed physician who indicates that they're handicapped, and they file it with the... with the Department. I think it's clear. It's clear on its face."
- Birkinbine: "Watch my lips. It's a question of timing. Do they have to do it first, or after..."
- Jaffe: "I just answered that question twice. I said they have to

24th Legislative Day

- March 23, 1983
- go to a physician. They have to get the letter of the physician, and then they have to file it and have it approved by the Department. Do you understand that?"
- Birkinbine: "Before they engage in such work, or when, if they are challenged?"
- Jaffe: "Of course, before they... I said that. Before they're engaged in that work."
- Birkinbine: "No you didn't, but thank you."
- Jaffe: "Well, if you read... If you read lines 21 and 22, I think you can understand it."
- Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? Representative Jaffe to close."
- Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think everyone understands Amendment #2.

 And, as I have indicated, it has been put in for the
 Illinois Retail Merchants' Association and for various
 Members on the floor of this House. And I would move its
 adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, all in favor say 'aye', opposed. Gentleman has moved for the passage... for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On Amendment #2 there are 69 'ayes', 39 'nays', 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Younge, amends House Bill 319 on page..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge. Representative Younge."
 Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3...I move for the
 adoption of Amendment #3 which would state that this
 Section, which is being applied to the Industrial Home Work
 Act, does not apply to producer cooperatives. I move for

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

the adoption of the Amendment."

- Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor define producer cooperatives for the floor?"
- Speaker McPike: "The Sponsor indicates she will yield."
- Younge: "A producer cooperative is a... a group of people who own collectively a business, and they share in the benefits of their work. It is a cooperative that produces and manufactures goods."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Birkinbine, to the Bill?"
- Birkinbine: "Thank you. I don't know anymore now than when I asked the question."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative
 Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will yield."
- Tuerk: "Well, I'd like you to run that by the Body once more, because I didn't understand your explanation either."
- Younge: "Yes. A cooperative is a business association whereby the members of the association own the business cooperatively or collectively, and they agree to limit their rate of return to 8%. And a producer cooperative is a cooperative that produces goods or services."
- Tuerk: "Well, I'm not too clear on that either. Let me go on to speak to the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Tuerk on the Amendment."
- Tuerk: "I think what the Sponsor intends to do is to exempt only garments produced by these cooperatives, whatever they are. However, the way the Amendment is drafted, it would also exempt from this prohibition all the following that precedes in the Bill: the processing of food, drugs or

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

poisons, medical bandages, processing of fireworks, explosives, toys, tobacco and so forth. The way the Amendment is drafted and placed in the Bill, it would seem to me that it applies to all of these things ; and therefore, it's far more encompassing than what she intended at the outset. That would be my interpretation of the Amendment ; and therefore, I would have to oppose the Amendment."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, is it possible for me to amend on its face to make it Section (G)?"

Speaker McPike: "Repesentative ... Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, I move to amend on its face to make this Section

(G) does not apply to producer cooperatives."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge, there is an objection.

On the Amendment, Representative from DuPage,
Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, may I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker McPike: "She re-indicates she will yield."

Karpiel: "I may have missed this, I'm sorry, because someone was asking me a question. What I would like to know, Representative, is why do you want these producer cooperatives excluded from this Bill, presuming this Bill is a very good Bill?"

Younge: "I think that the consumer... or the producer cooperative should be exluded, because there are situations which are not sweatshop situations involving people who have lost their employment as a result of plant closings and other arrangements that are beginning to form cooperatives, and many of those cooperatives sometimes start in the home.

And I don't think that the statute ought to prohibit or make illegal a person who is a member of a cooperative joining together to provide some service or make some goods. I think that the Bill is too... too general and too

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

vague ;and therefore, this ought to be put in there."

- Karpiel: "Well, actually, I agree with you, Representative. I think we should just vote against the Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from Kendall,
 Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we first discussed this Bill on... on Third Reading... not... Second Reading a week or so ago, there were a lot of concerns. Part of the concerns were people who were in cooperatives and people who were doing things and trying, as a producer cooperative, making garments, some garments in their home, selling them collectively. There are some There are senior citizens cooperatives senior citizens. that create... that make garments, headbands, scarves, things like that and are selling them, making them in a home and selling them collectively. I think this is a good Amendment. And, you know, there's a lot of people who maybe are not affluent. There's a lot of people who still are creative. They re entrepreneurs. They're not They want to join millions, but they're entrepreneurs. together. They want to create their own destiny. They want to work for something, and they want to see the fruit of their own labor. And that's what cooperatives give to I would support this Amendment. I think it's a good Amendment, and I would urge the other Members of this House to do soalso."
- Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from DeWitt,
 Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the definition of producer cooperative and after having listened to Representative Hastert's remarks, I am persuaded that this is a well-drafted, narrowly-defined Amendment that will substantially strengthen the Bill and make it a viable

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

vehicle. And I believe that we ought to adopt this Amendment, and I think everybody ought to be voting for it."

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? The Lady from St. Clair to close, Representative Younge."

Younge: "I ask the Body to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker NcPike: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #3.

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 333, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 333, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 333 authorizes the Conservation Department and the Conservation Police to set up funds for investigation as it pertains to the Law Enforcement Section of the Department, whereby what we call poaching goes on, and the commercialization of fish and game is considered to illegal. And in the Department of Law Enforcement and the Secretary of State's Police, they have this authority and power to set up what is called a Sting Operation. There is no opposition to this Bill, it passed the 14 to nothing, and it sets up the same criteria as the Department of Law Enforcement and the Secretary of State's Police. Recently, about a month and a half ago, they set up the Sting Operation, and they arrested the people and the suspects, and they were cited for violations. The Illinois Agents purchased those illegal gotten fish at a set up of a fish market, which was totally

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

funded by the State of Wisconsin, because we have no authorization within our Department of Conservation to set this fund up. We amended this Bill last week to allow donations to be given to the Department of Conservation by sports groups who wants to submit funds for this type of law enforcement, and I respectfully request support for the legislation. My Cosponsor, Representative McAuliffe, may want to close.

Speaker Mcpike: "The Gentlemen has moved for passage of House Bill that Motion, is there any discussion? 333_ On Gentlemen from Lake, Representative Matijevich. being no discussion. The Motion is, *Should House Bill 333 pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', no 'nays' and no voting House Bill 333. 'present'. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 117, Madigan; 118, Madigan; 119, Terzich - et al; House Joint Resolution 21, Zwick."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Resolution Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, House 117, Madigan, congratulates Mike Stefanos and his family on the successes of Dove Candies and Ice Cream has had through the years. House Resolution 118, Madigan, again congratulates our good friend, Coach Joe Lucco, for the success he's had through the years as a basketball coach and having the Edwardsville High School Gymnasium named after him, a rightful honor. House Resolution 119, Terzich - et al, congratulates Chief Michael upon his retirement. Edward J. House Joint Resolution 21, Zwick, commends Mr. LeFew on his hard work I move for the and achievements through the years.

24th Legislative Day

- March 23, 1983
- adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 For what purpose does The Gentlemen from Marion seek recognition? Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say the fiscal note have been filed on 337, for those who have an interest in that fiscal note, because I've been holding it for that reason."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you very much. Representative Greiman for purposes of the Adjournent Resolution."
- Greiman "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
- Speaker McPike: "Could you hold that just a minute? The Gentlemen from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would rise to introduce to the Body, Mr. Bob Palmer, the City Manager of the City of Elmhurst in DuPage County, represented by a number of people due to the reapportionment that your Party worked out, but specifically the individual is represented by Mr. Daniels, the Minority Leader."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen from Peoria, Representative
 Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, just to take a moment. I'd like to introduce the Honorable Richard Fislar, who is the Mayor of Chillicothe from my district. Even though he's a real good Democrat, he has seen the light of day, and he is seated over here on the Republican side. I'd like for Dick to take a bow."
- Speaker McPike: "We are getting ready to adjourn. The 2 o'clock Committees will meet immediately upon adjournment, and the Chair would suggest that the 4 p.m. Committees meet at 4:30. The Gentlemen from Madison, Representative Wolf."

24th Legislative Day

- March 23, 1983
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Personnel and Pensions
 Committee will meet in room C-1 at 4:30."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen from Will, Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Energy and Environment

 Committee will meet in 114 at 3:30. 3:30."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative DiPrima."
- Diprima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again I want to remind you that tonight we have the Veteran of Foreign Wars giving us a dinner at the Sheraton Inn, which is located at 3090 Stevenson Drive, and your ticket will be there waiting for you. I hope..."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen from Franklin, Representative Rea."
- Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I would like to introduce a couple of people in the balcony from the Wren Lake Conservatory District, which will be hosting a reception at the Illini Country Club from 4 until 8 this evening. And you're all invited. And up there in the balcony, Larry Foster, who is the Executive Director, and the legal counsel, Terry Black."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen from... I'm sorry. The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The postponed meeting of the Committee on Urban Redevelopment will be the 5th of April, at 11 o'clock in B-1."
- Speaker McPike: "Any further announcements? The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Allowing one half hour for the Clerk in Perfunctory Session, I will now move that the House stand adjourned at the hour of 12:30 tomorrow, March 23, 1983.

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen has moved, allowing the Clerk a half hour for Introduction of Bills and Messages from the Senate, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:30. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Leone: "Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. *Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills 27, 69, 98, 104 and 235, passed the Senate March 23, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary'. Introductions and First Readings. House Bill 796, Giorgi - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Transportation Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 797, Matijevich - et al, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expenses the Law Enforcement Merit Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 798, Matijevich - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to State Police. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 799, Matijevich - et al, a Bill for an Act to authorize police officers in the Department of Law Enforcement of the State of Illinois to organize and bargain collectively with their public employers. First Reading of the Bill. House 800, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to codify the law relating to counties. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of an Act in relationship to State Police. First Reading of Bill. House Bill 802, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading the Bill. House Bill 803, Brunner - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to oil,

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

coal and other surface and underground resources and to repeal an Act herein named. First Reading of the House Bill 804, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 805. Giorgi - et al. a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of orthic practice. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 806, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Pirst Reading of the Bill. House Bill 807, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 808, Harris, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill Greiman, a Bill for an Act to provide 809. family counseling services through Circuit Courts and to amend certain Acts herein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 810, Reilly - et al, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 811, Nelson, a Bill for an Act relating to restrictions on solar energy use. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 812, Brunsvold - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 813, William Peterson - et Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 814, Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. House Bill 815, Hoffman, a Bill for of the Bill. First Reading an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. House Bill 816, Hawkinson - et al, a Bill for of the Bill. an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 817, Hawkinson - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 818,

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

Stuffle - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 819, Terzich - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workers' Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 820, Bullock - et al, a Bill for an Act to award state contracts in targeted areas. First Reading of the House Bill 821, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create Sanitary Districts and to remove obstructions in the DesPlaines and Illinois Rivers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 822, Hawkinson al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 823, Satterthwaite - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of House Bill 824, Doyle - et al, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the administrative costs the Revenue deducted for collecting Department of local occupation and use tax. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 825, Ropp - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to Grade A milk and Grade A milk products and to repeal certain Acts herein named. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 826, Wolf - Stuffle - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code and amend Sections of the State's Salary and Annuity Withholding Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill Brunsvold - et al, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of Bill. House Bill 828, Ewing - Ropp - Hastert, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to oil, gas, coal and other surface and underground resources and repeal an Act berein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 829, Saltsman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of

24th Legislative Day

March 23, 1983

the Bill. House Bill 830, Jane Barnes - White, a Bill for amend certain Acts in relationship to an Act t.o compensation for injuries resulting from First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 831, immunization. Wait - Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Act to revise the law in relationship to recorders. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 832, Leverenz, a Bill for Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 833, Karpiel - et al, a Bill for an Act in relationship to quarterly tax reports being made to county and local municipalities by the Department of Revenue. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 834, Kirkland - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Committee Reports. Representative Mulcahev. Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following Bills were action taken March 23, 1983 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 107, 264, 579, 607, 609, 610, 622, and 625; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 81, 85, 369, 408, and 528; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar House Bill 626. House Bill 835, Matijevich - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Act in relationship to the State Police. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 836, Matijevich - et al, a for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to State Police. First Reading of the Bill. Being no further business, the House now stands adjourned till tomorrow, March 24, at 12:30 p.m."

07/19/83

PAGE

19

37

33

18

20

20

20

50 54

21

18

18

21

21

35

21

21

54

62

21

32

63

29

30

68 73

81

30

36

31

19

85

85

85

8.5

85

85 85

85

86

86

86

86

86

86

86 86

86

86

86

86

86

86

86

87

87

87

87

87

87

87

87

87

27

87

PAGE

FAGE

PAGE

PAGE

FAGE

1

STATE OF IIIINCIS 83RL GENEBAL ASSEMBLY 10:16 HOUSE OF REFRESENTATIVES DAILY IBANSCFIETICN OF DEFATE INDEX MARCH 23, 1983 HE-0021 FFID ON SECOND PAGF HB-0025 THIRD REALING FAGE HE-0027 THIFD EFFEING FAGE EE-0033 SECOND BEADING FAGE HB-0036 SECONE BEADING HE-0049 SECONE PEACING HB-0055 SECONE BEADING FAGE FAGE FAGE BB-0057 TEISD REACING EAGE HB-0057 CIHER FAGE HB-0114 SECOND READING HB-0139 SECOND FEADING FAGE FAGE EE-0140 SECOND BEADING FAGE HE-0169 SECONE READING FAGE HE-0170 SECOND READING FAGE HB-0171 THIED BEALING EB-0172 SECOND BEADING FAGE FAGE HE-0187 SECOND BEAUTING FAGE BB-0235 THIRD REACING FAGE BB-0246 THIED REALING FAGE HB-0255 SECOND BEADING HB-0286 SECOND FEATING EAGE FAGE HE-0299 THIRD READING FAGE HB-0302 SECOND REALING FAGE EB-0307 SECOND BEADING FAGE HB-0318 THIRD READING HB-0319 RECALLED FAGE FAGE HB-0333 THIFD BEAUING FAGE EB-0374 SECOND FEADING FAGE HB-0376 THIRD REACING FAGE HE-0384 SECOND READING EAGE HE-0404 SECOND BEAUING FAGE EB-0796 FIRST READING FAGE HE-0797 FIRST REALING FAGE HB-0798 FIRST REACING PAGE HB-0799 FIRST REALING FAGE HE-0800 FIRST READING FAGE HB-0801 FIRST READING FAGE HE-0802 FIRST BEADING FAGE HB-0803 FIBST REALING BE-0804 FIRST READING FAGE FAGE HE-0805 FIRST BEAUING FAGE

HE-0806 FIRST READING

HB-0807 FIRST BEALING HB-0808 FIRST REALING

HB-0809 FIRST REALING

HB-0810 FIRST REALING

HB-0811 FIFST FFFFING

HB-0812 FIRST READING HB-0813 FIRST BEACING

HB-0814 FIRST REACING

HB-0815 FIEST BEALING

EB-0816 FIRST READING HE-0817 FIRST BEADING

HB-0818 FIRST REALING

HB-0819 FIRST FFACING

EB-0820 FIRST READING

HE-0821 FIRST REALING

BB-0822 FIRST READING BB-0823 FIRST REALING

BB-0824 FIRST READING

HB-0825 FIRST READING

HB-0826 FIRST REALING HB-0827 FIFST REALING

HB-0828 FIRST REALING

HB-0829 FIRST READING

07/19/83 10:16

STATE OF ITTINCIS ESEND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REFERENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCEIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

FAGE 2

MARCH 23, 1983

BB-0830	FIRST	READING	FAGE	8.8
HB-0831	FIRST	REALING	FAGE	88
HB-0832	FIRST	READING	FAGE	88
HB-0833	FIRST	REACING	FAGE	88
EB-0834	FIRST	BEADING	FAGE	88
HE-0835	FIRST	BEADING	FAGE	88
BB-0836	FIRST	READING	FAGE	88

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - RABEI ISRAEL ZOEFBMAN	FAGE	1
PLECGE OF ALLEGIANCE	FAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
INTRODUCTION - STATE FASKETBALL CHARFIONS	FAGE	3
RECONSIDERATION OF AFRECVED JOUFNAIS	FAGE	7
COUNSEL GENERAL OF IRELAND - LIAM CANNIFFE	PAGE	15
ELECTION CONTEST SEPORTS	FAGE	32
REPRESENTATIVE MCFIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	33
AGREED RESCIUTIONS	FAGE	82
ADJCURNMENT	FAGE	85
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	85
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	85
COMMITTEE REPORT	FAGE	83
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	FAGE	88